European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejes.v7i12.3839 Volume 7 | Issue 12 | 2020

KEY FORUMS FOR PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN BASIC EDUCATION: A CASE STUDY OF TWO RURAL SCHOOLS IN THE EFFUTU MUNICIPALITY OF GHANA

Robert Andrews Ghanney[i]
Department of Basic Education
University of Education,
Winneba, Ghana

Abstract:
This study explores key forums for parental involvement in two school communities in Effutu Municipality of Ghana using ecological and inter-connectedness approach by Bronferbrenner, 1986, 2000). There has been relatively little previous research on parental involvement in school governance in poorer rural areas in Ghana. Developed as a small-scale qualitative case study, focus group discussions and individual interviews were used to explore the inter-relationships between SMC parents, teaching staff and communities. Purposive and convenience sampling techniques were used to select 16 participants for focus group discussion and 8 participants for interviews respectively. The decentralised system of education delivery in Ghana assumes an important role for school management committees and the focus group discussions therefore involved community participants who were members of school management committees as well as head teachers and teachers in each of the two rural case study schools. A key finding of the study was that although the formal structures for parental engagement in school governance were in place, in practice many members of the school management committee were unable to contribute fully to school management. Tensions in school governance situations also arose from the administration of capitation grants and monitoring of teachers. The study concludes that policies designed to encourage parental involvement in school governance must reflect not only important contextual differences but also the dynamics between structures and participants.

Keywords: school communities, parental involvement, School Management Committee (SMC), capitation grant, monitoring of teachers

[i] Correspondence: email ghanney66@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

School governance involves increased involvement in management and decision-making on the parts of parents, teachers and sometimes the community members. The local governance institutions that facilitate involvement can range from School Management Committee (SMC), Parent Teacher Association (PTA to School Governing Body (SGB) (Arnott & Raab, 2000: Adam, 2005; Nkansah & Chapman, 2006; Robinson, 2007; Nyarko, 2011; Appiah-Kubi & Amoako, 2020). School governance structures are established to ensure that parents have channels through which to articulate their voices and ultimately to improve access and quality of formal education.

Many countries have established educational laws to include parents in the governance of schools (Hill & Taylor, 2014). In a study of the parent participation in governance of local schools in the United Kingdom (UK), Duma (2013) found that the parent component in school governance is geared toward ensuring democratisation of education, which involves the idea that parents, as one of the major stakeholders in the education of children, can be achieved by the establishment of school governing bodies (SGBs) in which the number of parents comprises one more than the total of other members of a governing body who have voting rights.

Consequently, school governance structures or fora have been established to create space for parental involvement. Some of these structures are less formalised; for example parent associations, parent councils and other elected bodies of parents. These structures exist in many different forms. Whereas some transfer authority only to principals or teachers, others encourage or mandate parental and community participation, often as members of school committees (e.g. school councils, school management, parent committees etc.). Barrena-Osorio, Fajih & Patrinos (2009) argue that School-Based Management (SBM) transfers authority over the following activities: budget (allocating budgets); personnel management (hiring and firing teachers and other school staff); pedagogy (developing curriculum); maintenance and infrastructure (procuring textbooks and other educational materials, improving infrastructure); and monitoring and evaluation (monitoring and evaluating teacher performance and student learning outcomes). As part of wider social and democratic governance reforms, the Government of Ghana embarked on a process of education decentralization in 1987 (GOG, 1996). The central focus of this policy was the prescription of community participation in the affairs of school in each locality (Essuman & Akyeampong, 2011). Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE) policy recommends the formation of School Management Committees (SMCs), governing bodies and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) by individual schools to work hand-in-hand with the head teacher and guide him/her in school policy formulation (GES, 2001).

In terms of involvement in school governance, in developing countries, parents have largely been found to provide financial (e.g. PTA subscriptions) or in-kind contributions such as materials and labour to build or maintain school buildings rather than any meaningful engagement in the education decision-making process (see for

example, Geo-Jaja, 2004, p. 309 [in relation to Nigeria]; Chikoko, 2007, p.36 [in relation to Zimbabwe]). Consequently, parents' participation tends to be limited to making financial and material inputs. In their study on *Politics of participation and parental support for children's learning and school governance in Burundi, Malawi, Senegal and Uganda,* Edge, Marphatia, Legault, & Acher (2010) found that parents are the least powerful and have the least amount of information and access to school decision-making forums and around education policy, yet they contribute the most in terms of financial and in-kind support to schools.

Although the SMCs and similar bodies play a vital role in school governance in developing countries, there is a perception that they are assembled politically and therefore not the right forums to address the interests and needs of parents or the community in general (World Bank, 2008). Similarly, people who are supposed to be core constituents of SMCs are not always willing or do not think they have the capacity to play the roles the system assigns them. Edge et al., (2009a) argue that most parents do not think they have a role to play in school governance, a belief that is exacerbated by the fact that they are invariably only consulted once decisions have been taken and awaiting implementation. On the other hand, concerns have also been raised about SMC and PTA involvement in education in general because they are regarded as non-professional and lay person led in a foreign territory, that of education professionals (Tatlah & Igbal, 2011).

Previous research has shown that there is unequal access to participation in bodies such as SMCs and PTAs by socio-economic status and gender (Dunne, Akyeampong & Humphrey, 2007). In developing countries, the local elite and relatively more highly educated community members tend to take on the role of brokers of decision-making and, through their actions, close up the space for representation and participation in the affairs of the school by a more inclusive group of community members (Kingdon, Lutler, Asian, Raval, Moe, Patrino, Beteille, Baneji, Parton & Sharma, 2014). In a review of decentralization policy and practices in six sub-Saharan African countries (Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, Uganda, Malawi and Zimbabwe), Dunne et al. (2007) conclude that core education decisions are hardly ever decentralized in a way that encourages local community participation in decision-making. Dunne et al., (2007) conclude that there has been insufficient research on how parents and community partners actively collaborate with the school to address issues of access, attendance, completion, and other local education problems.

