

## Relationship between resource mobilization and the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy in government aided secondary schools in Bukonzo east constituency Kasese district. A cross-sectional study.

Page | 1

*Bwambale Agabito\*, Edmand Bakashaba*  
*School of Graduate Studies and Research, Team University*

### Abstract

#### Background:

The successful implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in government-aided secondary schools depends heavily on the ability of school governance structures particularly Boards of Governors (BOGs) to mobilize resources. Despite the policy's intention to expand classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and staff housing, disparities in infrastructure development remain evident in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District. Limited government funding, weak coordination, and inadequate capacity of BOGs continue to hinder policy outcomes.

#### Methodology:

The study employed descriptive and correlational research designs using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. A sample of 136 respondents was selected from a target population of 210 stakeholders including head teachers, teachers, student leaders, and BOG members. Data were collected using questionnaires, interviews, and documentary reviews. Quantitative data were analysed using SPSS, employing descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and regression analysis. Qualitative data were analysed thematically.

#### Results:

The response rate was 88.2%. Quantitative findings showed that BOGs were active in mobilizing in-kind support, voluntary labour, and student sponsorship but weak in fundraising, lobbying government, and partnering with NGOs. Policy implementation indicators including adherence to timelines, electricity access, laboratory functionality, library facilities, and classroom standards were generally low. Correlation results revealed a strong positive relationship between BOG resource mobilization and policy implementation ( $r = 0.784$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). Regression analysis showed that resource mobilization significantly predicted policy implementation ( $B = 0.582$ ,  $\beta = 0.662$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

#### Conclusion:

Implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Bukonzo East remains uneven and limited. Resource mobilization by BOGs is the strongest driver of successful infrastructure development, demonstrating the need for enhanced capacity and better coordination.

#### Recommendations:

Strengthen BOG capacity through training in proposal writing, strategic planning, and partnership development; institutionalize School Improvement Plans; create structured platforms linking schools to NGOs; and introduce matching grants to incentivize local resource mobilization.

**Keywords:** resource mobilization, education infrastructure, government aided secondary schools, Kasese District

**Submitted:** October 01, 2025 **Accepted:** October 20, 2025 **Published:** October 30, 2025

**Corresponding Author:** Bwambale Agabito

Email: [agabibwambs@gmail.com](mailto:agabibwambs@gmail.com)

School of Graduate Studies and Research, Team University

### Introduction

The implementation of education policies in secondary schools varies significantly depending on the country, region, and specific policy. In some places, policies are thoroughly integrated into school curricula and teaching practices, with robust frameworks for teacher training, standardized assessments, and continuous improvement

processes. However, in many areas, the implementation can be inconsistent, hindered by factors like insufficient funding, inadequate infrastructure, lack of professional development opportunities for educators, or resistance to change from local communities (OECD, 2018). While some policies are well-supported and lead to tangible improvements in student outcomes, others may be poorly

executed, resulting in disparities in access to quality education, unequal opportunities for students, and a gap between policy objectives and real-world impact (World Bank, 2018).

While pressures on education systems grow to deliver high-quality education and the number of reforms increase, policy makers do not necessarily grant much attention to their implementation. (OECD, 2017). The implementation of education policies is a complex, evolving processes that involve many stakeholders and can result into failure if not well targeted. It is therefore crucial to understand it, clarify its determinants and explore ways in which it can be more transparent and effective (OECD Working paper No.162, December, 2020).

Studies about education infrastructure expansion policy implementation continue to demonstrate the value of innovative programs, strategies, and impact-oriented educationists are converting findings into the policy. One of the challenges for the implementation of education infrastructure Expansion Policy in government aided secondary schools is who and how to help government implement the policy such that their goals can be translated into actions (Khan, 2016).

Current studies in Uganda show that education infrastructure expansion policy is high on the agenda of governments across the world. Global pressures focus increasing attention on the outcomes of the policy and on its implications for economic prosperity and social citizenship. The experience of each individual learner is therefore decisively shaped by the wider policy environment (Advisory Committee on School-based Management, 2020).

The policy tracking studies conducted by the Uganda Ministry of Education and Sports in 2008 and 2009 reveal that some school Managements do not properly understand all the policy guidelines to be implemented in government aided secondary schools (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2020).

The policy is a fundamental process through which an institution attains stability and undertakes other changes as part of its ultimate goal (Uchendu, 2020). The educational policy of Uganda is a general statement containing principles, regulations, and rules that govern many of the decisions, on how to educate the citizens. It seeks to answer questions about the purpose of education, the objectives that it is designed to attain, the methods for attaining them, and the tools for measuring their success or failure (Defination net 2025).

Education policies cover a wider range of issues such as those targeting equity, the overall quality of learning outcomes and learning environments, or the capacity of the system to prepare students for the future, funding, effective governance or evaluation and assessment mechanisms, among others (OECD, 2015).

The school management roles that this study will review include; resource mobilization, supervision and budgeting, while the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy will look at level of adherence to time lines, budget allocations and disbursements and new buildings built.

Some Board of Govnors in Kasese District and particularly Bukonzo East Constituency have experienced low implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy due to poor resource mobilization, inadequate supervision and inefficient teaching that derive from poor coordination of actors, and low investment in technology to mention but a few.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between resource mobilization and the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy in Government aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency Kasese District.

### **Research methodology**

#### **Research design**

The study employed descriptive and correlational research designs to describe the nature of the relationship between Board of Govnors (BOGs) and the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Government-Aided Secondary Schools of Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District, Western Uganda. Each design served a specific purpose in enhancing the rigor, validity, and interpretability of the study findings.

The descriptive design was employed to systematically describe the role, characteristics, and functioning of Board of Govnors in the target schools. It also detailed the then-current status of infrastructure development and implementation activities within the schools. This design was essential because it helped to paint a comprehensive picture of the key variables, particularly the nature of BOG operations and the prevailing infrastructure implementation status.

The correlational design was used to examine the strength and direction of the relationship between BOG involvement (independent variable) and the effectiveness of policy implementation (dependent variable). This involved statistical analysis such as Pearson's correlation coefficient of quantitative data collected through survey instruments that measured variables such as frequency of the engagement of the BOG, financial oversight, participation in infrastructure planning, and policy outcomes like timeliness, quality, and coverage of infrastructure projects by the BOG. The correlational design was appropriate because the study sought to determine whether a statistically significant relationship existed between two or more variables, without manipulating them. It enabled the researcher to establish whether stronger or more active BOGs were associated with more successful implementation of infrastructure projects, thereby providing empirical evidence to inform policy and practice.

Furthermore, both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used. The quantitative approach was based on measurements of the quantity or amount of the phenomena, expressed in numerical terms, to generate data about the phenomenon under study. In contrast, the qualitative approach was concerned with the qualitative aspects of the phenomena, relying on observations made by the researcher during the course of the study.

