

Pedagogical and Non-Pedagogical Inputs Impacting the UPE Program in Eastern Uganda

By Nicholas Itaagaⁱ (Ph.D); Gyaviira Musoke Genzaⁱⁱ (Ph.D);
Rogers Kategayaⁱⁱⁱ Mugagga Anthony Muwagga^{iv}

Abstract.

This article examines the pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs which do impact on the UPE programme in Eastern Uganda. The findings in this article are derived from a study which adopted a descriptive cross-sectional survey design. It examined a study population and sample from ten districts and a number of UPE stakeholders in Eastern Uganda which included primary school going children in UPE schools, Teachers, Head Teachers, Members of School Management Committees, parents and Non-Governmental Organisations dealing in UPE. The Study revealed that only basic inputs such as writing boards, chalk, and dusters were both available and in a usable state in all schools. Textbooks distributed by the MoES were available but most schools preferred to keep them intact for fear of the repercussions of losing even one of them. The rest of the pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs were either completely lacking or in an unusable state in the schools under study. The study concluded that the poor state, nature, and lack of the necessary inputs has negatively impacted on educational practice in the study area. The researchers recommended that all primary education stakeholders should provide and ensure availability and effective use of the pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs in the schools for effective teaching and learning activities.

Keywords: Economics of Education, Teaching and Learning Aids, Educational Administration, Efficiency in Education

1.0 Introduction

The inception of Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Uganda in general and Eastern Uganda specifically in 1997 created a plethora of challenges in its actual implementation and the facilities in which it was to be implemented (Mugagga & Kaahwa 2008). Different reports do indicate that after over ten years, the Programme has achieved a quantitative upsurge in pupil numbers but the qualitative achievements are wanting. The UPE programme in Uganda especially in the rural areas has many challenges especially for the pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs. Pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads refer to the teaching and non-teaching materials and facilities used as inputs in the teaching/learning process. They aid the teaching/learning process in several ways and are intended to make the transfer and/or acquisition of knowledge as smooth and as enjoyable as possible (Farrant, 1980; Roberts, 1984; Adeyanju 2003). They range from realia, placards, pictures, maps, chalk and board; to the outside facilities like playgrounds, balls for playing, school gardens, toilet facilities, security and health provisions, transport and counseling facilities, sanitary pads, midday meals and several others.

Available literature indicates that equipping schools with such pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads is one way of increasing efficiency of the education system (Ayot & Briggs, 1992; Sachs & Larrain, 1993). Literature further contends that well equipped schools are necessary for efficient

teaching and gaining of transferable knowledge which translates into an efficient education system (Deininger, 2003; Coulson, 2003). The inception of UPE in Uganda and Eastern Uganda in particular hinged on the assumption that massification of elementary education or primary education would enable learners at that stage to achieve meaningful education and its implied values, beliefs, and skills - both soft and hard skills.

1.1 Objectives of Universal Primary Education in Uganda

According to the Ministry of Education and Sports (2004), UPE was viewed as one of the Government's policy tools for achieving poverty reduction and human development. The Programme was aimed at achieving the following objectives:

- To provide facilities and resources to enable every child to enter and remain in school until they complete the primary cycle of education.
- To make education equitable in order to eliminate disparities and inequalities in society.
- To ensure that education is affordable by the majority of Ugandans.
- To reduce poverty by equipping every individual with basic skills.

1.2 Pedagogical and Non-Pedagogical Overheads: A Challenge to the UPE Programme in Uganda

Different authors such as Roberts (1984); Trudy (1999); and Adeyanju (2003) underscore the importance of pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads, but they are more concerned with the use of these overheads other than their state, nature, and availability in constrained areas. They emphasize that teaching/learning aids stimulate, motivate, and arrest the learners' attention; help learners to improve reading and other skills; illustrate a skill, fact or idea; and relieve anxiety, fears, or boredom. If interest is built properly, the learning process can take place effectively. This implies that use of teaching materials is important as they have the potential to arouse interest in teaching-learning process. Dale (1969), in his study found that a normal human being remembers 10% of what they read, 50% of what they see and hear, above 70% of what they hear, see and do. Similarly, an old Chinese proverb also explains the same view: "I hear and forget; I see and remember; I do and I understand". Goethe (1749 – 1832) a German writer and statesman said "knowing is not enough we must apply, willing is not enough we must do."

Since the launch of the UPE programme, the Ministry of Education and Sports in Uganda has spent a substantial proportion of its annual budget to increase the supply of pedagogical inputs to schools aimed at improving the quality of education. These include core textbooks; teacher guides; supplementary readers and non-text book materials (Bitamazire 2005). At the same time the misrepresentation and misinterpretation of the UPE policy by politicians and the community led to failure by the parents to provide certain salient basic non-pedagogical inputs to pupils which among others included failure to buy shoes, uniforms, sanitary pads, provision of school meals for their children. Different reports like UWEZO (2016); NAPE (2015); seem to suggest that children are not learning, not only as a result of constrained pedagogical overheads but also because they lack the basic non-pedagogical school and home inputs. This study and the resultant article presents the availability, state and nature of the pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs in UPE schools in Eastern Uganda.

