Alternative financing mechanisms of church-founded secondary schools in Uganda

Abstract:

Alternative financing mechanisms of church-founded secondary schools in Uganda geared towards mitigating the repercussions of financial resource scarcity in church-founded schools is an ongoing debate among denominational school stakeholders. This study analyzes the extent to which the schools are grappling with possible mechanisms to bridge their financing gap. The findings are a result of a cross-sectional survey of what the various church-founded school stakeholders suggest to be the possible Alternative financing mechanisms of church-founded secondary schools in Uganda. It was concluded that most of the students, teachers, head teachers and education secretariat officials revealed that School-generated businesses such as school farms, alumni associations as well as soliciting for funding partners who share in the mission of the Church are the most appropriate Alternative financing mechanisms for Church Founded Schools in Uganda.
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INTRODUCTION

In Uganda, education financing is experiencing a downward trend, whereby schools rely more on parents other than government for financing of their budgets. Education financing data by Uganda National education Accounts indicate that the government contributes 16% and 11% for lower upper secondary respectively, while Households contribute 63% and 78% for the same (UNESCO, 2016). With the growing difficulties in mobilizing financing resources for education in many school systems (OECD, 2017), funding church-founded secondary schools in Uganda has also become unimaginable. How to make the best use of the limited resources to pursue their objectives amidst competing priorities has also become a quandary.

Following the promulgation of the 1963 Education Act, which resulted into government takeover of all Mission schools in Uganda, various subsequent educational policy reforms and changing socio-economic situations in Uganda have put many educational institution into financing dilemma (Pillay, 2006). The flopped Government Educational Plan 1971/2-1975/6 due to a manpower vacuum created by expulsion expatriate teachers and fleeing of local teachers (Ssekamwa, 1997), for example, had funding implications. The Kajubi Report 1989 and the resultant Government White Paper on Education (1992) which led to the universalization of education also came with public financing significances. The 1995 Constitution, which posits education as a right, specifying that each child is entitled to basic education, calls for various financing avenues to effect education mandate stated therein.

Amidst the increasing demand for secondary education, household expenditure over the past years has been increasing, aggravating the cost of education (MoES, 2016). The religious Foundation Bodies are increasingly findings it a challenge to effectively finance their schools. Many have adopted a number of alternative financing methods as coping mechanisms required of a resource-strained institution (Ssekamwa, 1997). Generically, there is increasing cost of education, high cost of living and household income-poverty, making many secondary schools grapple with how to provide education with the already meager resources.

There is a progressively deficient public funding for government-aided church-founded secondary schools, where the traditional funding package was restricted, in favour of the capitation grant system – for selected schools, which is critically deficient (Semakula, 2010). The Church-founded
private schools, on the other hand, are similarly grossly affected by financing inadequacies, requiring households to make larger contributions towards education funding than ever before. For many schools, there is patently, rampant parents’ inability to pay the specified tuition as the conventional form of school financing. The outcome, besides the purportedly inadequate apportionment of financial resources within individual schools, curtails school effectivity and improvement (Kiwanuka, 2001). This is largely held accountable for the apparent inefficieney, escalating non-performance, dilapidation and inefficiencies of many such schools in the region, depicting the picture of Uganda at large. Quest for alternative sustainable financing options by church-founded secondary schools has, so far, been in vain.

In church founded secondary schools in Uganda, there is a growing discussion to take on alternative financing mechanisms. Kasibante (2001) notes that the Church has already demonstrated itself capable of providing a definite, established and managerial alternative for her schools, since it has been in business of education for over 2000 years worldwide, and for over 100 years in Uganda. Within the years of the Catholic Church in Uganda, for instance, her contribution to the development through education is significant (Wamala, 2007). However, the financing position in such schools continues to experience a deteriorating trend with no clear feasible alternative mechanisms to mitigate adverse effects from resource scarcity.

In this paper we define alternative financing mechanisms as innovative methods of financial resource mobilisation other than the traditional government grants and tuition payment by parents, galvanized by individual schools to overcome the perennial budgetary inadequacies. These various financing approaches are the alternative ways of financial mobilization meant to ultimately contribute to education financing for the effectiveness of church-founded secondary schools.