### Study setting

The study was carried out in selected secondary schools in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District. This constituency forms the eastern part of Bukonzo County, the district's northwestern county bordering the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the west. Geographically, Bukonzo East stretches from the foothills of the Rwenzori Mountains in the west to lower-altitude farmlands in the east. Its territory includes several Sub-Counties (e.g.,

Kyarumba, Kisinga, Munkunyu, Nyakatonzi, Kyondo, Kitabu, Bwera) scattered across hilly terrain and valleys. It borders Bukonzo West to the west, Busongora and other Kasese constituencies to the south and east, and the DRC to the northwest.

This study covered the period between 2021 to 2024 when Board of Govnors failed to properly execute their roles in the government aided secondary schools. Most Board of Govnors lacked managerial skills due to poor coordination between policy makers, school stake holders and the implementers.

### Target Population

The study targeted respondents from five government-aided secondary schools in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District. These schools were; St Johns' Nyakabingo SS, St Kizito SS, Saad Memorial SS, Kitolhu SS, Kisinga Vocational SS.

The total study population comprised 210 individuals drawn from key stakeholders in school management and administration, including head teachers, teachers, student leaders, and Board of Govnors (BOG) members. These groups were selected because they play central roles in the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policies and have firsthand knowledge of school governance, resource mobilization, and supervision processes.

Specifically, the population consisted of 5 head teachers, 101 teachers, 54 student leaders, and 50 BOG members, as obtained from the Kasese District Education Department (2024). This composition ensured that the perspectives of both administrators and beneficiaries of education policies were adequately represented in the study. (Kasese District Education Department, 2024).

**Table 1: Target Population of the Study**

| Secondary school        | Head teacher | Teachers   | Student leaders | BOG members |
|-------------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|
| St Johns' Nyakabingo SS | 01           | 25         | 12              | 10          |
| St Kizito SS,           | 01           | 20         | 11              | 10          |
| Saad Memorial SS,       | 01           | 15         | 10              | 10          |
| Kitolhu SS,             | 01           | 21         | 11              | 10          |
| Kisinga Vocational SS   | 01           | 20         | 10              | 10          |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>05</b>    | <b>101</b> | <b>54</b>       | <b>50</b>   |

**Source:** Kasese District Education Department (2024).

**Table 2: Target Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques, Data Collection Methods**

| Respondents     | Population | Sample Size | Sampling Techniques  | Data collection Methods |
|-----------------|------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Head teacher    | 05         | 03          | Purposive sampling   | Interview               |
| Teachers        | 101        | 65          | Stratified Sampling  | Questionnaire           |
| Student leaders | 54         | 35          | Stratified sampling  | Questionnaire           |
| BOG members     | 50         | 32          | Convenience sampling | Questionnaire           |
| <b>Total</b>    | <b>210</b> | <b>136</b>  |                      |                         |

**Source:** Kasese District Education Department (2024).

### Sample Size

The sample size for the study was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table of sample size determination, which provides a scientific method for identifying an appropriate sample from a known population at a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. Based on the total population of 210, the corresponding recommended sample size according to Krejcie and Morgan's table is approximately 136 respondents.

Accordingly, the study selected a total of 136 participants, distributed proportionally across the four respondent categories: 3 head teachers, 65 teachers, 35 student leaders, and 32 BOG members. Sampling techniques were chosen based on the nature of each group and their accessibility. Purposive sampling was used for head teachers due to their administrative expertise, stratified sampling for teachers and student leaders to ensure representation across schools and demographic characteristics, and convenience sampling for BOG members due to their varying availability. This approach ensured a representative and reliable sample reflective of the overall study population.

### Sampling Methods

The study employed a combination of probability and non-probability sampling techniques to select respondents from the target population. The choice of each technique was guided by the nature of the respondents, their accessibility, and the specific information they could provide relevant to the study objectives.

#### Purposive Sampling

Purposive Sampling was used to select head teachers because they hold administrative authority and possess in-depth knowledge about school management, policy implementation, and infrastructure development. This technique allowed the researcher to deliberately select individuals who are most knowledgeable and experienced in

the subject under study, ensuring the collection of rich and relevant information through interviews.

#### Stratified Sampling

Stratified Sampling was employed to select teachers and student leaders. This technique involves dividing the population into subgroups (strata) based on specific characteristics such as school and then selecting respondents proportionally from each stratum. This approach ensured that all categories of teachers and student leaders were adequately represented, reducing sampling bias and enhancing the representativeness of the sample. Questionnaires were administered to these groups to capture diverse perspectives on the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policies.

#### Convenience Sampling

Convenience Sampling was applied to select Board of Govnors (BOG) members. This technique involves selecting respondents who are readily available and willing to participate in the study. It was used because BOG members often have varying schedules and may not always be present at school during data collection. Convenience sampling therefore allowed the researcher to reach as many members as possible within the available timeframe.

### Data Collection Methods

The study employed both questionnaires and interviews as primary data collection methods. The use of multiple methods allowed for triangulation, enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings by capturing data from different respondent categories using tools suited to their knowledge and roles in the schools. Secondary data was corrected through documentary review method.

#### Questionnaires

Questionnaires were the main tool for collecting data from teachers, student leaders, and Board of Govnors (BOG) members. The questionnaire method was chosen because it

allows for the collection of data from a relatively large number of respondents within a short period, ensuring cost-effectiveness and efficiency. The questionnaires consisted of both closed- and open-ended questions designed to capture respondents' views on issues such as school supervision, resource mobilization, budgeting practices, and the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policies. The use of structured questions also facilitated easier coding and statistical analysis of responses.

## Interviews

These were conducted with head teachers using a semi-structured interview guide. This method was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to collect in-depth qualitative data and explore the participants' experiences, opinions, and insights regarding policy implementation and school management. The flexibility of semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to probe further into emerging themes, clarify responses, and obtain detailed information that could not be captured through questionnaires.

## Documentary Analysis

The study also employed the documentary review method to collect secondary data from existing records and publications relevant to education infrastructure development and school management in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District. This method involved systematically reviewing official documents, reports, and records to obtain factual and historical information that complemented the primary data collected through questionnaires and interviews.

Documents reviewed included school records, such as development plans, financial reports, minutes of Board of Governors (BOG) meetings, and inspection reports from the Kasese District Education Department. In addition, policy documents and government publications, such as the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy (Ministry of Education and Sports, 2024), Uganda Secondary Education Expansion Project (USEEP) reports, and District Education Statistical Abstracts, were analyzed to understand the broader policy framework guiding infrastructure development in government-aided secondary schools.

The documentary method provided valuable secondary information that helped to corroborate and validate data obtained from respondents. It enabled the researcher to compare the schools' actual implementation practices with official guidelines and benchmarks. Moreover, the analysis of these documents helped to trace trends in resource allocation, infrastructure expansion, and policy

implementation over time, thereby enriching the study's interpretation of findings.

Overall, the use of the documentary method ensured that the study was grounded in both empirical evidence and official records, strengthening the credibility and comprehensiveness of the research findings.

## Data Collection Instruments

The study utilized three primary data collection instruments: questionnaires, interview guides, and documentary review checklists. These instruments were carefully selected to ensure comprehensive collection of both quantitative and qualitative data relevant to the roles of School Management Committees and Boards of Governors in the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in government-aided secondary schools of Bukonzo East Constituency.