Most educational systems in developing countries are affected by tension and conflict as PTA executives and SMC compete against one another for dominance in the running of the school (Dunne et al., 2007). The situation undermines not only efficiency in school governance but also performance of the two bodies (Dunne et al., 2007; World Bank, 2008; Tatlah & Igbal, 2011). Disagreement over the roles of these bodies in school governance invariably leads to confusion (Dunne et al., 2007). In their study of four West Africa countries, De Grauwe, Lugaz, Balde, Moustapha & Odushina (2005) found that the relationship between SMC members and school heads was usually affected by conflict rather than collaboration. Consequently, school governance tends to be dominated by

head teachers and local political leaders who do not have sufficient resources to carry out their responsibilities (Bennell & Akyeampong, 2006). It can thus be inferred that at least in developing countries, the composition of SMC and PTA executives do not sufficiently reflect the interests of the communities and parents of the school.

In his study on Ghanaian schools, Gyan (2007) found that SGB members were never consulted in the decisions regarding the expulsion of the children but were compelled to endorse the decisions already taken by the school management team (head teacher and his staff). When parents were asked why they endorsed though they did not agree with the decision, they complained of fear of victimisation (e.g. failing of their children). This kind of practice is problematic as parents become rubber stamp of decisions taken by management team without their inputs. This supports the view expressed by De Grauwe et al., (2005) that in developing countries, the culture of accountability and participation is generally weak, allowing head teachers in particular to monopolise decision-making (pp.4-6). In a study on parental school involvement: the case of Ghana, Nyarko (2011) revealed a positive significant correlation between mothers' school involvement and the academic performance of the students. Fathers' school involvement was found to be non-significant to the academic achievement of the students. In a qualitative study on parental participation in children's education: Experiences of parents and teachers in Ghana, Appiah-Kubi & Amoako (2020) attributed poor parental participation in school to high cost of living which keep parents preoccupied with economic ventures, and low-esteem due to parents' illiteracy which makes them feel they cannot offer much besides paying their school fees.

The study employs Ecological and inter-connectedness approach. From its broader perspectives, education is represented as a shared responsibility between families, schools, communities and others, rather than being the preserve or exclusive role of schools. The academic literature from an ecological perspective can be used to examine inter-connectedness in parental involvement in school (Pipher, 1996; Swick, 2004; Comer, 2005). Connectedness describes the nature of relationships that provides the individual with support, security and direction. It also creates an environment within which one grows up and derives support and inspiration. Considering the benefits of a shared responsibility in education between families, schools and communities (Swick, 2004; Comer, 2005), one might expect that the more connected parents are to other adults, friends, community members, aunts, uncles, neighbours, the higher their likelihood of engaging in their children's education. Therefore, it might also be expected that high levels of connectedness will be associated with positive parental involvement.

Ecological systems theory was developed by Bronfenbrenner (1979) and explained in several subsequent reiterations (e.g, Bronferbrenner, 1986, 2000). This theory is based on the principle of interconnectedness within settings and the linkages between settings that affect individual development. It emphasises multiple interacting systems of influence and dynamic interactions between the child, the education system and wider social context over time. Bronferbrenner (1979) describes such connections in terms of first, the microsystem which includes the child – the primary element of the overall

system – the family and the school. The mesosystem refers to interconnections between microsystems that have indirect effects on children's development, such as parental relationships with the school. The exo system describes institutions or community organisations that influence both the microsystems and meso systems. The macro system describes the socio-cultural practices, beliefs and values that affect all systems. For example, in the context of the present study on rural Ghana, parental involvement in the school through the SMC (meso system) is reflected in the exosystem that is community influences on the child either directly or through the family (microsystem): and the macro system, which refers to the values embedded in the social context, and the influences that class, ethnic, and cultural differences have on the development of the individual. The ecosystem is evident in the public policy and community leaders' engagement in school enrolment drives.

The establishment of SMC is a national requirement in all public basic schools in Ghana. In comparison, the PTA is composed of the immediate stakeholders of the school in the community. The SMC aims at fostering effective community involvement and mobilization for efficient education provision and delivery (Addae-Boahene &Arkorful, 1999). The SMC is the body that provides a monitoring and supervisory role in the school, to ensure that quality educational services are being provided through efficient management and equitable allocation of resources (Nkansah & Chapman, 2006, pp. 509-532). In Ghana, the widespread introduction of PTAs and SMCs has served urban communities better because they have been able to muster financial capital to improve the quality of SMC urban schools, thus widening the gap between them and rural public schools (World Bank, 2004; Akyeampong, Djangmah, Oduro, Seidu & Hunt 2007; Dunne et al., 2007). School governing bodies in rural communities face many challenges including weak knowledge of school related issues, which affect their capacity to assume full responsibility. Rather than focussing attention on the nature and quality of capacity among school governing bodies in rural communities, relatively, research appears to have been largely focused on urban communities in Ghana and rural communities in Effutu Municipality are no exception. This is a significant gap in knowledge considering its implication for the outcome of education decentralization in Ghana. In recognition of this, the study sought to understand the key forum and forms of parental involvement in school governance from the perspectives of SMCs in two rural school communities in Effutu Municipality.

The importance of community participation through active involvement in school management committees (SMCs) is highly covered in 1987 Ghanaian Educational reforms and FCUBE policy, so the study's benefits lie in enriching the existing literature more importantly where many researches in this context have tended to focus on quantitative study and this research is mainly qualitative. Again, the findings and recommendations of this study may be useful for policy formulation to address challenges affecting the capacity of school governing bodies in rural communities. Educational managers also stand to benefit from the recommendations in effective governance of their school communities.

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1) What is the key forum for parental involvement at the case study schools in Effutu Municipality?
2) What forms of involvement are parents engaged in at the case study schools?

2. Methodology

The study was conducted in two school communities in rural Effutu Municipality in Ghana's Central Region. According to the Poverty Profile of Ghana in the 1990s, Central Region is the poorest region in southern Ghana (GSS, 2000). Vulnerability to poverty in Effutu Municipality is further deepened by low returns on fishing which is the major occupation of the people of Effutu Municipality (Brown, 2005). The municipality has a total population of 68,597, which amounts to about 3.1 percent of the total population of the region (GSS, 2010). The municipality has six rural communities with 10 public basic schools. The major economic activities are farming and fishing, with full occupational distribution showing that 49 per cent are involved in fishing, 22 percent in farming and 29 per cent in commerce (GSS, 2010). The choice of Effutu Municipality for this study was informed by the fact that in most rural areas, school children engage in commercial activities, mostly to support their families and themselves (Casely-Hayford, 2002; MOE, 2005). In most rural communities such as Effutu municipality, parents appear to push their children into economic activities such as fishing, farming and sand winning to raise income for the family at the expense of their children's education due to poverty (Brown, 2005). Considering the potential impact this could have on schooling and parental involvement in school governance, it seemed useful to explore how this challenge was addressed.