1.3 Study Research Questions

1. What are the available pedagogical inputs in UPE schools in Eastern Uganda?
2. What is the state and nature of pedagogical inputs in UPE schools in Eastern Uganda?

3. What non-pedagogical inputs are provided to pupils in UPE schools in Eastern Uganda?

1.4 Theoretical and Review of Related Literature

This study and article espouses the constructivism learning theory as expounded by Vygotsky (1980). According to Vygotsky, learning is an active and constructive process and the learner is an information “constructor”. It is believed that individuals actively construct their own subjective presentations of objective reality. New information is linked to prior knowledge, thus mental representations are subjective (Vygotsky, 1980). The theory relates to the study in the way that availability and use of teaching materials is expected to enhance learning as they facilitate the knowledge “construction process” alluded to by Vygotsky. This then called for an analysis of their state, nature, and availability in the study area.

2.0 The Pedagogical and Non-pedagogical Inputs in the Elementary/Primary School Programmes

Available literature from different reports and articles; for example Farrant (1980); UWEZO (2016); NAPE (2015); Muwagga & Kaahwa (2007) do reveal that elementary education systems have a number of pedagogical inputs which are salient for their effective and efficient operation and survival. Key among these are science equipment, audio-visual equipment, school furniture, and materials such as pictures, textbooks, and graphs which offer a vital service to teachers in the teaching process. In a way this view emphasizes the need for teaching and non-teaching materials to enhance the learning process, but does not indicate particular cases where lack of such materials has affected the learning process. In a similar manner Nkuuhe (2007), in his article makes a number of important revelations on UPE; in particular, he links UPE to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Though he makes novel definitions he does not clearly show the nature and state of UPE pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads in the schools. This limits his analysis on the success of UPE as a programme. On the other hand Nakanyike et al (2002); Ochoa & Bonifaz (2002); Okuni (2003) underscore the value of the MDGs and the implied UPE objectives but they do not clearly indicate the state of UPE pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads and their resultant implications on UPE internal efficiency. It is such gaps that the current study sought to fill.

It is important to note that by availability it is meant whether or not the concerned material and/or facility was provided in the school and ready for use by the teacher, pupil or any other school staff for purposes of enhancing the teaching/learning activity. State and nature examined whether or not the concerned item or facility was ready to be taken advantage of by the head teachers, teachers, pupils or any other school staff for purposes of enhancing the teaching/learning activities.

According to Juuko & Kabonesa (2007) availability or the state provision of the necessary infrastructure is crucial to the realization of the right to education. Such infrastructure includes classrooms, seating, and writing facilities among others. In their study carried out in Mpigi District in Central Uganda, they revealed that the state owns the largest number of schools in the country; for example in the year 2002, 78.2% of the 13,332 primary schools were government owned, while 14.1% were privately owned, and 7.5% were community owned. This underscores the important role the government has to play in the provision of pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads since the majority of the schools are government owned. Much as the above study was concerned with the legal implications of provision of education by the state, it has important insights to the current study. It for example revealed the details on the number and quality of buildings, sanitation

facilities for males and females, trained and well remunerated teachers, the availability of teaching materials and modern facilities such as computers, and showed that the state has not adequately met its obligation to provide and protect its children's right to education. It, however, was based on only one district in Uganda and therefore does not show the situation in the rest of the country, specifically Eastern Uganda for that matter.

According to Support And Love Via Education (SALVE), one of the Non-governmental Organisations operating in the country, schools in Uganda face huge challenges due to their lack of facilities. This makes it far harder for the children to learn and for the teachers to teach to a reasonable standard. In many cases schools are often only half built, without textbooks or any kind of teaching aids beyond a blackboard to help stimulate the children's minds. If, however, a school decides to improve its facilities, it also has to raise its fees in order to cover the improvement costs (Hillman & Jenkner 2004; Bategeka 2005). This of course means that fewer families in the community can then afford to send their children to such a school to make use of the better facilities. How such factors are affecting educational provision in the rural areas of Uganda is not known and this is what prompted the researchers to try and find out the state, nature, and availability of teaching and non-teaching facilities in primary schools in Eastern Uganda.