## Questionnaire

The questionnaire was the main instrument used to gather quantitative data from teachers, student leaders, and Board of Governors (BOG) members. It was structured to include both closed-ended and open-ended items.

Closed-ended questions (mainly Likert-scale items) were designed to measure respondents' levels of agreement on issues such as resource mobilization, supervision practices, budgeting processes, and the extent of policy implementation. These questions facilitated uniform responses, simplified coding, and supported statistical analysis using SPSS.

Open-ended questions provided respondents with the opportunity to express personal views, elaborate on experiences, and offer additional insights not captured in the structured items.

The questionnaire was chosen because of its efficiency in collecting data from a large number of respondents within a short time, its ability to ensure anonymity, and its suitability for capturing diverse perceptions across multiple schools.

## Interview Guide

A semi-structured interview guide was used to collect qualitative data from head teachers. The guide contained open-ended questions arranged around key themes such as policy implementation, school management roles, supervision challenges, budgeting processes, and infrastructure development constraints.



The semi-structured nature of the instrument allowed the researcher to: Probe for deeper explanations, seek clarification on emerging issues, and capture nuanced insights based on the head teachers' administrative experience and oversight responsibilities.

Page | 6

This instrument was particularly useful for generating rich, descriptive data that could complement and explain quantitative findings obtained through questionnaires.

### Documentary Review Checklist

A documentary review checklist was used to systematically collect secondary data from official school and district records. This checklist guided the researcher in extracting relevant information from documents such as: School development plans, Financial and audit reports, Minutes of Board of Governors (BOG) meetings, Inspection reports from the Kasese District Education Department and Policy documents (e.g., Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy, USEEP reports, District Education Statistical Abstracts).

The checklist ensured that all documents were reviewed consistently and that the data collected aligned with the study objectives. This instrument helped verify information obtained from respondents, provided historical context, and revealed trends in infrastructure expansion and resource use over time.

### Validity and Reliability

Content Validity Index (CVI) developed by Lynn in 1986 was used to declare the validity of the questionnaire. A questionnaire is declared valid if the minimum CVI is 0.70 or above 0.86 (Lynn, 1986). Thus, the formula:

$$\text{CVI} = \frac{\text{Number of questions declared valid}}{\text{Total number of questions}} \times 100\%$$

Total number of questions

The research instruments were judged by a selected expert who said that out of 25 questions, 21 were correct and thus the content Validity Index was (21/25) 0.84. This value was above 0.7 hence the instruments were valid to collect intended data accurately.

A test-retest method was used to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. This was done by administering the questionnaire to a few people (5) and after a period of one week it was administered to them again. The relative values of the study were put in SPSS to compute the Cronbach Alpha Co-efficient. The obtained value was 0.82. This value above 0.7 as suggested by (Lynn, 1986) hence the

instruments were reliable and consistent in collecting the intended data.

### Data Measurements

A Likert Scale of 5-Strongly agree, 4-Agree, 3-Not sure, 2-Disagree, and 1-Strongly disagree developed by Renesis Likert in 1932, was used to determine respondents' attitudes toward the study questions. The Pearson Linear Correlation Coefficient (PLCC) was used to determine the significant relationship between the level of school management and educational policy implementation at a 0.05 level of significance. The significant difference between the level of school management and the implementation of education policies was determined using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

### Data Analysis

Data collected were organized and analyzed using statistical methods, including frequencies and percentage tables, with the aid of the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to generate percentages and variances. The analyzed data were correlational, as they examined the relationships between school management and the implementation of education policies in government-aided secondary schools. The variables were measured using regression analysis, which is a statistical method used to estimate the relationships between a dependent variable and an independent variable. Regression analysis also helped to assess the strength of the relationship between variables and to model the potential future relationship between them.

### Ethical Consideration

#### i) University Policies

An introductory letter was obtained from Team University before going to the field to meet relevant respondents and other authorities.

#### ii) Privacy and Confidentiality

Agreements were made between the researcher and the informants to ensure utmost confidentiality. The information provided was treated solely for the purpose of this study.

#### iii) Informed Consent

To address human rights considerations, the researcher provided a letter of informed consent to the respondents, allowing them to participate in the study willingly. The researcher assured respondents that they would receive feedback on the final work as appreciation for their participation.

iv) Anonymity

The researcher ensured that the names of the informants were not revealed anywhere in the study, maintaining strict confidentiality.

## Results

### Response Rate

The overall response rate for the study was 88.2%, indicating a high level of participation among the targeted

respondents. Head Teachers and Student Leaders had a 100% response rate, showing full cooperation and interest in the study. This suggests that these groups were highly accessible and perhaps more motivated or obligated to participate. Teachers had a response rate of 83.3%, which is still considered strong. While slightly lower than the first two categories, it reflects a good level of engagement and reliability in data collection from this group. Board of Govnors Members had the lowest response rate at 68.8%. This relatively lower participation could be due to limited availability, lack of interest, or logistical challenges in reaching some members.

Despite the variation across categories, the overall response rate of 88.2% is generally acceptable in research and suggests that the data collected is representative and reliable for analysis. High response rates help reduce non-response bias and increase the credibility of the study findings.

**Table 3: Response Rate for the Study**

| Respondent Category      | Questionnaires Issued and Interviews Scheduled | Questionnaires Returned and Interviews Conducted | Response Rate (%) |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Head teachers            | 03                                             | 03                                               | 100.0             |
| Student leaders          | 65                                             | 65                                               | 100.0             |
| Teachers                 | 36                                             | 30                                               | 83.3              |
| Board of Guvnors Members | 32                                             | 22                                               | 68.8              |
| Total                    | 136                                            | 120                                              | 88.2              |

Source: Primary data (2025)

### Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Gender of Respondents

Under this section the category, gender and age group of respondents are addressed. The demographics are presented in descriptive form considering percentages and frequencies

Table 4 presents the gender distribution of the study participants. Out of the total 120 respondents, 83 (69.2%) were male, while 37 (30.8%) were female. This indicates that male respondents constituted more than two-thirds of the total sample, suggesting a gender imbalance in participation. The disparity may reflect the actual gender composition within the target population or differences in accessibility and willingness to participate across genders.

**Table 4: Gender of Respondents**

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------|-----------|----------------|
| Male   | 83        | 69.2%          |
| Female | 37        | 30.8%          |
| Total  | 120       | 100%           |

Source: Primary data (2025)

**Table 5: Age of Respondents**

| Age Group   | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| 14–18 years | 35        | 29.2%          |
| 19–22 years | 20        | 16.7%          |
| 23–30 years | 08        | 6.7%           |
| 31–45 years | 33        | 27.5%          |
| 46–60 years | 16        | 13.3%          |
| 60+ years   | 08        | 6.7%           |
| Total       | 120       | 100%           |

**Source:** *Primary data (2025)*

### Age of the Respondents

Table 5 presents the distribution of respondents by age group. The data shows that the majority of participants were within the 14–18 years and 31–45 years age brackets, representing 29.2% and 27.5% of the total sample, respectively. These two categories alone account for more than half of all respondents (56.7%), indicating significant representation from both younger and mid-career age groups.