The study employed a case study design. According to Yin (2009), the case study design facilitates an empirical inquiry well suited to investigating a contemporary phenomenon in-depth and within its real life context particularly when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly drawn (Yin, 2009, p.18). Accordingly, the study employed a case study design to provide rich, in-depth qualitative data to shed light on the SMC parental involvement in school governance.

In this research, the target population consisted of all public basic school SMC members in the Effutu municipality. According to the Municipal Education directorate estimates, this stood at 202 members. However, purposive sampling was employed to select 4 SMC participants (made up of chairperson and members) in each of the two case study schools totalling 8 for the Community focus group discussion. As a way of triangulating the findings from SMC, 4 school participants (made up of teachers and head teachers) were also selected from each of the case study schools totalling 8. The choice of eight participants in each group was made in accordance with the recommendation of Johnson and Christenson (2004, p.185) that a 'focus group should involve 6-12 members in a group to enable them interact freely among themselves' Out of the total of 16 participants for focus group discussion, 8 participants were selected through convenience

sampling for the semi-structured interviews. Scholars like Polit and Beck (2010) argue that for qualitative studies samples are typically small and based on information needs.

The study adopted qualitative methods of focus groups, interviews, supported by some initial documentary analysis of SMC handbooks to gain understanding of school governance from key stakeholder perspectives. I obtained a list of public basic schools from the Effutu Municipality, Education Directorate together with their community profiles with the assistance of the Municipal Director of Education (MDE). Two schools that represented the municipality's two broad livelihood profiles' engagement in fishing and farming (School 1) and trading and commerce (School 2) were purposely selected for the study. Apart from this, only these two school communities out of 10 rural communities had much functioning SMCs and with their experience and knowledge in issues related to parental involvement in school governance were selected.

McMillan & Schumacher (2006, p. 353) state that during focus group interview, establishing trust, being sincere, maintaining eye contact and conveying meaning through rephrasing the question for clarity are all more likely to readily elicit the requisite information than a rigid approach. If the focus group participant deviates from the topic, the focus group interviewer should tactfully steer him or her back. This enables the focus group facilitator to obtain an inside view of the social phenomenon under investigation (McMillan & Schumacher, 2006, p. 353). Accordingly, I asked participants questions in turns during the focus group 1 and 2, utilising open- ended questions to allow them to express their individual views on the topic: key forums for parental involvement in basic education in rural Ghana. Focus group 1 was made up of SMC members and that of 2 was composed of head teachers and teachers.

I developed and piloted schedules for the focus groups. According to Cohen, Manion & Morrison (2007, p. 353), in the guided interview approach, topics and issues to be covered are specified in advance in outline form and the researcher then decides the actual sequence and wording of questions in the course of the interview. The approach allowed me to ask participants pre-determined key questions and probe the ensuing responses deeply. Before proceeding with the focus group discussion, certain ethical dilemmas had to be addressed, namely, ensuring informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity (Cohen et al., 2003). At the start of the field work I informed participants how the process of collecting data would be done and why they were being asked to contribute. Details of focus group 1 and 2 participants are illustrated in Table1 and 2 shown below:

Table 1: Categories of Participant for Focus Group 1: Community Participants

Community Participants		**School 1**	**School 2**	**Total**
School Management Committee (SMC)	Chairperson	2	2	4
	Member	2	2	4

Details of focus group 2 participants are illustrated in Table 2 shown below:

Table 2: Categories of Participant for Focus Group 2: School Participants

		School 1	School 2	Total
School Participants	Head teacher	2	2	4
	Teacher	2	2	4

The semi-structured interview was one-on-one and allowed the researcher to focus on the research questions, yet open up new avenues for further probing to unearth important issues (Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh & Scrensen, 2006). A rationale for the appropriateness of an interview in this study is put forward by Creswell (2003) when he maintains that it allows exploration of variables under investigation in greater detail. The conversations were audio-taped to pave way for more accurate data representation during transcription and analysis with the permission from the participants

In my quest for education policy documents, I visited the Municipal Education office and having been previously informed by colleagues in the tertiary profession that accessing document was difficult and frustrating, I considered myself lucky to be provided with all that I requested i.e. SMC handbooks, the head teacher's and teacher's manuals. However, its weakness lies in the occasional problems encountered in accessing documents. As the analysis of the content of written material is subject to the interpretation of the researcher. I took care in making logical inferences in the knowledge that data could be open to multiple interpretations. I examined the SMC policy documents in order to establish the type and nature of the respective envisioned roles in relation to practice (GES, SMC/PTA Roles, 2001).

The researcher also used thematic analysis to analyze the data collected using the interview guide. The generated themes were monitoring of teachers, capitation grants, membership and functions of SMC, and training for SMC. Pseudonyms were used for community and teacher focus group as well as the use of school 1 and 2 to protect the identity of the participants and case study schools

3. Results and Discussion

Research Question 1: What is the key forum for parental involvement at the case study schools in the Effutu Municipality?

In Ghana, the major forum for parents' participation in school governance is the School Management Committee (SMC). The areas discussed include SMC membership, functions, and training for SMC members.

Membership and Functions

The rationale for instituting SMCs was to engage qualified community members with technical wherewithal to support a school's internal administrators (Mankoe, 2002). In Ghana, in line with the GES, PTA/SMC (2001) policy, membership of a SMC is made up of the head teacher; a representative of the Metropolitan/Municipal/District Assembly; chairperson of the Unit Committee; a representative of the Education Unit; a representative of the PTA (selected at a general meeting through voting); a representative

of the village chief; two members of the teaching staff; and two co-opted members of the community who might be parents.