Another important input in education is the physical infrastructure - specifically buildings which are used as classrooms, offices for school administration, libraries, staffrooms, teachers' houses, and several other uses in schools. In Uganda, the implementation of UPE meant a shift from exclusive education to massive education which brought an urgent need for more classroom facilities to match the increasing demand (Nakanyike et al 2002, Murphy 2003; Bategeka 2005). Bitamazire (2005) emphasizes that government is still committed to construct and furnish new facilities through the School Facilities Grant (SFG) Programme. The programme assists the most needy school communities to build new classrooms, supply furniture for the constructed classrooms, and build latrines and at least 4 teachers' houses per school. Several questions arise from here: What has so far been done? Have schools in the rural areas benefitted from the SFG? More specifically do UPE schools in Eastern Uganda have enough buildings with the necessary furniture? Such gaps prompted the researchers to find out the state, nature and availability of classrooms, staffrooms, teachers' houses, and library blocks with the necessary facilities in the study area.

The second Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) report of 2005 singled out midday meals (lunch) as a key input, the lack of which was affecting the performance of the UPE programme. The report indicates that children do not have lunch from school because parents cannot afford to pay the high financial costs. Furthermore, the report observes that as a result of the inability to move long distances home for lunch, or being able to return home for lunch because the school is near but finding no lunch at home, the achievement of UPE objectives is being highly threatened. The report asserts that UPE-related charges especially uniforms, scholastic materials and lunch fees, are turning away children from the programme (Multi Media Report, 2005). Similarly, a study of breakfast, midday meals, and academic achievement in rural primary schools in Uganda by Acham et al. (2012) revealed a significant association between academic achievement and breakfast and midday meal consumption. However, these reports are not disaggregated enough to be able to show the happenings in all parts and minute communities of Uganda (rural, urban, pastoral, fishing, farming); yet UPE is a countrywide programme.

Kakuru (2003) observed that the increasing primary school enrolment figures following the implementation of UPE in Uganda were not matched with a corresponding increase in facilities. In his report, he indicates that most public schools lack desks, chairs, and other facilities though rural schools are the most hit. Some schools operate from under trees implying that during rainy seasons, school programmes are greatly interrupted. There are also gender disparities in access to facilities resulting from the fact that when boys arrive earlier at school, their assertive nature gives them better access to school facilities than girls. However, MoES has put in place programmes to increase the number of classrooms, latrines, textbooks, and teachers (Kakuru 2003; Bitamazire 2005).

Much as these are good findings and provide an overall country picture, they fall short of indicating what facilities are available or not, their state, and nature in Eastern Uganda. Similarly, the reports do not indicate how the availability or lack of it has impacted on the internal efficiency of the UPE programme. Lack of such information prompted the researchers to find out the picture in Eastern Uganda where there is widespread poverty and economic deprivation.

3.0 Methodology

The study employed a descriptive cross-sectional survey design and collected both qualitative and quantitative data. The study population consisted of all primary education stakeholders in Eastern Uganda. The specific target population was constituted of primary-school-going-age children in Eastern Uganda, primary school teachers, SMC members, Primary School Head teachers, parents, and NGOs that deal in primary education in ten districts in Eastern Uganda. These were selected by simple random sampling; purposive and convenient sampling techniques. Such approaches were preferred due to time and financial constraints.

The composition of the study sample is summarized in table one below:

Table 1: Composition of study sample

Category	No. per school	No. of schools	No. of districts	Total
Head teachers	1	8	10	80
Teachers	2	8	10	160
Pupils	2	8	10	160
Parents	2	8	10	160
Total	7	8	10	560

The information in table 1 above shows that several stakeholders participated in the study.

4.0 The Available Pedagogical Inputs in UPE Schools in Eastern Uganda

The pedagogical materials were subdivided into in-class; and out-of-class materials and facilities. In-class teaching/learning materials included chalk, blackboards, dusters, maps, pictures, placards, e-learning facilities, textbooks, among others; while the out of class teaching/learning materials included school gardens, ground maps, weather stations, among others. The non-pedagogicals on the other hand included: buildings, midday meals, sanitary provisions, communication facilities, electricity, clean water, security provisions, transport facilities, health facilities, counseling facilities, among others. The researcher used an observation checklist and the responses obtained are as presented in Table 2.

It is important to note that in the study context and in Table 2 below, “availability” meant whether or not the concerned material or facility was provided in the school, and ready for use by the teacher, pupil or any other school staff for purposes of enhancing teaching/learning. Furthermore, in Table 2 the term “usable” meant that the concerned item or facility was ready to be taken advantage of by head teachers, teachers, pupils or any other school staff for purposes of enhancing the teaching/learning activities. On the other hand, “varied” meant that the usability or otherwise of a given item/facility was not uniform between schools, individual pupils, and teachers. The phrase “not applicable” in Table 2 was used where the item/facility in question was not available in a given school, therefore its state could not be assessed.