The 19–22 years age group constituted 16.7% of the respondents, while those aged 46–60 years accounted for 13.3%. Respondents within the 23–30 years and 60 years and above categories each made up 6.7% of the sample, reflecting the least represented age brackets in the study.

This distribution suggests a diverse age range among participants, with a stronger concentration among adolescents, young adults, and middle-aged individuals.

Such variation is beneficial to the study as it provides a broader perspective on the research issue across different stages of life. However, the relatively lower participation of older adults (60+ years) and young adults (23–30 years) may limit the extent to which the findings reflect the views of these specific age groups.

### Education Level of the Respondents

Table 6 illustrates the educational qualifications of the respondents involved in the study on the roles of Board of Guvnors (BOGs) in the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy in Universal Secondary Education (USE) schools within Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District.

**Table 6: Education Level of the Respondents**

| Education Level | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Secondary       | 60        | 50.0%      |
| Diploma         | 32        | 26.7%      |
| Bachelors       | 25        | 20.8%      |
| Masters         | 3         | 2.5%       |
| Total           | 120       | 100%       |

**Source:** *Primary data (2025)*

The findings reveal that a significant proportion of respondents (50.0%) had attained secondary-level education. This suggests that a substantial number of stakeholders particularly BOG members and student leaders may have basic formal education, which could influence their understanding and engagement with technical aspects of education infrastructure planning and policy.

Respondents holding a diploma qualification accounted for 26.7%, while 20.8% had obtained a bachelor's degree.

These groups likely include teachers, head teachers, and some committee members with formal training in education or management-related fields. Their relatively higher academic qualifications suggest that they are well-positioned to interpret policy documents, participate in school planning meetings, and influence infrastructure development processes.

A small proportion (2.5%) of the respondents held master's degrees, indicating a limited presence of highly specialized or advanced educational expertise among the stakeholders.



involved. Although few in number, these individuals could play a critical role in providing informed guidance, oversight, and leadership in the implementation of the USE infrastructure policy.

Overall, the educational diversity reflected in the data indicates that while there is a reasonable level of academic competence among the stakeholders, additional training or capacity-building efforts may be necessary particularly for those with lower educational qualifications to ensure effective participation in policy implementation and school infrastructure planning.

Page | 9

### Marital Status of the Respondents

Table 7 presents the marital status of the respondents who participated in the study examining the roles of Board of Govnors (BOGs) in the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy in Universal Secondary Education (USE) schools in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District.

**Table 7 Marital Status of the Respondents**

| Marital Status | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| Single         | 49        | 52.5%      |
| Married        | 65        | 43.5%      |
| Separated      | 6         | 4.0%       |
| Total          | 120       | 100%       |

**Source:** Primary data (2025)

The findings indicate that a majority of respondents were single, accounting for 49 individuals, which represents 52.5% of the total sample. This suggests that a significant proportion of participants likely including students, student leaders, and some young teachers were unmarried at the time of the study. The high representation of single respondents may reflect the age distribution within the sample, especially considering the involvement of school-based stakeholders who are still early in their careers or education.

Respondents who reported being married made up 65 individuals, representing 43.5% of the sample. This group is likely composed largely of adult stakeholders such as teachers, head teachers, and members of Board of Govnors. Their marital status may imply greater personal investment in the school environment, especially in relation to the long-term planning and sustainability of education infrastructure.

A small portion of the respondents 6 individuals or 4.0% reported being separated. While this group is numerically minimal, their inclusion contributes to the diversity of the respondent pool and may offer unique perspectives shaped by personal and social experiences.

Overall, the marital status distribution demonstrates a healthy mix of perspectives across different life stages. This

diversity enhances the robustness of the study by incorporating viewpoints from both younger, possibly more idealistic stakeholders and older, more experienced individuals. It also underscores the importance of inclusive policy implementation strategies that consider the varying personal circumstances and social responsibilities of those involved in the school management and infrastructure development processes.

### Quantitative Findings on Resource Mobilization in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency.

According to table 8, responses were measured using a 5-point Likert scale where 5-strongly agree, 4-agree, 3- not sure, 2- disagree and 1-strongly disagree and was analyzed using descriptive statistics particularly, mean and standard deviation. This section presents the quantitative findings regarding the role and effectiveness of Board of Govnors (BOGs) in mobilizing resources for Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District. The data were obtained from a structured questionnaire and analyzed to determine the level of involvement of BOGs across various dimensions of resource mobilization. The results are presented in Table 8 and discussed below in terms of their mean values and standard deviations.

**Table 8: Quantitative findings on Resource Mobilization in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency**

| Statement                                                                                              | Mean  | Standard deviation |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| BOG organize cash donations from parents and community members during school fundraising events        | 1.348 | 0.328              |
| BOG encourage in-kind contributions such as building materials                                         | 4.217 | 0.267              |
| Board of Govnors encourage parents to provide voluntary labor during construction of school structures | 4.284 | 0.228              |
| BOGs help in negotiating and managing parental contributions                                           | 4.332 | 0.341              |
| BOGs link the school with NGOs for donations on building projects                                      | 1.134 | 0.421              |
| BOGs link sponsors to vulnerable students for support                                                  | 4.312 | 0.584              |
| BOGs lobby for timely disbursement of capitation grants                                                | 2.621 | 0.312              |
| BOGs lobby for deployment of qualified teachers.                                                       | 4.091 | 0.183              |
| BOGs lobby for allocation of additional infrastructure support from government                         | 1.847 | 0.211              |
| BOGs help schools initiate income-generating projects                                                  | 2.634 | 0.352              |
| BOGs engage in developing School Improvement Plans                                                     | 1.193 | 0.219              |
| BOGs participate in budgeting processes of the school                                                  | 4.027 | 0.311              |

**Source:** Primary data (2025).

This section presents the quantitative findings regarding the role and effectiveness of Board of Govnors (BOGs) in mobilizing resources for Government Aided Secondary

The results indicate that BOGs exhibit a high degree of involvement in several domains of resource mobilization. These domains are characterized by mean scores equal to or greater than 4.0, suggesting frequent and active participation:

On Negotiating and Managing Parental Contributions, the (*Mean* = 4.332; *SD* = 0.341). This was the highest-rated indicator, showing that BOGs play a significant role in organizing, coordinating, and overseeing contributions made by parents. This includes both material and service-oriented support.

On Encouragement of Voluntary Labor for School Construction, the (*Mean* = 4.284; *SD* = 0.228). BOGs highly encourage parents and community members to provide voluntary labor during the construction and maintenance of school structures, which is a cost-effective strategy for improving school infrastructure.

On Linking Sponsors to Vulnerable Students, the (*Mean* = 4.312; *SD* = 0.584). The findings demonstrate that BOGs are actively involved in identifying vulnerable learners and facilitating their linkage to external sponsors who can support their education through financial or material assistance.