On the other hand, church-founded secondary schools in Uganda refers to; Formal and nonformal centres for inculcation of knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and behaviors through educational institutions or schools founded and administered by denomination-based organizations or religious nongovernmental organizations. The institutions are peculiar providers of education, with such characteristics as: (1) affiliation with a religious body, (2) a mission statement with explicit reference to religious values, (3) financial support from religious sources, and/or (4) a
governance structure where selection of board members of staff is based on religious affiliation and where decision-making is based on religious values of churches, temples and mosques (Bouta et al., 2005).

**LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL REVIEW**

Given the government and private efforts to continue financing private demand for education, both households and school establishments ought to continue exploring innovative financing approaches as alternative financing mechanisms, to enable access and affordability to secondary education. The study thus delves into finding the various alternative ways of financial mobilization to ultimately contribute to education financing for the effectiveness of church-founded secondary schools.

In many developing countries, including Uganda, access to high-quality secondary education is determined by several factors; one major factor being household income. According to Gichuhi (2015), private spending on education at this level takes multifaceted aspects; tuition, coaching (private tutoring), books and scholastic materials, uniforms, transport, meals, fieldwork, examinations among others. The poor parent in particular has a higher opportunity cost in doing this, such as the foregone child labour, where children, especially girls, often help with agricultural production, water collection and the care of younger siblings. Stakeholders of church-founded secondary schools; households, administrators, staff and students must continue exploring innovative financing ways to sustain access and affordability to education.

In regard to cost-effectiveness analysis (Rice, 2002), the relationship between financing mix and effectiveness is best illustrated, whereby the question, “Should we support this financing method or that program?” is aptly addressed. Here, the studies look at alternative methods of accomplishing specific education outcomes using a mix of different financing methods and coping mechanisms and, therefore, attempt to identify the program options that are most successful at the least possible cost are made. Hence, in any school environment, attention is put onto allocating resources where they will be most beneficial to foster education quality.

Getange, et al (2014) studied alternative sources of funding for free day secondary education in public schools in Kisii central district, Kisii county, Kenya through a combination of desktop review and field data revealed that the government of Kenya was the major funder of the schools
where the study was carried out. However, the study also revealed that the finances offered were grossly inadequate and irregularly remitted to schools.

The role of the private sector in the finance and provision of secondary education in Uganda cannot be underrated (Winkler & Sondergaard, 2008). It comprises the sizeable fees paid by households to public and private secondary schools. It is, therefore, critical to protect and sustain household financing levels, most of which is provided by high income households to permit the expansion of more heavily subsidized educational opportunities to lower income households. In so doing, it will be more sustainable to support education at this level, from various fronts. A research showing how this can be done is just timely.

Wylie and King (2004) empirically revealed that secondary and primary schools spent similar proportions on average for property management administration and depreciation but secondary schools spent a higher proportion on learning resources other than entitlement staffing. However, this study ascertains whether a similar situation prevails among church owned secondary schools.

Omollo, Atieno & Onyango (2016) studied the effects of financial budgeting in management of public secondary schools in Uriri sub-county, Migori county, Kenya and with use of descriptive statistics and revealed that over 85% of the respondents showed heads of schools had limited financial knowledge in terms of locating possible funders accounting for low funds received from the government. Afolayan (2014) studied a holistic review of public funding of primary education in Nigeria and established that inadequate school funding affected the efficiency. As a result teachers were inadequate and infrastructures were not enough, contributing to school ineffectiveness. This particular study concentrates on secondary education, and assessing the effect of financing mix to effectiveness of church-founded schools.

Tumen (2013) studied the impact of school resourcing and financial management on educational attainment and achievement and with use of linear regression models and binary logistic regressions and revealed that the differences in the overall school funding practices had no impact on differences in achievement. Alternatively, this reviewed study used regression analysis while the completed study used Pearson correlation.
According to Samuel (2003), the principle explains the escalating cost of private cost of education as many governments are drifting away from bearing the cost of education. Some research findings show that the reason for this is because the individual benefits more from education. Samuel (2003), for instance, in a study for World Bank on public expenditures in Lagos State schools found out that household unit cost of primary education was N33,000, while the public unit cost was under N3,000.