Table 2: The state, nature, and availability of pedagogical and non-pedagogical facilities in the schools

Kind of Facility		Availability	State
Pedagogical facilities			
A) In-class pedagogical facilities			
i.	Blackboards, chalk and dusters	Available	Usable in most schools
ii.	Wall maps and globes	Not available	Not applicable
iii.	Placards	Not available	Not applicable
iv.	Essential textbooks	Most schools have	Usable
v.	Picture/graph posters	Not available	Not applicable
vi.	Pens, pencils, exercise books	Parents provide	Varied
vii.	Mathematical sets	Parents provide	Varied
viii.	E-Learning facilities/internet	Not available	Not applicable
ix.	Audio-visual equipment	Not available	Not applicable
B) Out-of-class pedagogical facilities			
i.	School gardens	Not in all schools	Varied
ii.	Netball and foot ball facilities	Not in all schools	Varied
iii.	Library facilities	Not available	Not applicable
iv.	Classrooms	Inadequate	Varied
v.	Weather station	Not available	Not applicable
Non-pedagogical facilities			
i.	Office space for head teachers and their deputies	Not in all schools	Varied
ii.	Staffrooms	Not in all schools	Varied
iii.	Staff room furniture	Not in all schools	Varied
iv.	Staff houses	Not in all schools	Varied
v.	Stores and kitchen facilities	Not in all schools	Varied
vi.	Electricity	Not available	Not applicable
vii.	School telephone facilities	Not available	Not applicable
viii.	School radio and/or Television	Not in any school	Not applicable
ix.	School fence & gate provisions	Not available	Not applicable
x.	Mid-day meals	Available in some schools	Varied
xi.	School security provisions	Not available	Not applicable
xii.	Toilet facilities	All schools have	Varied
xiii.	Counseling services	Not in any school	Not applicable

	xiv. Clean/safe water	Available in some schools	Varied
	xv. School transport facilities	Not available	Not applicable
	xvi. Health facilities/first aid boxes	Not available	Not applicable

Source: Field study

Findings in Table 2 reveal that among the in-class pedagogical materials, blackboards, chalk, and dusters, plus essential textbooks were both available and in a usable state in the study area. On the other hand, audio-visual equipment, weather stations, and e-learning/internet connectivity facilities were lacking in all schools. Interestingly, the availability and state of items like exercise books, mathematical sets were reportedly varied; these are the materials supposed to be provided by parents according to the UPE provisions. This shows the high rate of poverty in the study area. Furthermore, the state and nature of out-of-class pedagogical facilities was also found to be varied. Library facilities as an item was most affected because no school in the study area had a library. Most schools simply had a sideboard in the head teacher's office in which to keep the books supplied by the Ministry of Education and Sports together with other school documents.

4.1 The Available Non-pedagogical Inputs

As regards non-pedagogical facilities, none of the schools had counseling facilities (school counselor) and radio/Television sets. Other facilities like security, health provisions, staffrooms, office space, transport, and electricity were equally not available. The study as well probed the availability of sanitary pads, food for midday meals, in the schools under study. It was revealed that all these were not available. The toilet facilities in most schools were in a sorry state with many of them lacking shutters; some had "shutters" made out of dry banana leaves or mats, some had mud and wattle shelters, and in some schools the toilets were being shared between pupils and staff.

The findings in Table 2 are supplemented by some photographic impressions. The first is Figure 1, which shows a pit latrine shared between pupils and staff in one of the schools visited.



Source: Field study

Figure 1 Photograph of the only pit latrine in one of the study schools

The above photograph shows a pit latrine shared by all pupils and staff in one of the schools in the study area.

In order to fully understand the state, nature, and availability of the pedagogical and non-pedagogical overheads identified in Table 2 the study sought for qualitative responses from the key stakeholders through interviews and focus group discussions (FGD). During the interviews, teachers revealed that:

“Classrooms are not enough, in some cases we conduct classes in temporary structures and under tree shades, which cannot be done when it is raining.....” (Response from a teacher interviewed in Butalejja district in December 2017).

Most of the schools that participated in the study had essential textbooks either distributed by the Government of Uganda or got from donors. However, it was interestingly revealed that these books are not used by the teachers and the pupils: head teachers prefer to keep them unused in the cupboards for fear of interdiction or imprisonment once the books get lost. When pressed hard for reasons for the non-use of the textbooks, one of the head teachers put it point blank:

“If you are not careful with those books you can end up in prison,so in order to avoid prison, I would rather keep the books intact so that when inspectors come they find them all and in good condition...”

(Response from a headmaster interviewed in Tororo District in December 2017)

As regards the teaching/learning materials, the above findings in Table 2 were corroborated by the following views of one of the teachers:

“The government has provided the minimum teaching/learning materials like chalk and blackboards, but other school teaching and learning needs are not provided yet they are a prerequisite for effective teaching and learning..... Pupils in our UPE schools cannot effectively compete with their counterparts in the well-facilitated private schools in the urban areas” (Response from one of the teachers interviewed in Kamuli District in September 2017).