On Encouraging In-Kind Contributions (e.g., Building Materials), the (*Mean* = 4.217; *SD* = 0.267). This indicator also recorded a high mean, suggesting that BOGs frequently mobilize community support in the form of non-cash donations such as timber, bricks, cement, and other construction-related materials.

On Lobbying for Deployment of Qualified Teachers, the (*Mean* = 4.091; *SD* = 0.183). BOGs were found to actively engage with the relevant authorities to advocate for the deployment of adequately trained and qualified teachers to ensure improved learning outcomes.

On Participation in School Budgeting Processes, the (*Mean* = 4.027; *SD* = 0.311).

There was substantial evidence that BOGs are involved in school financial planning. Their participation in budgeting promotes transparency, accountability, and alignment of resources to school priorities.

Findings on Lobbying for Timely Disbursement of Capitation Grants showed (*Mean* = 2.621; *SD* = 0.312). While BOGs are somewhat involved in following up with relevant government agencies for the release of capitation grants, the results suggest that their efforts are inconsistent or not always effective.

On Initiating Income-Generating Projects, the (*Mean* = 2.634; *SD* = 0.352). This finding indicates that BOGs sometimes facilitate the initiation of income-generating projects such as school farms, brick-making, or vocational services, but these initiatives are not widespread or sustainable.

On Organizing Cash Donations during Fundraising Events (*Mean* = 1.348; *SD* = 0.328). The findings reveal that BOGs rarely engage in mobilizing cash donations from parents or community members. This may be due to low household incomes, lack of fundraising skills, or poor planning of such events.

On Linking Schools with NGOs for Building Project Donations, the (*Mean* = 1.134; *SD* = 0.421). The data suggest a significant weakness in forming partnerships with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) for infrastructural support. This represents a missed opportunity for external resource mobilization.

On Lobbying for Additional Government Infrastructure Support, the (*Mean* = 1.847; *SD* = 0.211). BOGs appear to have limited engagement in advocating for improved infrastructure from the government, possibly due to lack of knowledge on lobbying processes or weak linkages with policy makers.

On Participation in Developing School Improvement Plans (SIPs), the (*Mean* = 1.193; *SD* = 0.219). This was among the lowest-rated indicators, pointing to the limited involvement of BOGs in the formulation of SIPs. This raises concern since SIPs are critical planning tools that guide school development priorities and resource allocation.

The findings suggest that while BOGs in Bukonzo East Constituency are strongly engaged in mobilizing community-based resources, especially through voluntary labor, in-kind support, and student sponsorship, they are less effective in formal advocacy roles and strategic planning efforts, including developing partnerships with NGOs and preparing School Improvement Plans.

### **Qualitative findings on Resource mobilization by Board of Govnors in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency.**

One Head Teacher said *“Our BOG has been instrumental in mobilizing resources, especially through community contributions. They organize village meetings and appeal to parents to contribute in kind like building materials, labor, or foodstuffs for construction workers. Although monetary contributions are limited due to poverty levels, the sense of ownership among parents is strong when they are involved directly. We also write proposals to NGOs, but follow-up support is inconsistent.”*

Another Head Teacher said *“We operate on a very tight budget, so the BOG helps by prioritizing urgent needs. For example, last year, they lobbied the local council for some financial support to repair our classroom roofs. They also allow the school to use school land to grow crops, and the proceeds go into infrastructure maintenance. It's not much, but it's sustainable. Transparency and accountability are key to their mobilization efforts.”*

Another Head Teacher said *“The BOG focuses a lot on advocacy and partnerships. One of their biggest achievements was negotiating with a local church to co-fund a science laboratory. They also make use of PTA meetings to mobilize voluntary contributions. They encourage old students and local businesses to ‘adopt’ specific projects like latrines or water tanks. It takes time, but we are seeing results.”*

The Chairperson of the BOG at one of the selected secondary schools said *“Our role is to ensure the school has what it needs to run properly. We talk to parents regularly and explain the importance of supporting the school. Sometimes we collect small funds, other times we organize communal labor days. The community responds better when they see visible changes like a new classroom roof or painted buildings.”*

Also another member of the Board of Govnors at another secondary school said *“We don't rely on government funds alone. We meet quarterly to identify urgent gaps—like broken desks or leaking roofs—and then we divide tasks. Some members follow up with local politicians or NGOs; others rally parents. It's not easy, especially with poverty and political interference, but we do what we can.”*

The BOG Member at a selected secondary school said *“We once held a fundraising event in partnership with a local radio station to raise money for a girls' dormitory. It worked well because we involved district officials and the church*

leaders. We try to be creative and use the networks we have. We also encourage parents to donate in labor if they can't afford money."

The treasurer on the BOG on one of the selected secondary schools said *"Most of the time, our role is to bridge the gap between school administration and the community. We help the head teacher explain budget constraints to parents. We also sometimes offer personal donations like cement, nails, or timber and call on friends in better positions to help. We've also started a small parents' savings group to support emergencies."*

## Thematic Analysis

### Community Engagement and Participation

**Theme Description:** A dominant theme in the responses was the reliance on the local community especially parents for support in non-financial forms, such as labor, materials, and small monetary donations. Mobilizing the community fosters a sense of ownership and shared responsibility for school development.

#### Supporting Quotes:

- *"They organize village meetings and appeal to parents to contribute in kind—like building materials, labor, or foodstuffs..."* (Head Teacher 1)
- *"We talk to parents regularly and explain the importance of supporting the school."* (BOG Member 1)

#### Interpretation:

This theme reflects the socio-economic realities in the constituency where financial resources are scarce, but social capital and collective effort remain strong. The BOGs effectively utilize community goodwill as an alternative to financial input.

### Prioritization and Strategic Planning

**Theme Description:** BOGs actively participate in identifying and prioritizing urgent infrastructure and resource needs. The committees take a pragmatic approach to determine what can be feasibly addressed with the available limited resources.

#### Supporting Quotes:

- *"The BOG helps by prioritizing urgent needs... they lobbied the local council for some financial support..."* (Head Teacher 2)
- *"We meet quarterly to identify urgent gaps... and then we divide tasks."* (BOG Member 2)

#### Interpretation:

This indicates a strategic and consultative planning process in which the BOGs are key stakeholders. Their involvement ensures that limited resources are not wasted and that interventions are timely and targeted.

### Partnership Building and Advocacy

**Theme Description:** The BOGs play a proactive role in building partnerships with NGOs, local churches, political leaders, and other stakeholders. They also engage in advocacy to attract external support for school infrastructure and other pressing needs.

#### Supporting Quotes:

- *"They lobbied the local council... also make use of school land to grow crops..."* (Head Teacher 2)
- *"One of their biggest achievements was negotiating with a local church to co-fund a science laboratory."* (Head Teacher 3)
- *"We once held a fundraising event in partnership with a local radio station..."* (BOG Member 3)

#### Interpretation:

This theme reflects resourcefulness in extending beyond internal means to external support systems. It also points to an evolving understanding of resource mobilization as not only internal (within school or parents) but also networked with broader institutional actors.