Akinyemi (2005), estimating the unit cost of primary education in Lagos State found out that both the private and social cost of education were escalating every year with household spending (private cost) estimated to be more than 70 percent of the total cost and government spending less than 30 percent per child. The situation in Uganda seems to be taking a similar course. In many schools, parents are peculiarly the sole financiers of their children’s education, and the fact is that their incomes are much lower than the tuition fees and living expenses demanded by the schools.

Blaug (1987) argues that public expenditure on education depends not only on the costs of instruction but also on the volume of direct aid to students. He further notes that the levels of public spending on student aid can encourage or discourage the private demand for education but cannot directly affect levels of economic development or rates of growth of GNP per head. However, this seems to be an erroneous assertion according to other findings, since education of individuals in society largely determines the level of employment, and hence economic growth and development. Other school outputs that explain an effective school are, as a matter of this study, are cited, which may add both to an individual’s or society’s development.

According to UNESCO (2011), the process of effectively financing education expansion as well as quality improvement is rendered more complex by the lack of solid statistics on the costs and financing of education. Since the mid-1990s, four factors have promoted a rapid increase in the share of lending to general secondary education as cited by World Bank (2012). First, as primary completion rates have risen, the demand for secondary places has grown. Secondly, the equitable and sustainable financing and management of secondary education has become a major challenge, especially in low-income countries. Thirdly, education in economic and social development is being reassessed in the context of globalization and competitiveness in the information age. Fourthly,
changes in secondary education are being driven by rapid transformations in technology and labour markets.

The Uganda government White Paper on Education (1992) stresses the need to expand and increase opportunities at secondary level. It provided a basis for future reforms aimed at increasing access, quality, governance and, above all, how to enhance the private-public partnership to galvanize robust funding. According to the Uganda Education Statistical Abstract (2009), the secondary sub-sector in Uganda has three types of schools: government-owned, community-owned and private sector-owned. The annual school census (2009) depicts that of the 3,149 schools then covered, 30% were government-aided, 12% were community-owned, while 58% were privately owned, and most of whom were denominational in nature. The study, however, does not indicate where the various types of schools solicit their funding for their sustainability and effectiveness, which this study elaborately illustrates.

The United Nations Centre for Trade and Development (UNCTAD) also indicated that 74% of the variation in per-capita income across countries accounted for the inadequate provision of secondary education in third world countries (United Nations, 2005). In Africa, new solutions to overcome the perennial problem of sharing the financial burdens of provision of secondary education with other stakeholders such as religious denominations are incessantly being sought (Cole, 2008). The author makes no special mention of how to diversify financing to purposefully impact effectiveness in the school system. This study will indulge into the various mechanisms of pooling financial resources, as well as other non-financial remedies, to foster school effectiveness and improvement.

Countries such as the Czech Republic have made financing of secondary education more low-priced by increasing the teacher workload, teacher intensity in terms of the student-teacher ratio and merging of schools with low enrolment. Other adduced cost reduction measures such as the use of computers in teaching include individual teacher innovations have also been practiced (OECD, 1999). The case of Uganda requires a rather different approach altogether which rhymes well with the economic situation. This study endeavors to articulate such adapted approaches that can also further effectiveness in the church-founded secondary schools.

Financing of secondary school education over the last two decades in Uganda has had to accommodate a number of bottlenecks including general inflation and the government’s budgetary
difficulties. This, according to Akoyo (1989), has weighed heavily on parents and communities, who have always had to come in to top up heavy deficits in the daily running of the schools in terms of high fees payments. Since the researcher is precursor to the USE scenario in Uganda, a supplemental research ought to be undertaken to cater for the deficiency of government funding.

