

Background paper prepared for the
Education for All Global Monitoring Report 2003/4
Gender and Education for All: The Leap to Equality

The introduction of free primary education in sub-Saharan Africa

Abby Riddell
2003

This paper was commissioned by the *Education for All Global Monitoring Report* as background information to assist in drafting the 2003/4 report. It has not been edited by the team. The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and should not be attributed to the *EFA Global Monitoring Report* or to UNESCO. The papers can be cited with the following reference: "Paper commissioned for the *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2003/4, The Leap to Equality*". For further information, please contact efareport@unesco.org

The Introduction of Free Primary Education in Sub-Saharan Africa¹

Over the past decade several countries in sub-Saharan Africa have abolished primary school tuition fees typically as part of renewed attempts to resurrect their education systems which have been in decline, and even suffering reduced enrolments after the initial growth following Independence. Whereas in the eighties and early to mid-nineties, cost-sharing had been a policy promoted by international financial institutions such as the World Bank, the direct (and indirect) costs to parents of their children's education became obstacles to their attendance and continued enrolment. The inability of parents to afford such costs fell on girls disproportionately, typically being the first to be pulled out or allowed to drop out of school. Has the introduction of 'free' primary education (FPE) turned the tables on this decline? Five countries are included in this study to provide evidence of the outcomes to date of such a policy change: Kenya, Malawi, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. These countries provide a range of experience dating back to 1994, when Malawi introduced free primary education, up to the present day, when in 2003, Kenya followed suit.

Section 1 provides a very brief synopsis of some of the facts surrounding each country's approach to FPE, illustrated in Table 1. Section 2 reviews and compares these countries' different experiences.

1. Synopsis of Five Countries' Experiences with the Introduction of Free Primary Education

1.1 Malawi

Free primary education was introduced in October 1994 following its announcement in June by the newly elected Government brought into power through the first multi-party elections since Independence. Just prior to that time, the Banda Government had brought in tuition waivers, in phases, from Standard 1, but parents still had been expected to pay book fees and to contribute to school funds. From 1994, however, Government was supposed to be responsible for all costs, though in practice it continued to expect communities to contribute to school construction. Given the lack of an overall policy framework and an analysis of the resource implications of embarking on this route, it is not surprising that even today, critics allege that the expansion of primary education has been at the expense of quality. (Kadzamira and Rose) Indeed, it is worth noting that the sudden introduction of FPE by the new administration was

¹ Several colleagues have helped me to piece together the different stories and statistics of the five countries' experiences of FPE reviewed here. I am especially grateful to: Richard Arden, Jonny Baxter, Nathalie Houlou, Nancy Kendall, Nansozi Muwanga, Steve Packer and Felicity Townsend. I, of course, remain solely responsible for any errors.

opposed by the development community which preferred the more gradual, phased route and only came around when FPE was declared, what was essentially a political imperative. In the first year of FPE, enrolments increased by over 50% from 1.9m in 1993/4 to about 3.2m in 1994/5. Net enrolments prior to FPE had been 58% for girls, increasing to 73% by 1996; and 58% also for boys, but only increasing to 68% by 1996. Gross enrolments increased from 67.9% in 1990/1 to 158.1% in 1999/2000. Male and female gross enrolment rates were comparable in 1999/2000: at 157.9 and 158.3%, respectively.

Such rapid enrolment increases challenged an already weak system that even before expansion had a pupil-teacher ratio of 70:1 with 13% of teachers being unqualified and an average of 100 pupils crowding existing classrooms. The biggest challenges were, not surprisingly, pressure on classroom facilities, insufficient teachers and an inadequate supply of instructional materials, all areas to which the development community responded, attempting to cater for shortfalls of the order of 38,000 new classrooms and at least 25,000 additional teachers. Some of the measures introduced to cater for such shortfalls included the creation of the Malawi Integrated In-Service Teacher Education Project (MIITEP), designed to produce 18,000 teachers at a lower cost and in a much shorter time than conventional full-time teacher training programmes, the building of associated teachers' resource centres, engaging communities in school and teachers' housing construction, and providing instructional materials. At the same time, the administrative and management capacities of the Ministry of Education were to be developed to cope with such undertakings. Alongside these reforms, other policies were introduced such as allowing no uniforms, prohibiting corporal punishment, revitalising parent-teacher associations, introducing curriculum changes and a new language policy and decentralising to the district level.