### Innovation and Income-Generating Initiatives

**Theme Description:** BOGs and school administrations have initiated small-scale income-generating activities to supplement limited government funding.

### Supporting Quotes:

- *“They allow the school to use school land to grow crops...”* (Head Teacher 2)
- *“We’ve also started a small parents’ savings group to support emergencies.”* (BOG Member 4)

### Interpretation:

Such initiatives indicate innovation and a long-term sustainability mindset. Although small in scale, they represent efforts to develop alternative and more sustainable funding streams.

### Transparency and Trust

**Theme Description:** Transparency in resource management and open communication with parents and community members are emphasized as foundational to effective mobilization and sustained support.

### Supporting Quotes:

- *“Transparency and accountability are key to their mobilization efforts.”* (Head Teacher 2)
- *“We help the head teacher explain budget constraints to parents.”* (BOG Member 4)

### Interpretation:

Trust between school leadership, the BOG, and the community appears essential for mobilization. When

stakeholders trust that their contributions are used responsibly, they are more likely to continue supporting the school.

The thematic analysis reveals that Board of Governors in Bukonzo East Constituency play a central role in mobilizing limited resources through grassroots engagement, partnerships, and innovative problem-solving. However, their efforts are hampered by broader systemic challenges, underscoring the need for more structured government support and investment. Strengthening the capacity of BOGs through training, policy backing, and financial facilitation could enhance their effectiveness in managing and expanding school infrastructure.

### The implementation of Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency

#### Quantitative findings on the implementation of Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency

The study utilized a Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) to assess the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in government-aided secondary schools in Bukonzo East Constituency. Data collected were analyzed using mean scores and standard deviations to determine the extent of implementation across various infrastructural indicators.

**Table 9: Quantitative findings on the implementation of Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency**

| Statement                                                                              | Mean  | Standard deviation |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| The school adheres to timelines in implementing infrastructure policies                | 1.281 | 0.239              |
| The school spends over 30% of its budget on infrastructure development                 | 2.272 | 0.341              |
| The schools spend 10% of its budget on maintenance of existing infrastructure annually | 1.851 | 0.292              |
| The school has access to main grid electricity                                         | 2.253 | 0.385              |
| The school has access to other forms of electricity                                    | 2.652 | 0.427              |
| The school has access to main grid safe water                                          | 4.062 | 0.186              |
| The school has access to other forms of water source                                   | 4.465 | 0.429              |
| The school has a functional well stocked library                                       | 2.211 | 0.136              |



|                                                                                     |       |       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| The school has access to internet                                                   | 1.873 | 0.532 |
| The school has sufficient latrine facilities for both teachers and students         | 2.442 | 0.322 |
| The school meets the standard required classrooms blocks (4 blocks of 3 classrooms) | 2.674 | 0.193 |
| The school has functional laboratories (physics, biology, chemistry)                | 2.231 | 0.285 |

**Source:** Primary data (2025)

As presented in Table 9, the findings revealed significant disparities in the levels of implementation across the measured indicators. The adherence to timelines in implementing infrastructure policies recorded a very low mean score of 1.281 with a standard deviation of 0.239, indicating that schools rarely meet expected timelines for infrastructural development. Similarly, the budgetary allocation to infrastructure development and maintenance remains inadequate, with mean scores of 2.272 and 1.851, respectively. This suggests that most schools do not allocate sufficient funds toward the expansion and upkeep of infrastructure.

Access to energy remains a notable challenge. The mean score for access to main grid electricity was 2.253, while that for alternative electricity sources was slightly higher at 2.652, indicating limited but slightly more frequent reliance on alternative energy sources. In contrast, access to water services was notably better. Schools reported a high mean score of 4.062 for access to main grid safe water, and an even higher mean of 4.465 for other sources of water, highlighting that water infrastructure is more readily available or prioritized than other infrastructural elements.

When assessing learning and teaching facilities, the data revealed notable deficiencies. Access to a functional and well-stocked library had a low mean score of 2.211, and access to the internet was similarly low at 1.873, suggesting significant gaps in digital and literary resources. Laboratory facilities for core science subjects also scored poorly, with a mean of 2.231, indicating that practical science education is likely hampered by inadequate infrastructure.

Sanitation infrastructure showed moderate levels of adequacy. The availability of sufficient latrine facilities had a mean score of 2.442, suggesting room for improvement in sanitation provision. The availability of standard classroom blocks also scored relatively moderately at 2.674, indicating that while classroom infrastructure exists, it does not consistently meet required standards.

Overall, the findings point to limited implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in most of the key areas, particularly in terms of adherence to policy timelines, financial allocation to infrastructure, access to

electricity, and provision of academic resources such as libraries, laboratories, and internet connectivity. However, access to water infrastructure appears to be relatively well addressed across the schools surveyed.

### **Qualitative findings on the implementation of Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Government Aided Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency.**

These responses are qualitative and reflect personal observations, challenges, and opinions on the implementation of this policy, which aims to improve infrastructure such as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and sanitation facilities.

One of the Respondents said *"The policy is good on paper, but implementation has been slow. We have only seen a few classrooms constructed in the last five years, and even then, the student population has outgrown the available space. The government promised a science laboratory, but it has never materialized. We feel the school has been left behind."*

Another respondent when asked whether her school benefited from infrastructure projects under the policy?, she said *"Yes, to some extent. We received a block of four classrooms under a government project last year, which helped ease congestion. However, our sanitation facilities are still inadequate, and there's no library. The policy implementation is partial and doesn't address all the urgent needs of the school."*

Another BOG Member when asked about the progress regarding education infrastructure in the school, she said *"We appreciate the construction of staff houses and a few classroom blocks, but there's still a long way to go. The school lacks a proper laboratory, and some buildings are poorly finished. The implementation is inconsistent—some schools are prioritized more than others, and the criteria are unclear."*

Also another BOG Member said *"There's been some positive change, especially in classroom expansion, but maintenance is a big problem. After construction, no one comes back to inspect or repair. Some buildings are already*



developing cracks. So while the policy is being implemented, it lacks follow-up and quality assurance."

Another BOG Member was asked on whether the policy is being implemented as intended in their school, she said "Not fully. We were told our school was included in the expansion

program, but apart from temporary structures donated by NGOs, we haven't seen much from the government itself. The BOG has had to mobilize the community for local construction work. The policy is not well-financed or equally applied."