In theory, the appointment of individuals to the SMC should be devoid of any form of discrimination: a person's political leaning, religious background, tribe, or gender should not be considered in their appointment to the SMC. Membership should be based solely on merit (Mankoe, 2002). It emerged at the Community Focus Group Discussion (FGD) that SMC membership in School 1 was all male-dominated: most were activists of political party and/or influential people (e.g. those who had the greater authority to mobilise villagers for communal labour), but had little knowledge or experience in school management. The highest educational attainment of the SMC members at School 1 was Middle School Leaving Certificate. The inference from the composition of the SMCs is that rather than provide a platform for parental participation, it creates room for a few, well-connected community members to assume responsibility for school management (Dunne et al., 2007; Kingdon et al., 2014). As one focus group discussion participant (FGD) puts it:

> "*Appointment of people to serve on SMC largely recognises people in the community who are well-to-do and influential, leaving out the poor. Yes, affluent people offer support, especially with financial assistance; but they hardly attend meetings because of their business schedules. I have also noticed that only a few appointees do have their children in the school*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

Literature indicate that the local elite and relatively better educated community members tend to take on the role of brokers of decision-making and, through their actions, close up the space for representation and participation in the affairs of the school by a more inclusive group of community members (Kingdon et al., 2014). In this sense, it would appear that the policy expectations for greater representation and involvement in school by parents was not being realised. In the case of School 2 community, the data revealed that most of the SMC members tended to be more experienced and knowledgeable in management and education matters. The highest educational attainment was first degree in Basic Education. It was agreed at the focus group discussions (FGDs), however, that in both schools, the position of SMC chairperson was restricted to a parent which is contrary to the stipulations in the PTA/SMC manuals.

Most participants in the focus group discussion in School 1 raised concerns about how some community members come to serve on the SMC and the extent to which due process was observed in their appointments:

> "*I don't know how members are appointed to serve on the SMC. I feel the membership needs to be reviewed. If you listen to the type of contributions made by some members, you begin to wonder the criteria for their appointment – I strongly suspect that some of them are favourites of the ruling political party which makes the appointment anyway*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

The GES Manuals provide that the tenure of office for an executive member of the SMC shall be three years though a member shall be eligible for re-election to another additional three-year term only or one year in the case of a chairperson. As an SMC member commented:

> "*The school administration is very strict on tenure of office for members including the executive position and would ensure that members stick to the stipulated number of years demanded by the SMC/PTA manuals regardless of one's personal contact or relations with management*." [Community FCD, School 2 Participant]

The focus group discussions also threw up questions about the length of years in relation to appointments to SMCs, some SMC members at School 1 community identified as being in office far longer than their mandated tenure of office. As one participant stated:

> "*Our SMC chairman has served for 12 years, contrary to what we were made to understand from the beginning. Is he the only person with ideas to lead the committee? All efforts to get this anomaly rectified have proved futile as he has the full backing of the head teacher*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

This situation in which a head teacher at School 1 insisted on his favourite as chairperson even after completing his/her mandatory term of office compromises accountability and transparency. However, excellent the chairperson's performance, the rule must be upheld and enforced. This raises questions about people's suitability for the roles assigned them.

A critical determinant for appointment to an SMC is the issue of relevant skills, knowledge and expertise because of their combined efforts on school policy, administration, finance and development (Mankoe, 2002; MOESS, 2005). Yet, these criteria have been described as barriers to the democratic process because the majority of parents in rural communities are unlikely to contribute on account of their obvious lack of these skills (Adam, 2005). As one of the head teachers put it:

> "*Getting the right calibre of members to serve on the SMC has been a major source of worry to us as head teachers. Our work as heads are often impeded by a number of appointees who may be financially okay but may lack the requisite educational backgrounds. Most of them lack the skills and knowledge to make meaningful contributions at meetings*." [Teacher FGD, School 2 Participant].

The quote above indicates that the ability of the SMC to participate in school management varies. It suggests that most SMC members in rural communities such as this one lack the capacity or skills to effectively participate in school management.

Another head teacher corroborated the limited capacity and skills of many of the SMC members saying that:

> "*The low educational attainment of some SMC members is a big blow to the governance system. Most of them rarely contribute to preparation of SPIP and budgets. They are often traders, farmers and fishermen with very low education but who find themselves as political appointees. Sometimes, the school is expected to co-opt other members to assist for a fee. More or less like consultants all because of low educational background of most substantive members. For these, the major responsibility is checking teachers' lateness and attendance to school. Apart from the chairperson and a few others who meet the minimum requirement, the rest are mere followers*." [Teacher FGD, School 1 Participant].

A lack of suitable persons negatively affect parental involvement in formal school governance with ramifications for both school and community since, in some instances, head teachers relied on 'others' who perform some duties for a fee. It is clear that in the study schools, membership of the SMCs left much to be desired. The question that then remains unanswered is where to apportion blame: the idiosyncrasies' of the head teacher or the environment.

Training for SMC Members

The importance of training in school management for SMC members in poor rural communities like this one stems from issues such as lack of knowledge and skills (Watt, 2001; Mankoe, 2002; Adam, 2005). During the focus group discussions, most SMC participants were positive about the training organised for them but also pointed some shortcomings. For example, one SMC member indicated:

> "*One month after my appointment, I received a letter from the Municipal Director of Education (MDE) instructing the head teacher to organise an orientation for the newly appointed members. The head teacher took us (new SMC members) through the GES SMC manuals on SMC/ PTA. Unfortunately, we were not given copies of the manuals but were asked to come to the office any time we are in doubt about our roles and functions as SMC members*." [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

An SMC member expected, as a matter of right, to be issued with his/her own copy of the manual. One SMC member commented:

> "*At the orientation sessions, we were told to visit the school often to check teachers' lateness and absenteeism. We were also told to see the head teacher when in doubt of anything in connection with our functions as outlined in SMC/PTA manuals. Surprisingly, we were not given copies of the manuals*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

The above quote makes it clear that the inability of the head teachers to provide orientation training for newly appointed SMC members is due to a lack of resources. This explains the lack of support to the SMC's role in school governance.