The impact of the new commitment to FPE can be judged at one level by the more than doubling of government recurrent expenditure devoted to education; between 1990/1 and 1997, this proportion rose from 11% to 24%, much of the increases going toward new teachers' salaries. Primary education's share of total educational expenditure went up from 45% to 65% in the early years of FPE, not least because of the conditions attached to external funds, which themselves constituted about 40% of the primary education budget (Kadzamira and Rose, citing Bernbaum et al). The larger external financial undertaking has been reflected in a larger donor role in the policy arena as well, though this influence had been present well before the introduction of FPE.

The circumstances surrounding the rapid quantitative expansion of the primary sector, together with this donor dependence has raised a number of issues regarding the long-term impact of the 1994 FPE policy of the Malawi Government. Some observers have pointed to a "loss of national vision" at the macro level and the "corrosion of pupil, teacher and parent relations" at the more micro level (Kendall) as well as a loss of teacher professionalism. Kadzamira

and Rose point to the qualification escalation as a subsidiary outcome, the continued lack of access of some sub-groups (street children, out-of-school youth, those with special needs, orphans and illiterate adults). Further, they point to continuing disparities between different income groups. Whilst the enrolment expansion has been remarkable, the quality of education – and many would say, even the ‘value’ of education – has deteriorated.² Thus, by 1997, more than half the teachers were untrained, compared with 13% before the introduction of FPE. The number of pupils per classroom went from 102 in 1992/3 to 422 in 1994/5 but back to a level similar to 1992/3 by 1996: 119; pupils per textbook were 2.9 prior to FPE, declining to 7.1 in 1994/5 but then bouncing back to 3 by 1997. Even more worrying is the fact that repetition rates are over 20%, and 55% of primary enrolment are over-age thus requiring non-formal education.

It is possible that Malawi’s dependence on donors has resulted in more reactive than pro-active policy visions, although current curriculum development efforts have been more inclusive, seeking grassroots involvement and approval. Further, if one is optimistic, the on-going decentralisation of the Ministry of Education could elicit a wider spectrum of opinion that potentially could influence the educational development path. Much weighs on a Policy Investment Framework bringing together coherent, phased plans for grappling with the variety of policies required to ensure that quality improvement goes hand in hand with continued enrolment expansion and increased retention and that groups not traditionally afforded access are reached, but underlying any such policies there needs to be a widespread understanding of the role education can (and should) play in modern Malawi. Otherwise, the educational system will continue to be in ‘catch-up’ mode, rather than defining, for Malawi, what is most appropriate for its long-term education and economic development.

1.2 Kenya

Following the election in Kenya at the end of 2002, in early 2003 the new Government announced its intention to introduce free primary education. This entailed the abolition of tuition fees, a part of the increasing costs of education to parents which had accounted largely for the decreasing primary and secondary school enrolments in the 1990s. Following this announcement, enrolments surged from about six million to about 7.2 million pupils, resulting in a gross enrolment rate of 104% compared with 87.6% in 2002. Whether other costs, such as exam fees, have been abolished has yet to be clarified, and over this first year, it is likely that new policies will be devised to deal with the overall costs of primary education. Other measures have already been taken, such as reducing the number of subjects, increasing the pupil-teacher ratio from 32:1 to 40:1, empowering districts to select teachers, and the introduction of multi-grade and shift teaching in some schools. However, a decision was taken that no

² This sense of the loss of ‘value’ of education perhaps has as much if not more to do with the overnight transition from an elitist to a mass education system than with the specific eclipse of quality as such.

additional teachers would be appointed until there had been a mapping of overall teacher requirements.

Although the cost-sharing policies of the previous decade have now been understood to be a significant cause of the high drop out and low quality of primary schools in Kenya, the new policy of free primary education will be likely to lead to a trade off between a dependence on parents and a dependence on external finance to meet the bills. Likely shortfalls will not only be in the numbers of trained teachers, but in instructional materials, building funds and furniture. The bulk of these latter items – i.e. not including teachers' salaries - had been financed previously, predominantly through levies on parents.