**Table 10: Documentary findings Implementation of Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Selected Secondary Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency**

| Name of School                           | New Classrooms Constructed | Science Laboratories | Library Facility  | Staff Houses Constructed | Improved Sanitation Facilities | Implementation Rating |
|------------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Saad Memorial Secondary School- Kiburara | 2 (Incomplete block)       | None                 | None              | 1 (by community)         | Latrines renovated             | Low                   |
| Munkunyu Secondary School                | 4 (Gov't funded)           | 1 (Basic setup)      | None              | None                     | 3 new stance toilets           | Moderate              |
| Mutanywana Secondary School              | 3 (Gov't funded)           | None                 | None              | 2 (Gov't constructed)    | One new block of latrines      | Moderate              |
| Kisinga Voc S.S                          | 6 (Gov't + NGO support)    | 1 (Fully equipped)   | 1 (Basic library) | 2 (Gov't supported)      | 2 stance latrines added        | High                  |
| Mahango Seed S.S                         | 1 (Temporary structure)    | None                 | None              | None                     | No recent improvements         | Very Low              |

**Source:** Kasese District Education Department (2024)

### Documentary Finding.

**Key:** "Implementation Rating" is a qualitative assessment based on infrastructure coverage:

- **Very Low:** 1–2 components present
- **Low:** Some construction but mostly incomplete or donor-driven
- **Moderate:** 2–3 components implemented with basic government support
- **High:** 4–5 components in place and functional

This section presents findings on the extent to which the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy has been implemented in selected government-aided secondary schools within Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District. The assessment focused on five key infrastructure components targeted by the policy: classroom construction, science laboratories, library facilities, staff accommodation, and sanitation improvement.

The findings, summarized in Table 10, reveal varied levels of policy implementation across the sampled schools.

The data indicated that classroom construction is the most commonly implemented component of the policy across all schools. Kisinga Voc Secondary School reported the highest level of progress with six new classrooms constructed through a combination of government and NGO support. In contrast, Mahango Seed Secondary School had only one temporary classroom structure, highlighting significant infrastructural limitations. Munkunyu SS and Mutanywana secondary schools had moderate achievements, with 4 and 3 classrooms constructed, respectively, while Saad Mem. Secondary School had only an incomplete block of two classrooms.

Implementation of science laboratories remains notably weak. Only Kisinga Voc Secondary School had a fully equipped laboratory, while Munkunyu Secondary School reported a basic setup. The remaining schools, including Saad., Mutanywana, and Mahango Seed, lacked any laboratory facilities, which negatively affects the delivery of science-based subjects and limits students' practical learning opportunities.

Library development is another under-implemented aspect of the policy. Among the five schools, only Kisinga Vocational Secondary School had a functioning, albeit basic, library facility. All other schools lacked library infrastructure, underscoring a broader gap in academic resource provision and information access for students and staff.

In terms of staff housing, Mutanywana and Kisinga voc secondary schools each reported the construction of two staff houses through government support, while SAAD Mem Secondary School relied on community mobilization to construct one housing unit. The other schools, namely Munkunyu s s and mahango Seed, reported no improvements in staff accommodation. Lack of on-site housing has implications for teacher retention and punctuality, particularly in remote and rural areas.

Sanitation facilities showed moderate improvements in some schools. Munkunyu and Mutanywana secondary schools reported the construction of new latrine blocks, whereas Saad noted renovations to existing facilities. However, Mahango Seed Secondary School had no record of recent sanitation improvements, placing students and staff at health and safety risks.

The overall implementation rating based on the number and quality of infrastructure projects varied significantly. Kisinga Voc Secondary School emerged as the most successful, with substantial infrastructure investments attributed to both government and NGO efforts. Munkunyu

and Mutanywana secondary schools were categorized under a moderate implementation status, having achieved improvements in at least three key areas. Saad Mem. Secondary School exhibited low implementation levels, with most infrastructure either incomplete or driven by community initiatives rather than formal government funding. Mahango Seed Secondary School recorded the lowest performance, with minimal to no visible improvements under the policy framework.

The findings suggest that the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in Bukonzo East Constituency is uneven and inconsistent. While some schools have benefited from significant improvements, others continue to struggle with basic infrastructure needs. This disparity may be attributed to factors such as limited government funding, prioritization gaps, and over-reliance on external or community-based support mechanisms. The policy, while well-intended, appears to lack robust coordination and equitable distribution of resources across the constituency.

### Correlation Analysis

These findings are interpreted in light of the study's specific objectives, which sought to examine how the roles of Board of Govnors (BOGs) particularly in resource mobilization, supervision, and budgeting affect the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in government-aided secondary schools in Bukonzo East Constituency.

**Table 11: Correlation Findings**

| The implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy in Bukonzo East Constituency. | BOG Resource mobilization |       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
|                                                                                               | Pearson Correlation       | 0.784 |
|                                                                                               | Sig. (2-tailed)           | .002  |
|                                                                                               | N                         | 120   |

**\*\*.** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results show a strong positive correlation between the BOG resource mobilization and the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy ( $r = 0.784$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). This indicates that schools where BOGs are more actively involved in mobilizing resources either from the government, NGOs, or the local community tend to experience a higher level of policy implementation.

This shows that resource mobilization is critical to bridging funding gaps. Active BOGs that seek support beyond government allocations help accelerate infrastructure development, such as classroom construction and sanitation improvements.

The results in Table 13 show that all three BOG functions resource mobilization, supervision, and budgeting are

positively and significantly correlated with the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy. Among them, resource mobilization had the strongest correlation, highlighting its central role in driving infrastructure growth in under-resourced educational environments like Bukonzo East.

This section presents the findings of a multiple linear regression analysis conducted to determine the extent to which the roles of the Board of Governors (BOGs) specifically resource mobilization, supervision, and budgeting predict the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy in government-aided Universal Secondary Education (USE) schools in Bukonzo East Constituency.

## Regression Analysis

**Table 12: Linear Regression Analysis of roles of Board of Governors in the implementation of education infrastructure expansion policy in Universal Secondary Education Schools in Bukonzo East Constituency, Kasese District**

| Model                     | Unstandardized Coefficients (B) | Standard Error | Standardized Coefficients (Beta) | t    | Sig. (p-value) |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|------|----------------|
| (Constant)                | 1.245                           | 0.312          | —                                | 3.99 | 0.000          |
| BOG Resource mobilization | 0.582                           | 0.067          | 0.662                            | 8.69 | 0.000          |

The analysis reveals that BOG resource mobilization has the strongest positive influence on the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy, with an unstandardized coefficient  $B = 0.582$ , a standardized beta of 0.662, and a t-value of 8.69 ( $p < 0.001$ ). This suggests that for every unit increase in resource mobilization effort by the BOG, the implementation of the policy increases by approximately 0.582 units, holding other factors constant.

## Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study indicate that BOGs in Bukonzo East Constituency are highly engaged in mobilizing community-level resources. Specifically, they actively manage parental contributions (Mean = 4.332), encourage voluntary labor for school construction (Mean = 4.284), link sponsors to vulnerable students (Mean = 4.312), and promote in-kind contributions (Mean = 4.217). These results suggest that BOGs effectively leverage community goodwill to support school operations, particularly through parental engagement and local volunteering.

The study also found that BOGs play a moderate role in lobbying for the deployment of qualified teachers (Mean = 4.091) and participating in school budgeting (Mean = 4.027). These findings indicate that BOGs are attempting to ensure transparency and efficiency in school management and have some influence over teacher allocation, which is crucial for instructional quality. This observation is consistent with Wandera, Eryenyu, and Atibuni (2024), who

demonstrated that active BOG participation in governance and resource oversight positively affects instructional resources and teacher performance. Such engagement underscores that BOGs' influence extends beyond infrastructure and finances to the quality of human resources within schools.