Table 2 further reveals varied state of scholastic materials; some pupils especially in the rural areas were found to be using one exercise book for all the four subjects, while others had empty mathematical sets used to keep pens and pencils and a few personal items. One of the pupils the researcher talked to outside class explained that:

“My father only gives me one exercise book at a time yet I need all the four exercise books (one per subject) at the same time. I use the only one I have been given for all the subjects until when it gets finished; and that is when my father can buy another for me.....” (Response from a pupil interviewed in Busia District in December 2017).

Table 2 further reveals that school radio and television sets, counseling services, e-learning and internet connectivity facilities, and audio-visual equipment as non-pedagogical facilities that are not available in the schools. This, according to the teachers, affects effective teaching and learning:

“Our school lacks the necessary modern equipment to enable us teach effectively; our pupils cannot compete effectively with those in well facilitated schools in the urban areas in PLE ; that is why our school cannot get any first graders.....” (Response from a teacher interviewed in Bugiri District in October 2017).

Table 2 finally reveals lack of school buildings leading to insufficient office space, classroom and staffroom space and consequently would be offices serve as food stores, textbook stores, head teacher’s office, and in some cases such space is used as a venue for meetings. One of the head teachers interviewed noted that:

“My office is multipurpose, it is a store for food and at the same time school records are kept here. Each corner serves a different purpose, sometimes I even fail to get where to pass to reach my seat...” (Response from a Headmaster of a school in Tororo District interviewed in December 2017).

Table 2 indicates that availability of pupils’ mid-day meals is varied in the study area. This prompted the researchers to probe for further explanations on this item. Through FGDs, the majority of the teachers and head teachers indicated that schools do not provide mid-day meals due to lack of funding from government, yet the parents have not bothered to carry food to schools. When schools tried to levy fees for feeding, the parents did not respond, and complained bitterly about the development. The parents on the other hand indicated that the children who would have helped them in the gardens to produce food are in school all the time, so there is no food to carry to schools. One parent explained the situation as follows:

“We are happy that the government has provided free education through UPE... However, the children who help us in the garden to produce food are the very children who are required to go to school.....how then do you tell us to take food to school.....I would request the government to provide porridge to the children at school, we cannot produce

enough food for the family and even have some extra to take to school.....”(Interview with a parent in Kaliro District in November 2017).

The pupils finally indicated that they starve during school time while others try to pick some fruits from the nearby gardens and bushes. One pupil explained as follows:

“The school does not provide lunch so during lunch time, if it is a season for mangoes; we run to the nearby bushes and eat mangoes for free. When it is not a season for mangoes we uproot cassava tubers from the nearby gardens or harvest sugarcane..... of course it is risky in case you are got by the owner of the garden but we try to be very conscious of such.....” (casual conversation with one of the pupils in a school in Buyende District).

4.3 The School Pedagogical Context

The study also sought to establish the nature of the school pedagogical context. This included the pupil-teacher ratio; the state of the classrooms, ventilation, size of the classrooms vis-à-vis the number of pupils; the state of the chalkboards, teacher dress code: ie attire, shoes, and general facial outlook.

Table 3 Pupil-teacher ratio in the study area

Number of teachers	Number of pupils	Pupil-Teacher Ratio
326	15,052	1:46

Source: Field study

Findings in Table 3 reveal a pupil-teacher ratio of 1 teacher to 46 pupils which is acceptable in Uganda. However, this figure is an average which is very misleading given that the study was based on 80 schools that is 8 schools from each of the 10 districts. The average number of teachers per school therefore becomes 4 which is not enough given that all schools had classes from primary one up to primary seven. The FGDs with the head teachers revealed that schools do not have enough teachers perhaps due to the low enrollment but majorly due to teacher attrition, which is occasioned by poor working conditions particularly the “miserable” salary as described by one of the head teachers, who noted that:

The government (of Uganda) salary is so low that a teacher survives by mistake. We do have so many needs but the income is little yet we are required to be in school regardless of whether one has lessons to teach or not..

This then prompted the researchers to conduct in-depth discussions with teachers regarding their working conditions. The teachers revealed that the major problem of the UPE programme is the meager salary for teachers, and in several instances the salary comes very late. 90% of the teachers complained that the poor teachers’ pay is indicative of government’s lack of seriousness and commitment to the UPE child. The study discovered that on average, teachers earn between Shs. 150,000/= and Shs. 250,000/= per month. In order to highlight the plight of teachers, the study looked at the prices of essential commodities in the country in the month of December 2017 which were as follows: Sugar cost anywhere between Shs. 4,000/= and Shs. 6,000/= per Kilogramme; Salt cost Shs. 1,000/= per Kilogramme; Rice cost Shs. 3,500/= per Kilogramme; a tray of eggs cost Shs. 11,500/= Above all, the price of fuel was Shs. 4,200/= per liter for petrol and Shs. 3,800/= per liter for diesel. This of course is not to ignore other essential requirements like medical care, school fees,

and clothing among many others. Teachers' salary cannot therefore sustainably cater even for the smallest family of two people (husband and wife only) – they regularly operate in deficits.