An effort to rejuvenate the public financing role, in relation to secondary education was embarked on in 2007 with the introduction of USE across the nation in most of the government-aided schools. The move, however, has so far been demonstrated by many education critics as being inconsistent with quality and school effectiveness.

The study adopted the Human Capital theory of school effectiveness and improvement, whereby Hargreaves (2001) posits that any improving school should enhance both its intellectual and social capital to achieve the desired educational outcomes of intellectual and moral excellences. This is done through utilization of the available resources to learn/teach successfully and by using the higher leverage strategies based on evidence of what works and, or innovative professional practices. In a highly effective/improving school, substantial investment (financing) in the physical and social capital leads to knowledge creation/better teaching and innovation, focusing on students’ outcomes; intellectual and moral excellences that position a school as efficacious.

Deriving from the human capital framework, cost analysis attempts to explain that investing in human capital has both economic and non-economic benefits. Firstly, the individuals’ earning capacity and employment prospects is enhanced through education, which brings a spillover effect to the acquisition and distribution of income, productivity of enterprises and economic growth at large (Psacharopoulos and Woodhall, 1985).
METHODOLOGY

The study utilized a cross-sectional survey design that predominantly assumed a quantitative research approach. Qualitative approach was also used to some extent. The qualitative approach was chosen because it goes deep into the minds of the people to investigate intangible variables such as attitudes and mentalities. The quantitative research approach achieved a more particularized understanding of the views and experiences of the respondents. Scholars such as Bryman (1988), Datta (1994) and Niglas (1999) identified intellectual foundations of the concept and value base of these approaches. The study population included all denomination-based secondary school stakeholders for both government-aided and privately owned secondary schools as well as partner schools (to government). The target population included the Foundation Body Catholic and Protestant education secretaries of the archdioceses of Kampala (Catholic Church) plus Namirembe and Mukono dioceses (Anglican Church). The study employed different sampling techniques to choose the study sample. The sample techniques gave to the members of the study population to be included in the sample size (Amin, 2004). Different sample groups were selected using different sampling techniques such as simple random sampling to select parents and denominational education secretariat staff within the target institutions. Purposive sampling was also employed (Maxwell, 2005). The purposive sampling technique was used to select school administrators and Board of Governors members. The technique was used because it gave the research opportunity to choose key people that would furnish with important in-depth information regarding the issues under investigation. The study sample included 40 denomination-based secondary schools; 25 Catholic and 15 Protestant founded from within the selected four metropolitan dioceses of Kampala, Namirembe, and Mukono, with the eventual sample size amounted to 700 subjects. The study mainly used interviews, questionnaire and documentary analysis to obtain the required data on school infrastructure, student enrolment, resources (school fees, school enterprises) and financial management practices that were useful in analyzing management of the financing of the selected institutions.
Findings

This study focused on funding coping mechanisms for performance of church-founded secondary schools in Uganda. It was priory argued that the twin goals of expanding Secondary education and maintaining its equitable access in Uganda are inextricably linked to the issue of adequate funding that can be galvanised through various fronts. The contribution of households - the largest private financier of education in Uganda (UNESCO, 2016) covers around one-fourth of all education expenditure in developing countries. Secondary schools ought to diversify their financing sources to foster their educational effectiveness. This is an area not yet given enough attention and hence, church-founded schools being pioneers of education in Uganda, should also pioneer this kind of drive. The analysis below presents responses on the situation in the church-founded schools, on which the study will base to propose remedies for a robust financial mix therein. Table 1 represents responses on how various schools salvage the situation in case of a deficit budget.