Despite these strengths, the study revealed limited engagement by BOGs in strategic resource mobilization. Activities such as organizing cash donations (Mean = 1.348), linking with NGOs (Mean = 1.134), lobbying for additional government infrastructure support (Mean = 1.847), and participating in the development of School Improvement Plans (Mean = 1.193) were minimal. This indicates that while BOGs are effective in mobilizing local community contributions, their engagement in formalized and sustainable resource mobilization remains weak. Similar findings were reported by Buys, du Plessis, and Mestry (2020), who noted that school governing bodies in disadvantaged settings struggle to institutionalize sustainable resource mobilization despite entrepreneurial efforts.

Importantly, your emphasis on community-level mobilization and parental involvement finds support in empirical research. VanMark, Aheisibwe, and Arinaitwe (2025) found that increased community participation in government-aided secondary schools in Uganda positively correlated with learner retention. This suggests that BOG-facilitated community engagement and resource mobilization contribute meaningfully to school sustainability. A broader regional perspective, such as

research in Ghana, indicates that when community participation is grounded in trust and inclusive governance, schools benefit in terms of management effectiveness and sustainability, which aligns with the patterns observed in Bukonzo East (VanMark et al., 2025).

Page | 18

Overall, these findings reinforce the conclusion that BOG-led community mobilization remains a vital and sometimes the only viable avenue for resource generation and school support in government-aided contexts. However, for long-term sustainability, there is a clear need to build capacity for formal strategic mobilization, including external funding, planning, and partnerships, as many governing bodies currently operate under structural and resource constraints (Wandera et al., 2024; Buys et al., 2020; VanMark et al., 2025).

Overall, the study highlights that while BOGs in Bukonzo East are successfully leveraging community-level contributions, there are significant gaps in their capacity for strategic, formal resource mobilization. Strengthening skills in long-term planning, formal partnerships with NGOs, and systematic fundraising could enhance the sustainability and overall impact of BOG activities on school development.

## Conclusions

The study found a strong positive correlation between BOG resource mobilization and the implementation of the Education Infrastructure Expansion Policy ( $r = 0.784$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). This implies that schools with BOGs actively engaged in mobilizing financial, material, and community resources demonstrate higher levels of policy implementation. The finding highlights that resource mobilization plays a critical role in bridging funding gaps left by limited government support. Schools where BOGs successfully attract assistance from local communities, NGOs, and development partners experience faster progress in infrastructure development, such as classroom construction, renovation, and provision of essential facilities. Therefore, strengthening the capacity of BOGs in resource mobilization is key to improving the implementation of infrastructure expansion policies.

## Recommendations

1. The Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) should design targeted capacity-building programs to equip BOGs with skills in proposal writing, partnership building, and donor engagement.
2. Workshops should focus on how to develop and

execute School Improvement Plans, which can serve as a foundation for strategic fundraising and long-term investment planning.

3. Schools should be mandated to involve BOGs in the drafting, reviewing, and implementation of SIPs, which should be submitted annually to district education offices. SIPs should include infrastructure expansion goals, budget projections, and potential funding sources.
4. District Education Departments should facilitate structured platforms for BOGs to interact with NGOs and potential donors through education fairs, project exhibitions, and donor roundtable meetings.
5. MoES, through local governments, should introduce matching grants for schools that raise a certain percentage of funds locally to support infrastructure development.

## Areas for further Research

Future research should compare the effectiveness of BOGs in resource mobilization across rural and urban schools to determine variation in fundraising capacity and infrastructure support.

Further studies should assess how formal training of BOG members enhances their ability to mobilize resources, engage donors, and support school infrastructure development.

Research should examine whether educational level, professional background, and experience of BOG members influence their effectiveness in mobilizing resources for infrastructure projects.

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

|              |                                   |
|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>ANOVA</b> | Analysis of variances             |
| <b>CVI</b>   | Content Validity Index            |
| <b>KCCA</b>  | Kampala Capital City Authority    |
| <b>MOE</b>   | Ministry of Education             |
| <b>NCDC</b>  | New Curriculum Development Center |
| <b>NGO</b>   | Non-Governmental Organisation     |

**OECD** Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

**PLCC** Pearson Linear Correlation Coefficient

**BOGs** Board of Govnors

**S.S** Secondary School

**SPIPs** School Performance Improvement Plans

**SPSS** Statistical Package for Social Sciences

**UBOS** Uganda Bureau of Statistics

**USE** Universal Secondary Education

**USEEP** Uganda Secondary Expansion Project

### Source of funding

There was no source of funding

### Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflict of interest

### Author biography

Bwambale Agabito is a student School of Graduate Studies and Research, Team University.

Edmand Bakashaba is a research supervisor at School of Graduate Studies and Research, Team University.

### Author contribution

BA is the principal investigator of this study

### Data availability

Data available on request

### References

1. Khan, A. R. (2016). Policy implementation: Some aspects and issues. *Journal of Community Positive Practices*, 3(1), 3–12.
2. Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). (2020). *Uganda Secondary Education Expansion Project (USEEP)*. Retrieved from

- <https://www.education.go.ug/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/Final-SOCIAL-ASSESSMENT-for-USEEP-05-05-2020.pdf>
3. OECD. (2017). *The future of education and skills: Education 2030*. OECD Publishing
4. World Bank. (2018). *Education policy implementation challenges in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
5. Definitions.net. (n.d.). *Education policy*. In Definitions.net dictionary. Retrieved November 28, 2025, from <https://www.definitions.net/definition/Education+policy>
6. Advisory Committee on School-based Management, 2020
7. OECD (2015). *Education at a Glance 2015: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2015-en>
8. OECD (2018). *Education at a Glance 2018: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2018-en>
9. OECD (2020). *Education at a Glance 2020: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en>
10. Buys, M., du Plessis, P., & Mestry, R. (2020). The resourcefulness of school governing bodies in fundraising: Implications for the provision of quality education. *South African Journal of Education*, 40(4), Article 2042. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40n4a2042>
11. VanMark Tumusiime, Aheisibwe, I., & Arinaitwe, J. (2025). Community participation and retention of learners in government-aided secondary schools in Kazo Sub-County, Kazo District. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, 8(2), 1083–1100. <https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.8.2.3315>
12. Wandera, J., Eryenyu, C., & Atibuni, D. Z. (2024). The influence of school board of governors' roles and instructional resource availability on teachers' performance in secondary schools in Busia District, Uganda. *Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 8(1), 382–392. <https://doi.org/10.59765/45ryte56>

## PUBLISHER DETAILS

Page | 20

### SJC PUBLISHERS COMPANY LIMITED



Category: Non Government & Non profit Organisation

Contact: +256 775 434 261 (WhatsApp)

Email: [info@sjpublisher.org](mailto:info@sjpublisher.org) or [studentsjournal2020@gmail.com](mailto:studentsjournal2020@gmail.com)

Website: <https://sjpublisher.org>

Location: Scholar's Summit Nakigalala, P. O. Box 701432, Entebbe Uganda, East Africa