Finally, through FGDs teachers complained about the lack of facilities in the schools where they teach. The most critical facility was the toilet, lack of which implied that when teachers need to answer nature's calls, they either go to nearby bushes or neighbours' homes, or they have to share the available pit latrines with pupils, however ridiculous it may be. They also complained about walking long distances to and from school, indiscipline of UPE pupils, not being involved in the management of their schools and evaluation of the UPE programme, lack of lunch for themselves and the pupils, not being consulted in curriculum development, and low enrollment, irregular pupil attendance, and high dropout rates.

5.0 Reflections on the Challenges of Pedagogical and Non-Pedagogical Inputs in UPE Schools in the Study Area

The study findings revealed that basic inputs like blackboards, chalk, and dusters were available in all primary schools in the study area and were in usable state. However, there are equally important inputs like scholastic materials required by pupils, school uniform, and midday meals which were not adequately provided, and in some cases they were completely lacking, rendering the teaching/learning process grossly incapacitated. Information gathered from the head teachers indicated that the textbooks provided by the Ministry of Education and Sports were in particularly very good condition because of the stringent measures instituted by the Ministry regarding their handling and usage. As regards the non-teaching materials, the study revealed gross lack of such inputs in all the schools in the study area. This finding is similar to the views expressed by Nyakato, published in the *New Vision* newspaper dated Tuesday 30th May 2011 in which she indicated that gross lack of teaching materials was reportedly one of the biggest challenges faced by the teaching staff in Ayila primary school in Amuru district.

Similarly the above findings are in line with those of Juuko and Kabonesa (2007) who singled out quality of school buildings, sanitation facilities, trained and well remunerated teachers, the availability of teaching materials and modern facilities such as computers, as crucial inputs which were lacking in the schools they studied in Mpigi district. This, to them, was one of the major setbacks to effective teaching/learning and therefore accounting for the poor performance in Primary Leaving Examinations in the district. Furthermore, in Busia District, according to Womakuyu's article published in the *New Vision* news paper, of Tuesday 19th April 2011, one of the schools in the district has only seven teachers, lacks classrooms and textbooks. Pupils studying under such grossly deprived circumstances cannot effectively compete with their counterparts in the urban and well facilitated schools. Unfortunately at the end of the primary cycle of education all these pupils sit the same examinations.

It is important to note that according to the UPE policy, parents/guardians are expected to provide pens, pencils, exercise books, mathematical sets, school uniform, and mid-day meals to their children while the Government is expected to provide the rest of the pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs (MoES 2004). But how much is government spending on UPE activities in the schools? According to the Permanent Secretary Ministry of Education and Sports, as reported by the *New Vision* Newspaper dated 29th April 2011, the government is only proposing to increase its expenditure on UPE pupils from Uganda Shs. 1,800/= to 2,300/= per day (per pupil). This is rather

ridiculous given that the November 2017 (when data was collected) exchange rate was 1US\$ = 3,400 Uganda Shillings. The government of Uganda was therefore spending less than 1US\$ per child per day and the proposed increase is still less than a dollar per child per day. This cannot be sufficient to buy all the necessary pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs.

The above findings are a clear testimony that the schools in the study area are not benefitting from the advantages of using teaching/learning materials as advanced by Goethe (1849 – 1832; Farrant (1980); Dale (1981). Several educators agree that human beings can hardly remember what they are told if they do not have a visual aid to associate it with. Secondly, pupils who are not academically inclined easily tune out when a teacher stands in front of them explaining issues that do not make much sense to them, and there is nothing for them to watch. It is therefore clear that lack of teaching aids significantly impedes pupil learning and achievement. According to Trudy (1999) teaching aids help learners to improve reading and other skills, illustrate a skill, fact or idea and relieve anxiety, fears or boredom. No wonder the UPE programme has been criticized for the half-baked graduates that cannot read and write especially in the rural areas. According to Emorut, in an article published in the *New Vision Newspaper* dated Tuesday 19th April 2011, the pupils of Owale village in Katakwi district vanished into the bushes on realizing that they were due to be subjected to a test to gauge their competencies in learning and reading. Similarly, according to Nyakato in an article published in the same *Newspaper* dated Tuesday 3rd May 2011, the primary five pupils of Ayila parents' primary school in Amuru district "fall as silent as a grave when asked to solve a mathematical equation. They can only hatch a solution after the teacher has translated the question into Luo their local language".