A major responsibility of the SMC members outlined was the need to check teachers' lateness and absenteeism. One SMC member described her understanding of the role thus:

> "*We (new SMC members) were made to understand that the school belongs to us and that the school management or governance was therefore, in our hands and so, we should regularly visit the school to check on the teachers and the pupils as well. We must report teachers' absenteeism, lateness, drunkenness and other immoral behaviours to the head of the school, and then to the circuit supervisor, who, in turn, would take it up with those concerned*. [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

Another SMC member noted:

> "*We were told to visit the school often to check teachers' lateness and absenteeism. We were also told to see the head teacher when in doubt of anything in connection with our functions as outlined in SMC/PTA manuals."* [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

The study shows that most SMC members in both schools had limited knowledge of their responsibilities and they tended to focus on teachers' absenteeism or lateness. However, as spelt out in the GES manual, other roles such as financial and property management, as well as conflict resolution were expected of SMC members and these should be addressed in the orientation sessions.

The capacity of rural communities to provide this sort of supports (refresher courses. seminars and in-service training) is challenged (Watt, 2001; Adam, 2005). One major challenge is that poor communities with low levels of education attainment often lack the time, money, confidence, skills and lack of cooperation of the school staff (Watt, 2001; Adam, 2005; Donkor, 2010). When asked why seminars, in-service training, orientation and refresher courses were not organised for SMC members to enable them upgrade their skills and knowledge in school governance, one head teacher noted:

> "*We are not able to organise seminars or in-service training for SMC members in this rural community due to a lack of money*." [Teacher, FGD, School 2]

Another head teacher added:

> "*Most of the SMC members in this rural community have not had in-service training or seminars which could have fully enhanced their capacity to perform due to resource constraints*." [Teacher FGD, School 1]

The head teachers in the above quotes seem to be saying that the capacity of SMC members in rural communities to access in-service training and seminars stem from lack of money and/or resource constraints.

Research Question 2: What forms of involvement are parents engaged in at the case study schools? The areas discussed include SMC parental involvement in school finance specifically the management of capitation grants, but also the monitoring of teachers.

The SMC and Parental Involvement in School Finance

A principal function of the SMC as discussed in the study schools was its role in financial management. The community focus group discussions highlighted the key role of the SMC in financial management through the capitation grant scheme and it also had oversight responsibility in the supervision of school fees/levies and accounts. These issues are discussed below:

The Administration of the Capitation Grant

This section is about the process involved in administration of the capitation grant and who is involved and what follows is about what SMC members and teachers think of it and their extent of involvement.

Process involved in administration of the Capitation Grant and those involved

The capitation grant is based on a School Performance Improvement Plan (SPIP) (GES Guidelines for Distribution and Utilisation of Capitation Grants, 2005). The procedure for computing the plan begins with input from the teachers and then their head teacher, who, upon completion, has to discuss with the chairperson of SMC for approval (GES Guidelines for Capitation Grants, 2005, ibid). The approved SPIP is then sent to the Municipal Education Office for onward submission to the Ministry of Education (MOE) through the Ministry of Finance for final release of the funds. Upon release of the capitation grant to the district, the funds are finally deposited in the school account (GES Guidelines, ibid).

One reason why SMC members are not fully involved in the administration of the capitation grant is because they do not have the necessary technical know-how in its accounting. The drawing up, verification and authorisation of SPIP are technical matters that require people with the necessary expertise to thoroughly scrutinise the accounts. Unfortunately, most SMC members do not possess the requisite knowledge or skills in accounting and therefore left everything to the head teacher and his or staff. As one SMC chairperson confirmed:

> "*The examination of the SPIP (a major segment of the capitation grant) is very technical and complicated. I often find myself at the wrong place, but I cannot take the school to ransom and reject it even though it is prepared by the school administrators*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant].

The above quote shows that SMC members lacked knowledge in the accounting of SPIP which made them rely on school administrators. This might compromise accountability issues in school governance.

Focus group discussions revealed that there is no reason to justify rushing the examination of capitation grant. It also revealed suspicion between those involved. As one SMC member put it:

> *"I disagree with the contention that the undue delay in the release of capitation grant prevents a thorough examination of the SPIP and budgets. What prevents the SMC in bringing copies of SPIP and budget to a general meeting so that we can all make inputs? Is SMC chairperson trying to hide things from us?"* [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

In many cases, community members like the sample used in the current study, lacked skills and experience needed in drawing up of annual plans and budgets. Invariably, in such instances the task is left in the hands of head teachers and officials of Metropolitan/ Municipal/ District Directorates (MMDs). The practice sacrifices accountability and transparency because the MMDs are intended to play the role of impartial arbiters in such matters (GES, 2001). This kind of situation can be a source of malpractice, as one SMC member disclosed during the focus group discussion:

> "*My cousin at the GES office assists the head teacher all the time in preparing the school SPIP and budgets and according to him, figures are often massaged to favour them*." [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

SMC members in many cases are therefore nominally involved, by way of making their inputs in the local governance of the programme. This finding corroborates the assertion by Dunne et al., (2007) that core education decisions are not generally decentralised in a way that encourages broader local community participation in decision-making.

What SMC members and Teachers think of Capitation Grant

During the focus group discussions, participants from both schools hailed the introduction of the capitation grant claiming that though there are still costs as it does not cover everything, it is cheaper:

> "*Before the introduction of capitation grant, I had lost interest in the affairs of the school and so when they called meetings I seldom attended. But now that the burden of paying fees has been lifted off my shoulders, I take keen interest in the affairs of the school*." [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

Another SMC member added:

"*The introduction of capitation grant has in a way reduced my financial burden as regard payment of tuition fees though there are other levies to be paid. I now feel more predisposed engaging in school activities. My interest in school activities is now re-kindled*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant].

In other words, most parents welcome the capitation grant even though it does not give them a complete financial 'reprieve' as they still need to pay other levies as PTA members.

On their part, however, most teacher participants expressed misgivings about the capitation grant saying it had brought hardships in school management because it was woefully inadequate and often released too late. The introduction of capitation grant had meant head teachers, for example must defend each and every expenditure item to the SMC. In addition, teachers complained that the capitation grant has led to most parents into thinking that everything associated with their children's education was free, catered for by the grant funds:

"*A time will come there will not be any school project like classroom block, library etc because anytime you mention it SMC members ask what are we doing with our capitation grants. It appears that these days the capitation must cater for everything in the school, except our salaries*." [Teacher FGD, School 2 Participant].