Table 1: Findings on how schools cope in case of a deficit budget

| Assessment                                                                 | Frequency | Percentage % |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Demand school debtors, prompting them to pay                              | 14        | 12.5         |
| Withdraw some votes/activities                                            | 14        | 12.5         |
| Push payments to another term or year                                      | 13        | 11.6         |
| Negotiate with suppliers to postpone cash payments                         | 11        | 9.8          |
| Staff get part of the salary                                              | 11        | 9.8          |
| Acquire loans from SACCO or bank to finish up the term                     | 10        | 8.9          |
| Debt rescheduling                                                         | 9         | 8.0          |
| Cut on the budget expenditure                                             | 9         | 8.0          |
| Borrow from overdraft /bank                                                | 8         | 7.1          |
| Borrow from the Foundation Body                                           | 6         | 5.5          |
| Do fundraising drive                                                      | 3         | 2.6          |
| Borrow from friends and well-wishers                                      | 2         | 1.8          |
| Ignore/Postpone some votes (items on the budget)                          | 2         | 1.8          |
| **Total**                                                                 | **112**   | **100**      |
Table 1 above shows 14 (12.5%) respondents who revealed that their schools instead demand school debtors and prompt them to pay, in order to deal with the deficit budgets, and indeed the same number; 14 (12.5%) withdraw some votes/activities from the budget in question, to deal with the deficit. Other respondents, who instead push payments to another term or year, were 13 (11.6%), 11 (9.8%) negotiate with suppliers to postpone cash payments, similar to those that said they paid staff only part of the salary, while those that reported acquisition of loans from SACCO or bank to finish up the term were 10 (8.9%). Likewise, those that reported debt rescheduling and cutting of the budget expenditure were 9 (8.0%) for each endeavor. The other 8 (7.1%) borrowed from bank overdraft while 6 (5.5%) said that they borrowed from the Foundation Body. Those that said in order to deal with a deficit budget they did fundraising drives were 3 (2.6%), finally 2 (1.8%) mentioned that the schools borrowed from friends and well-wishers, and similarly, 2 (1.8%) stated that their schools postponed some votes (items on the budget) to a subsequent budgets. It was ascertained that the secondary schools in the study had several stakeholders; these ranged from students and staff, to parents, Old students, friends, well-wishers and funding partners, all of whom shared in the financing ‘burden’ in relation to the particular schools. The researcher went on to finding in which ways the schools in question you engaged their stakeholders to contribute to financing of school programs. One interviewed parent said, “The school Head teacher is not aggressively pursuing various cost cutting options available as a way of minimizing the schools operational costs. Another interviewee argued, “Involving students in the school’s manual work is not only instrumental in providing necessary labour to address budget deficits, but when done objectively it can ensure robust development of the students’ appreciation of agriculture as a core economic activity, as well as using the proceeds to supplement the school budget”.

Table 2: Findings on the ways in which schools engaged their stakeholders into financing the school programs

| Assessment                                                                 | Frequency | Percentage % |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Write funding proposals and present them to NGOs, alumni, friends and well-wishers. | 25        | 22.3         |
| Call for bursaries of needy but bright students from the Foundation Body.     | 21        | 18.8         |
| Through Board of Directors resolutions.                                     | 20        | 17.9         |
| Call upon stakeholders to visit the schools to appreciate the need for financing. | 16        | 14.3         |
| Call PTA meetings for financing solutions                                    | 11        | 9.8          |
| Engage stakeholders in fundraising drives                                    | 10        | 8.9          |
| Students work in the school garden                                          | 9         | 8.0          |
| **Total**                                                                  | **112**   | **100**      |

Table 2 above shows 25 (22.3%) who reported that schools were writing funding proposals and present them to NGOs, alumni, friends and well-wishers, while 21 (18.8%) called upon the Foundation Body for bursaries of needy but bright students, as methods of engagement to those stakeholders. Other respondents 20 (17.9%) recommended that their schools would seek Board of Directors resolutions through their periodic meetings, and 16 (14.3%) asked stakeholders to visit the schools so that they could appreciate the need for financing particular programs. Respondents who identified PTA meetings for financing solutions were 11 (9.8%), engaging stakeholders in fundraising drives; 10 (8.9%), while those that mentioned students engagement in work that promoted the school effectiveness such as in the school garden, were 9 (8.0%). Therefore, the schools generally cared to involve the various stakeholders in the school improvement endeavors within their reach.