Furthermore, Farrant (1980) is of the view that science equipment, audio-visual equipment, school furniture, and materials such as pictures, textbooks, graphs offer a vital service to teachers in the teaching process. This, however, is not the case in the UPE schools in the study area since the study revealed that such materials are simply not available; the funders, particularly the Government has not provided such materials, neither has it facilitated the teachers to develop them. Interestingly, the study did not reveal any case where teachers had either improvised or used real objects as teaching/learning aids. When asked why they could not improvise, their answer was lack of financial resources, time, and the zeal to embark on such a venture. The situation is worse when it comes to practical subjects. According to Wangusa, in an article published in the *New Vision newspaper* dated Tuesday 19th April 2011, school farms are supposed to show the students practically what the teacher is talking about; they serve as demonstration guides to students. He regrets the idea of school farms/gardens dying out in most schools due to lack of space for establishing farms. In the study area, the few schools that had school gardens planted cassava, maize, sweet potatoes, and such food crops for the teachers' consumption; but most important is that pupils are made to cultivate in the gardens as a punishment for crimes they commit in school. This has a negative implication of pupils taking farming to be a punishment instead of an economic activity or a learning experience.

Midday meals are such an important input that their absence is negatively impacting on UPE activities in the study area. The study revealed that parents have not heeded government's call to provide midday meals to their children and the head teachers, teachers, and pupils expressed concern over the absence of lunch at school. This finding is in agreement with the PPA report of 2005. Government feels that the provision of midday meals at school should be the parents' responsibility, while the parents think the government should cater for all the school requirements

including the midday meals. Acham et al (2012) observed that many parents, particularly in the rural areas, cannot afford to pay even for a meal of maize porridge for their children. It is interesting to note that some politicians feel that there is some element of laziness on the part of the parents in failing to provide food. The flip side of this, however, is that in most families the children are the main source of labour on the family farms so if they are in school then the parents are not able to produce enough food for the family with some extra for taking to school.

Finally, education is supposed to develop the body, mind and soul (Muwagga, 2006). This cannot be achieved through classroom theoretical instruction alone but rather through the use of instructional materials in and out of class; and out-of-class activities which include games and sports. According to the Ministry of Education and Sports undersecretary, Aggrey Kibenge, Education is not about examinations alone, but it is about acquiring skills and knowledge that one would use when they leave school. He emphasizes that no country has ever developed without emphasizing practical subjects. Furthermore, Juuko & Kabonesa (2007) emphasize the need for the state to provide the necessary infrastructure for the realization of the right to education. Absence of such facilities means that pupils are not given a chance to identify and develop such physical talents; while their counterparts in the urban and well facilitated schools do have such opportunities. According to the 2002 Uganda Education Abstract, poor classroom conditions and lack of adequate facilities outside class in lower classes may be responsible for children losing interest in school and taking on other activities like trading. According to an article written by Womakuyu published in the New Vision Newspaper dated 19th April 2011, one of the pupils reported that he often obtains grade U (failing) in class due to lack of scholastic materials and does not even have school uniform. This tempts him to return to smuggling.

The state, nature, and availability of pedagogical and non-pedagogical facilities in Uganda's UPE schools is a clear testimony that putting up schools and having children enroll in them when the teachers are not well facilitated or the required facilities are not available or in very poor state does not add up to a coherent education policy. Furthermore, the education policy review commission report 1989 emphasises that an education system cannot be better than the quality of its teachers. Well facilitated teachers, in addition to their training, and preparation constitute their quality. According to the Uganda Education Report (2000), for Primary one to Primary five (6 – 11 years), children are expected to master reading, writing, oral expression, numeracy and life skills; while for Primary six and Primary seven (12 – 13 years) the identified skills are knowledge, life skills, social, vocational and problem solving skills, values, and attitudes. All these can only be achieved if the system is up and running with all the necessary pedagogical and non-pedagogical facilities available in the schools.

6.0 Conclusion

The current study concludes that pupils in UPE schools are not realizing the benefits that accrue from the use of teaching/learning materials because they were either not available or were in an unusable state. Furthermore, since UPE schools were poorly facilitated as revealed by the study, their pupils were likely to perform poorly in public examinations compared to those in well-facilitated urban and more so private schools. Pupils in UPE schools were not being availed an opportunity for full development of all their potential – mind, body and soul due to lack of pedagogical and non-pedagogical facilities.

7.0 Recommendations

The researchers recommended that the government and its development partners should provide the necessary pedagogical and non-pedagogical inputs required for effective teaching and learning in all UPE schools. This, it was thought, would ensure that the pupils get all round education which caters for the mind, body and soul. Furthermore, much as a lot of money is spent on purchasing and availing the few inputs to the schools, government should reduce on the restrictions it has imposed on their use to ensure that teachers and pupils use them effectively.