As one head teacher remarked:

"*Compared to the past, the collection of school fees and levies is not easy these days. Most parents feel they have no financial obligations because of the capitation grants. It's not surprising that these days we are unable to undertake many developmental projects as we did prior to the advent of the grant*." [Teacher FGD, School 1 Participant]

Teachers also reported that following the introduction of the capitation grant, some parents including SMC members, fail to provide books, uniforms and other basic materials to support their children. It can be inferred from the foregoing that, teachers expressed their disillusionment with executing projects since the inception of the capitation grant. This is saying that even those SMC members involved in the administration do not understand what is included and what is not.

In the focus group discussions, it became apparent that SMC members desired for more education on the utilisation of the capitation grant in order that they could make meaningful contributions to its management. As one SMC member noted:

"*I need to be better informed about the capitation grant so as to be better involved in its management. For now, though I'm a member of the SMC, my knowledge in which school items are catered for by the capitation grant and which are not is very limited. No wonder*

several people do not appear to be responsible in their children's education." [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

The foregoing quote underscores the insufficiency of education given to the public in general and the inadequate preparation given to members appointed to join in school governance. Similar points were made by an SMC at School 1:

"*We need enough education on this capitation grants as the interpretation to it has been quite different and we get confused as to what is 'free' and what is not. The GES needs to come clear on the scheme*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

Again, this suggests that public education about the capitation grant in both study communities has been inadequate.

A major disclosure from the focus group discussion was that SMC members were only contacted when the capitation grant was due for release and the school heads required the signature of the SMC chairperson. As one SMC member revealed:

"*After the money has been released and we begin to ask questions about how they were being used, we are told by school officials that management of the funds are the preserve of school authorities and the GES. We (SMC members) have no role in that*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant].

But on his part, one aggrieved SMC member questioned that:

"*How can the whole school SPIP and budget be approved by the chairperson only? Meanwhile instead of the chairperson bringing the accounts to a SMC meeting for our inputs, this is not done. I suspect foul play between the SMC chairperson and the head teacher*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant].

Another SMC member added:

"*This idea of SMC chairperson and the head teacher being sole signatories of capitation grant accounts need to be reviewed as it creates room for financial malfeasance*." [Community FGD, School 2 Participant]

It thus seems that in both schools, the SMC chairperson's approval signified the community's acceptance of the use of the capitation grant and that this was problematic since the mechanism lacked deeper engagement in terms of how funds are generated and utilised. In other words, on finances, the SMC members were consulted only when funds needed to be released and involvement in school governance was therefore very limited. These parents appeared to want more involvement in school governance. Perhaps

surprisingly, teacher participants suggested that SMC members needed to be more actively involved in decisions about capitation grant funding:

> "*SMC members should not leave the management of capitation grant business in the hands of head teachers and chairpersons alone. They need to be actively involved since their children stand the risk of losing out if wrong decisions are taken*." [Teacher FGD, School 2 Participant].

One can conclude that from the teacher's perspective, SMC members have, not fulfilled their duties if they allow only head teachers and the SMC chairperson to manage capitation grant. Directly or indirectly, teachers are alluding to issues of transparency and accountability in the disbursement of capitation grants. From the foregoing it seems that teachers either perceive malpractice on the part of the head teacher or are not satisfied with the lack of transparency in the disbursement of the grants.

Adequacy of the Capitation Grant

Head teachers raised the issue of the inadequacy of the capitation grant as a whole, considering the financial obligations of the school. For example, they claimed funds were needed for the purchase of teaching and learning materials, examination fees, and repairs to building and furniture, amongst other things. One head teacher noted that:

> "*Sometimes the school has to post-pone end-of-term examination because of the delays in release of capitation grant*." [Teacher FGD, School 1 Participant].

Some class teachers also expressed their misgivings with the capitation grant scheme. As one class teacher summarised it:

> "*The capitation grants has increased enrolment in classrooms which has, in turn, increased our load in the form of marking amidst shortage of text books, tables and desks*." [Teacher FGD, School 2 Participant].

The above quote shows that what people think the capitation grant covers and reality is different in a school which does not have enough of what they need and if having increased enrolment, resource allocation has not kept pace is clearly a critical issue in a context where there is a funding gap. However, teachers tended to blame politicians who often make inaccurate presentation about capitation grant to the media a situation which lead the public, including SMC members to think that basic education was indeed free. A teacher observed that:

> "*Politicians must be advised to desist from giving wrong impression about capitation grants because parents are then deluded into thinking that everything is free in basic education when this is not so*. [Teacher FGD, School 1 Participant]

In view of misinformation by politicians (Yoshioka, 2010), there are still some community members who hesitate in paying other school fees/ levies. In this study, even some of the SMC members showed signs of disengagement from their official duties when impressed upon to pay additional cost in their children's education. The data collected for this study highlights how some community members refused involvement in school governance as a result of payment of additional cost in children's education (Mankoe, 2002; Adam, 2005). It also seems to be contradicted by the earlier quotes as regards hailing of the capitation grant. This is because people responded differently and had different views.

The SMC and Parental Involvement in the Monitoring of Teachers

Monitoring and supervision of basic education delivery by SMC involves school visits (MOESS, 2006). SMC members at both case study schools regarded their role as inspectorial and supervisory. They, accordingly, monitored teachers as a measure of accountability through visits to the school to check for lateness, drunkenness and other unethical behaviour. During the focus group discussions, SMC participants complained that, often on their visits, they encountered teachers arriving late at school while others chatted with colleagues under a tree or on the veranda. Such practices flout the code of ethics of teachers. For example, one SMC chairperson reported that:

> "*Teachers fail to return to the classroom after break, so, children continue playing until it is time to go home. I have also observed some teachers come to school drunk while others fail to report for duty or come to school late*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant].

And:

> "*If GES had put up teacher bungalows in the rural communities, this persistent teacher lateness to school would have been curtailed because it is a tedious job for teachers who have to walk to school daily*." [Community FGD, School 1 Participant]

A World Bank (2004) report found that teacher absenteeism and lateness is a huge challenge in Ghana. According to the report, absenteeism can be blamed on teachers living at considerable distances from a school. In the current study, an SMC participant suggested that absenteeism had declined in the community, thanks to the monitoring role of the SMC:

> "*Teacher absenteeism used to be very high in our rural schools but with the regular monitoring of SMC members, the situation has now changed for the better, though we learn some teachers are reportedly uncomfortable with our frequent visits*." [Community FGD, School 2 Participant].