In an interview, one respondent said, “School management were endeavoring to diversify their sources of income as having various sources of income will ensure that there is a constant revenue stream that can cushion the schools against the effects of budget deficits”. The researcher also went on to ascertain whether the church-founded schools in the study area had any income-
generating projects set up to supplement the traditional financing sources. To this concern, the responses are hereby recorded in the Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Status of Income-generating projects in the school

Figure 1 above represents 98 (87.5%) respondents who revealed that their schools did not have any income-generating initiatives to supplement the traditional income sources, while only 14 (12.5%) said that their schools had some forms of income-generating projects, which supplemented the other financing sources. For the respondents who said ‘yes’, they went further to testify in regard to the various types of income generating activities their schools possessed, as illustrated in Table 3 below:

Table 3: Findings on the types of income-generating projects owned by church-founded secondary schools

| Assessment                        | Frequency | Percentage % |
|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Agricultural project (School farm/garden) | 4         | 28.6         |
| Piggery unit                      | 3         | 21.4         |
| Lock-up shops                     | 2         | 14.3         |
| Poultry farm                      | 2         | 14.3         |
| Zero grazing cows                 | 2         | 14.3         |
| Eucalyptus forest                 | 1         | 7.1          |
| **Total**                         | **14**    | **100**      |
In regard to the income-generating projects owned by the schools, 4 (28.6%) said they owned school farms, 3 (21.4%) mentioned possession of a piggery unit while those that reported schools owning lock-up shops, Poultry farm and zero-grazing cows were 2 (14.3%) for each type of school project. Only 1 (7.1%) respondent reported their school owning a Eucalyptus forest as their project. The above analysis almost confirms that the notion of school income generating project among church-founded schools is, at the moment, a rather farfetched reality.

In another subsequent concern, the study went on to ascertain prospective financing plans available for the church-founded secondary schools, as could be verified by the school administrators, since these are mostly the custodians of strategic planning for their institutions, and yet they are fully on the ground for implementation of the plans. A respondent through an interview suggested, “The school Head teachers of this church-founded school need to be more innovative in diversifying their income streams and also in financial planning and implementation of their budgets so as to manage their schools deficits”.

Table 4 gives, in general, administrators’ insights in line with the future financing of the schools in question, some of which refer to endeavors simply to stream financial aspects within the particular schools.
Table 4: Findings on the future financing prospects for Church-founded secondary schools

| Assessment                                                      | Frequency | Percentage % |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Search for donors through networking and writing funding projects| 21        | 18.8         |
| Invest in income generating activities                         | 17        | 15.2         |
| Use available land to produce food                             | 16        | 14.3         |
| Lobby the government for more funding for key projects          | 12        | 10.7         |
| Aggressive school marketing to increase the number of students to generate more fees | 12        | 10.7         |
| Expand school facilities to accommodate increased number of students | 9         | 8.0          |
| Increase fees with time within the ability of most parents      | 9         | 8.0          |
| Improve on accountability of finances in relation to the Board of Governors’ requirements | 7         | 6.3          |
| Get external auditors e.g. from the Foundation Body            | 5         | 4.5          |
| Start another school (branch)                                   | 4         | 3.5          |
| **Total**                                                      | **112**   | **100**      |

In Table 4, it is evident that 21 (18.8%) respondents proposed that if schools searched for donors through networking and writing funding projects, future financing would be guaranteed, while 17 (15.2%) thought that the schools would invest in income generating activities. Other respondents, 16 (14.3%) in number said that their schools would use the available land to produce food to supplement the budget, and indeed the number of those who thought they would lobby the government for more funding for key projects were the same as those who would opt for aggressive school marketing to increase the number of students that would in return generate more fees 12 (10.7%). The respondents who would expand school facilities to accommodate increased number of students were equal to those that would increase fees with time within the ability of most parents; 9 (8.0%). The respondents who said they would improve on accountability of finances in relation to the Board of Governors’ requirements were 7 (6.3%), whereas the ones who would involve external auditors such as from the Foundation Body, to provide professional services as well streamlining financial operations were 5 (4.5%). Finally the respondents who mentioned that they would in future start another school (branch) for better
financing were 4 (3.5%). Hence, the respondents were prospectively positive about improvement of the financing aspect.