8.0 References

- Acham, H, Kikafunda J.K, Malde K.M, Wilna. H, Oldewage-Therona & Egal A. (2012) Breakfast, Midday Meals and Academic Achievement in Rural primary Schools in Uganda: Implications for Education and School Health Policy. *Food and Nutrition Research* 2012; vol 56.
- Adeyanju. L. (2003). Teachers' Perception of the Effects and Use of Learning Aids in Teaching: A Case Study of Winneba Basic and Secondary Schools. <http://www.ultibase.rmit.edu.au>.
- Ayot. H.O & Briggs. H (1992). *Economics of Education*. Ist Edition. Educational Research and Publications. Nairobi, Kenya.
- Bategeka, L. (2005). Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Uganda. Policy Case Study: Access to Public Services. Inter-Regional Inequality Facility; Sharing Ideas, Policy and Practice Across Africa, Asia and Latin America.
- Bitamazire, G.N.(2005). Status of Education for Rural People in Uganda. A presentation at the Ministerial Seminar for Education for Rural people in Africa Held Between 7th to 9th September 2005 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Coulson. A. (2003). Implementing "Education For All" Moving From Goals to Action; a Paper prepared for the second Incontro Internazionale Milanoliberal, Milan Italy.
- Dale. E. (1969). *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching*. Dryden, New York.
- Deininger K (2003). Does Cost of Schooling Affect Enrollment by the Poor? *Universal Primary Education in Uganda*. *Economics of Education Review Journal*. Vol 22, P291-305.
- Farrant J.S. (1980) *Principles and Practice of Education*. Longman, Harlow. UK
- Hillman,A.L. & Jenkner, E. (2004). *Educating Children in Poor Countries*. Economic Issue No.33. IMF Publication.
- Juuko F.W & Kabonesa C (2007). *Universal Primary Education in Uganda: Right or Privilege*. Working paper No.8. HURIPPEC: Kampala.
- Kakuru, M.D (2003) *Gender Sensitive Educational Policy and Practice: Uganda Case Study*. A paper prepared for the International Bureau of Education. Makerere University Department of Sociology.

Ministry Of Education and Sports (2004). Universal Primary Education (UPE), Enhancing UPE: A Stakeholder's Handbook. Kampala, Uganda.

Multi Media Report (2005), Hunger and Charges Threaten the Universal Primary Education Programme; the Second Participatory Poverty Assessment Report. www.ugpulse.com/writer/uganda/Ultimate+Media.aspx

Murphy, L. (2003). Does Increasing Access Mean Decreasing Quality? An Assessment of Uganda's Progress Towards Reaching EFA Goals. Background paper for EFA monitoring report.

Muwagga M.A. (2006). The Philosophical Implications of the Liberalisation of University Education in Uganda. Doctoral Thesis. Makerere University Kampala.

Nakanyike M., Kasente D. et al (2002). Attendance Patterns and Causes of Dropout in Primary Schools in Uganda. A Research Report. Kampala, Uganda. Makerere University Institute of Social Research.

Nkuuhe .J. (2007). Birth of the Millennium Goals; Meaning of MDGs Globally and Locally. UNDP News Uganda. A Quarterly Newsletter publishes by the Communications Unit of the United Nations Development Programme UNDP, Uganda.

Ochoa, M. & Bonifaz, A (2002). An Analysis of Disparities in Education: The Case of Primary School Completion Rates in Bolivia. The World Bank, Washington DC.

Okuni. A (2003). EFA policies, strategies and reforms in Uganda: assessment of the current potential for sustainable progress towards achieving the EFA goals by 2015. Aga Khan Foundation.

Roberts, D. (1984). Ways and Means of Reducing Early Student Drop - out Rates. *Distance Education*, 5, 1, 50 - 71.

Sachs. D.J. & Larrain. B. F. (1993) Macroeconomics In The Global Economy. Prentice Hall Publishers, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA.

The New Vision Newspaper Tuesday, 19th April, 2011. Katakwi pupils dodge reading test.

The New Vision Newspaper Tuesday, 19th April, 2011. Opolot quits smuggling to pursue dream career.

The New Vision Newspaper Tuesday, 19th April, 2011. How one school has beaten the food crisis.

The New Vision Newspaper Friday, 29th April, 2011. Government increases funds to schools.

The New Vision Newspaper Tuesday 3rd May, 2011. After LRA war Ayila parents strive to revive education.

Trudy.K.S. (1999). Using Teaching Aids. An extract from the Lingual Links Library, Version 4.0, published on CD-ROM by SIL International.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1980). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

ⁱ Dr. Nicholas Itaaga is a Senior Lecturer and Chair, Department of Foundations and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University in Uganda.

ⁱⁱ Dr. Gyaviira Musoke Genza is a Lecturer in the Department of Foundations and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University in Uganda.

ⁱⁱⁱ Rogers Kategaya is an Assistant Lecturer in the Department of Foundations and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University in Uganda.

^{iv} Mugagga Anthony Muwagga is a Professor in the Department of Foundations and Curriculum Studies, School of Education, College of Education and External Studies, Makerere University.