This suggests that, despite the beneficial effects, teachers at the receiving end of the SMC's vigilance were not always comfortable with the role.

De Grauwe et al., (2005) in their study of four West African countries found that the relationship between SMC members and school heads was usually characterised by conflicts rather than collaboration. SMC members are often regarded as intruders and the entire body perceived as counterweight to the head teacher's authority, leading to tension and conflicts. In the current study, it was evident that the apparent power play between SMC members and teachers with regard to monitoring and supervision of the school did not go well with some teachers. Class teachers did not hesitate to express their sentiments. As one of them complained:

> "*Why are SMC members sitting on our happiness in the school? Why do they order us about with questions such as, "When did you report for school? Have you signed the attendance book?" They order as if they are our employers. It is high time the head teacher told them to stop*." [Teacher FGD, School 2 Participant]

Another class teacher remarked:

> "*The posture of SMC on our members is often an intrusion or if you like an invasion into our personal and professional space? Do they know how I completed training college? Have they been trained to handle pupils? What is annoying is that most of them are illiterate*." [Teacher FGD, School 1 Participant].

In other words, the suspicion teachers hold about their relationship with SMC appears to be a potential source of conflict and tension with negative ramifications for school governance. According to Kendall (2007), from the teachers' point of view, the increased involvement of SMCs in school life is often seen as a threat. Until the advent of SMCs, teachers were secure in the knowledge that their professional conduct was not in doubt and went unchallenged – not even by the government. The arrival of SMC on the educational scene has changed the dynamics, the slightest indiscretion or misdemeanour could land one in trouble. However, in response to the emerging realities, one class teacher cautioned:

> "*I have decided that if this intrusion by SMC members into our professional business continues, I will leave the community. After all, they are crying out for teachers, who do not want to accept postings into rural communities due to poor socio-economic conditions*." [Teacher FGD, School 2 Participant]

Again, the inference is clear, teachers consider activities of SMC members as intrusive; they (SMC members) can overstep their bounds. From the foregoing comment, some teachers have reached the threshold of their tolerance level. Disagreement over the roles of SMC and teachers in school governance invariably leads to confusion (Dunne et

al., 2007; Edge et al., 2010). If an organisation is subject to ambiguities in a role definition or unclear boundaries of responsibilities, the stage is set for interpersonal frictions between stakeholders (Ramani and Zhimin, 2010). The implication from the foregoing is that SMC members are in a way prevented from exercising their legitimate role in school governance.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

The discussion has highlighted the SMC as a formal governance forum for parental involvement in Ghana, including their composition, role in financial management as well as monitoring of school teacher discipline. It emerged that political and other considerations go into the process of appointments contributing to the appointment of SMC members without the requisite qualification which in turn affects their functioning and participation in school governance. For example, the drawing up, verification and authorisation of capitation grant under SPIP are technical matters that require people with the necessary expertise to thoroughly scrutinise the accounts. In many cases, SMC members in the current study, lacked skills and experience needed in drawing up of annual plans and budgets of the capitation grant. Invariably, in such instances the task is left in the hands of head teachers and officials of Metropolitan/ Municipal/ District Directorates (MMDs). This practice sacrifices accountability and transparency because the MMDs are intended to play the role of impartial arbiters in such matters (GES, 2001). This practice raises issues about transparency and accountability in school governance which can affect parental involvement. SMC involvement was seen as threat for the teachers who are supposed to know the governing rules and regulations. In one case, a teacher had contemplated quitting the community if the perceived intrusion of SMC members continued. This non-appreciation of the rules of engagement by people supposed to know means SMC members are in way hindered from playing their legitimate role in school governance. In the face of such suspicion, very few members will insist on performing their legitimate role.

This study supports previous research in arguing that parental involvement is essentially relational in that it involves relationships of different quality with key stakeholders (De Grauwe et al., 2005; Ahmed and Nath, 2005; Dunne et al., 2007; Edge et al., 2010). For example, in the current study, it was evident that the apparent power play between SMC members and teachers with regard to monitoring and supervision of the school did not go down well with some teachers to the extent that a teacher in School 2 community threatened leaving if what was perceived to be an intrusion continued. As this is not an intrusion but a mandated role, it is about policy and how it is sometimes received. The suspicion teachers held about their relationship with SMC was a potential source of conflict and tension with negative ramifications for school governance. This finding challenges the literature on decentralisation policies which assume that parents and teachers are willing partners and eager to cooperate together in education. This study has highlighted not only the contextualised nature of parental involvement but also the

interconnectedness of the different stakeholders, school staff and the wider community but also the value of research that explores multiple perspectives on parental involvement in children's education. Within rural communities as this study has shown it is the way in which social networks and interconnectedness are culturally constructed which influences the way in which involvement of parents or guardian occurs. The study therefore concludes that policies designed to encourage parental involvement in school governance must reflect not only important contextual differences but also the dynamics between structures and participants.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no conflicts of interests.

About the Author

Robert Andrews Ghanney is a Senior lecturer in Social Studies at the Department of Basic Education of University of Education, Winneba.

References

Adam, F. (2005). Community Participation in School Development: Understanding Participation in Basic Schools Performance in the Nanumba District of Ghana (Unpublished thesis). University of Bergen, Norway.

Akyeampong, K., Djangmah, J., Oduro, A., Seidu, A. & Hunt, F**.** (2007). Access to Basic Education in Ghana: the Evidence and the Issues, CREATE Country Analytic Report. Brighton: Centre for International Education, University of Sussex.

Appiah-Kubi, J. & Amoako, E, (2020). Parental participation in Childrens' Education: Experiences of Parents and Teachers in Ghana. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science,* 13(3), 456-473

Arnott, M. & Raab, C. (2000). The Governance of Schooling: Comparative Studies of Devolved Management: Routledge-Falmer.

Barrena-Osorio, F., Fajih, J. and Patrinos, H. (2009). Decentralised Decision-making in Schools: The Theory and Evidence on School-based Management: Washington DC: World Bank.

Bennell, P. and Akyeampong, A. (2006). *Is there a teacher motivation crisis in Sub-Sahara Africa and South Asia? London*: DFID

Bronfenbrenner, U. & Evans, G. (2000). Developmental science in the 21st century: Emerging questions, theoretical models, research designs, and empirical findings, *Social Development*, 9(1), 115-125.