On the same objective, another participant revealed that when funds are mobilized either internally or externally, the school is able to buy textbooks, teachers’ instructional materials, build classrooms, among others which significantly influence effectiveness and efficiency of the schools. The implication of these findings suggests that with funds acquired from different sources, school effectiveness can profoundly be enhanced. In line with this, one parent said; “when finances are mobilized, we are told they are fairly allocated amongst development projects and academic needs of learners. If resources acquired are not enough, key things like students welfare, staff upkeep, salary and maintenance are prioritized first”. These findings thus suggest that allocations for finances mobilized are determined by the collections from the different revenue sources. A certain interviewed respondent said, all stakeholders including the Foundation Bodies’ NGOs, donors, parents and the members of the public should encourage the school heads to seek ways of cutting costs so as to ensure that all the funds obtained from the diverse sources can be used within their confines. This will aid in the minimization of school operational costs.”

Table 5: Correlations between funding coping mechanisms and effectiveness of church funded secondary schools

| Correlation type       | Value | Approx. significance |
|------------------------|-------|---------------------|
| Pearson’s R            | 0.478 | 0.045               |
| Spearman’s correlation | 0.481 | 0.045               |
| Total                  | 112   |                     |

Table 5 shows that the measures undertaken to improve financial allocation have influenced the quality of education and school effectiveness at large as indicated by Pearson’s R at 0.5. This implies that the measures undertaken have directly determined the level of quality of education at the schools. This concurs with Kajubi (1993) that government should substantially finance both government-aided schools as well as reasonably support private schools. In this case,
government funding as well as diversification of financing sources are key in stimulating improvement and effectiveness of church-founded secondary schools.

An interviewed respondent argued, “There is need for supplementary funding. Such funding necessitates additional funds to be raised from non-government sources as recommended by a ministry. This is done mostly by income generating activities in the schools”. Another interviewed respondents said, head teachers are not especially keen on cutting expenses but instead chose to raise the parents’ contributions as a way of managing the budget deficits”

There are study participants who indicated that adequacy of funds mobilized influenced operations of church-founded secondary schools effectively. One participant indicated; “As we collect huge sums of money from various sources, students, government, donors and others, this school is able to meet the teaching-learning objectives programmed. For instance, last year students paid tuition promptly and the school was able to pay teachers promptly leading to achievement of goals”. This suggests that with adequate funds collected, teachers are paid promptly, which makes them more dedicated to their duty of teaching.

DISCUSSION

The study aimed at establishing the alternative mechanisms of financing church-founded secondary school in the metropolitan dioceses of Kampala, Namirembe, and Mukono. The findings of the study revealed an insignificant relationship between alternative mechanisms and effectiveness of church funded secondary schools in the region. The findings meant that despite the modes of funding are parents, government, grants, donors or any others, the effectiveness of the secondary schools funded by the church will remain constant; it will instead be the volume of funding and the choice of school program funded that matters.

The study findings showed inadequate funds provided to schools from the traditional sources; government and tuition fees payment. This was in agreement with Afolayan (2014) studied a holistic review of public funding of primary education in Nigeria and established that inadequate school funding affected the efficiency. As a result teachers were inadequate and infrastructures were not enough contributing to schools ineffectiveness.
The study finding agreed with Tumen (2013) who studied the impact of school resourcing and financial management on educational attainment and achievement and revealed that the differences in the overall school funding practices had no impact on differences in achievement. Alternatively, this reviewed study used regression analysis while the completed study used Pearson correlation. Financial sources of church funded secondary schools in the central region insignificantly relate with effectiveness of selected secondary schools.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is concluded that the alternative financing mechanism may come from private sector, NGOs, or business activities of schools such as school farm and other businesses. It is therefore recommended that Schools should not rely on government and tuition fee payment sources but should encourage widening of the financial base by creating internal revenue generating units, fundraising, and donations, among others. These would also entail sensitizations made to different funders. Funding should also come from old students, friends, well-wishers and funding partners, all of whom shared in the financing ‘burden’ in relation to the particular schools.
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