Bronfenbrenner, U**.** (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, 22(6), 723-742

Bronfenbrenner, U**.** (1979). The Ecology of human development: Experiment by nature and design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, C. (2005). A Study on Child Trafficking in Sending Communities of the Central Region of Ghana. University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast: Centre for Development Studies (Research Report).

Casely-Hayford, L. (2002). The Social Impact of Poverty on Educational Attainment: Lessons from the North: Paper presented at the fifth International Conference on the child -Children and Poverty: The impact of our Economic, Social and Political Choices. Montreal, Canada. 23-25, May 2002.

Cohen, L., Marion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). Research Methods in Education, London: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000). Research Methods in education (5th ed.) London and New York: Routledge Falmer. Coleman, J. (1987). Families and Schools. *Educational Researcher*, 16(6), 32-38

Comer, J. (2005). The rewards of parent participation. *Educational Leadership*, 62(6), 38-43

Chikoko, V. (2007). 'Negotiating Roles and Responsibilities in the context of Decentralised School Governance: A case study of one cluster of schools in Zimbabwe'. *International Studies in Educational Administration,* 35(1), 22-38

Creswell, J. (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and Mixed methods approaches (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage

De Grauwe, A., Lugaz, C., Balde, D., Moustapha, M. & Odushina, D. (2005). 'Does decentralization lead to school improvement? Findings and Lessons from research in West Africa, 'Journal *of Education for International Development1* (1).

Donkor, A. (2010). Parental Involvement in Education in Ghana: The Case of a Private Elementary School. *International Journal about Parents in Education,* 4(1) 23-28.

Duma, M. (2013). The principals' views in parent participation in governance of rural schools. Studies on Home and Community Science, 7(2) 99-107.

Dunne, M., Akyeampong, K. and Humphreys, S. (2007). School Processes, Local Governance and Community Participation: understanding access. CREATE, Research Monograph, No. 6, London.

Edge, K., Marphatia, A., Legault, E & Acher, D. (2010). Researching Education Outcomes in Burundi, Malawi, Senegal and Uganda. Using participatory tools and collaborative approaches. London, UK: Action Aid and the Institute of Education: University of London.

Edge, E, Tao, S, Riley, K and Khamsi, K. (2009a). Teacher quality and parental participation: An exploratory review of research and resources related to influencing student outcomes, London: Action Aid and the Institute of Education.

Essuman, A. and Akyeampong, K. (2011) Decentralisation policy and practice in Ghana: the promise and reality of Community participation in education in rural communities. *Journal of Education Policy,* 26, 513-527

Geo-Jaja, A. (2004). "Decentralisation and Privatisation of Education in Africa: Which Option for Nigeria?" *International Review of Education*. 50(3-4), 307-323.

Ghana Education Service (2001). SMC/PTA Handbook: Improving Quality Education through Community Participation.

Ghana Statistical Service (GSS) (2000). Population and Housing Census. Accra: Ghana Statistical Service

Government of Ghana (GOG) (1996). White Paper on the Report of the Education Review Committee, Accra: Government of Ghana.

Gyan, K. (2007). The impact of Parent-Teacher co-operation on the Child: the case of Kasoa in the Awutu-Senya District of Ghana (Unpublished Long-Essay), University of Education, Winneba.

Hill, N. & Craft, S. (2003). Parental School Involvement and School Performance. Mediated pathways among socio-economically comparable African American and Euro American Families, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 74-83.

Hill, N. & Taylor, L. (2014). Parent School Involvement and Children's academic achievement. Pragmatics and Issues. Current *Directions in Psychological Science,* 12(3), 161-164.

Johnson, B. and Christenson, L. (2004). Educational research: quantitative, qualitative and mixed approaches. (2nd Ed) Allyn & Bacon.

Kendall, N. (2007). "Parental and Community Participation in improving Educational Quality in Africa: Current Practices and Future Possibilities*" International Review of Education* (53)5-6):701-708

Kingdon, G., Lutler, A., Aslan, M., Rawal, S., Moe, T., Patrinos, H., Beteille, T., Baneji, R., Parton, B. & Sharma, S. (2014). A rigorous review of the political economy of education systems in developing countries. Final Report: Department for International Development.

Mankoe, J. (2002). Educational Administration and Management in Ghana. Progressive Stars Printing Press: Madina, Accra.

McMillan, J. & Schumacher, S. (2006). Research in Education: Evidence-based inquiry. (6th ed) Boston: Pearson Education.

Ministry of Education (2005). Education Sector Annual Report 2005. Accra: Ministry of Education.

Nyarko, K. (2011). Parental School Involvement: The case of Ghana. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies* (JETERAPS), 2(5), 378-381

Nkansah, G. & Chapman, D. (2006). Sustaining Community Participation: What remains after the money ends? *Review of Education* (52) pp.509-532.

Pipher, M. (1996). The shelter of each other: Rebuilding our families. New York: Bulletined Books.

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2010). *Essentials of Nursing Research: Appraising Evidence for Nursing Practice, (*7th ed). Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer Health | Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Ramani, K. and Zhimin, L. (2010). A survey on conflict resolution mechanisms in public secondary schools: A case study of Nairobi Kenya.

Robinson, M. (2007). Introduction: Decentralisation Service Delivery? Evidence and Policy Implications, IDS Bulletin, 38(1), 1-6.

Swick, K. (2004). Empowering Parents, families, schools and communities during the early childhood years. Champaign, IL: Stipes.

Tatlah, I. and Igbal, M. (2011). Role of Board of Governors and Parent Teacher Associations in District Public Schools in the context of conflicts and challenges. Department of Education, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan.

Watt, P. (2001). Community Support for Basic Education in Sub-Saharan Africa. Africa Region Human Development Working Paper Series, World Bank.

World Bank (2008). Governance, Management, and Accountability in secondary education in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington: The World Bank.

World Bank (2004). Books, Buildings and Learning Outcomes: An impact Evaluation of World Bank Support to Basic Education in Ghana. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Yin, R. (2009). Case Study Research: Design and Methods, London: Sage.

Yoshioka, A. (2010). Promoting Inter-Community-School Relations through the Capitation Grant in Ghana (Unpublished Thesis). University of British Columbia.