Total education spending before the introduction of FPE amounted to 29% of Kenya's recurrent expenditure, of which about 55% was on primary education. However, as 93% of this has gone on salaries, there has been little left for capital or development expenditure. Over the past three years, a DFID-supported project which matched government funding of textbooks led to average annual increases in non-salary expenditure of 25%. Overall, the real challenge will be the reallocation of resources within the education sector as Kenya already spends 6% GDP and 36% of recurrent expenditure on education.

DFID, SIDA, the World Bank, CIDA and UNICEF are contributing to bridging the immediate funding shortfalls, especially those related to teaching and learning materials as a result of previous under-investment and FPE. The World Bank has recently approved a grant of \$50 million and DFID has provided £13 million this year. GTZ, JICA and the WFP are also contributing to the sector. In addition to instructional materials, there is a focus on national financial and general management training, to enable new responsibilities to be undertaken effectively at national, district and school levels. Other investments in capacity building are also planned, including for an educational management information system and for school-based teacher development. Complementing such individual components, however, is assistance being given toward the development of an overall strategic framework and plan for the sector. This is feeding into the PRSP and Economic Recovery Plans and encompasses EFA planning, and the new curriculum which is being rolled out over the next four years. A comprehensive teacher development plan will need to be a part of this framework as well.

The on-going curriculum reform goes some way towards addressing the problem of relevance. At present only 47% of those enrolled in primary education complete it and only 27% of those eligible for secondary school enter Form One. What is emerging from the strategic planning exercise is a set of indicators that will measure the challenge of providing greater educational access at the same time as educational quality and systemic efficiency are improved. If successful, FPE, financing of the strategic plan, increased efficiency and careful

prioritisation, should lead to the virtuous circle of educational development and linked to economic growth.

1.3 Tanzania

'Free' primary education was announced in 2001, largely as part of the PRSP process, having been incorporated into the Education Sector Development Programme, which has provided the framework for partnerships with the international development community since its appraisal in early 1999. In 2001, the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) was launched, and tuition fees and other mandatory cash contributions to schools were abolished. This was consistent with the EFA target of ensuring the enrolment of all 7-13 year-olds by 2006. A gross enrolment ratio of 98% in 1980 had declined by the early 1990s to below 70%, and in 1999/00, the year before FPE was introduced, the gross enrolment rate was even lower, 63%, the net enrolment rate reaching only 46.7%. There were severe shortages of classrooms, desks, instructional materials and teachers' housing, as well as insufficient numbers of teachers to cater for the school-aged population.

The PEDP consists of four main components: (a) expanding enrolment; (b) improving the quality of teaching and learning processes; (c) building capacity within the education system and other public and private sectors with a stake in education provision; and (d) strengthening the institutional arrangements that support the planning and delivery of education services. Government has set aside 25% of its recurrent budget for education, of which 62% is for primary education. Instead of tackling all out-of-school children at once, in the first year children between the ages of 7-10 were targeted, with a goal of 1.5m. This was exceeded in practice, with the GER rising to 100.4% and the net enrolment ratio to 80.7%. In subsequent years, the age range targeted has been extended. In 2001/2 nearly 14,000 new classrooms were planned, and about two-thirds have been completed, as well as the construction of teachers' houses, toilets and the supply of classroom furniture, using development grants made to school committees. Other measures that were introduced included the recruitment of between 9 - 10,000 teachers per year and their upgrading, an improved curriculum and increased numbers of textbooks. A \$10 capitation grant was also introduced, like the development grants, controlled by school committees. This was intended to cover some of the additional school-based costs.

Measures such as not requiring uniforms have not been implemented in practice (by parents) because of the social ostracism this would involve. Other, substantial indirect costs have also remained, such as for instructional materials, the provision of which has not been sufficient to date. Double-shift schooling and multi-grade teaching have been started as interim measures to deal with shortfalls. The Government's renewed efforts at introducing FPE (Nyerere introduced it in the '70s) are appreciated, but the more time-consuming qualitative advances required to maintain parental support will place it in the

balance until they have been achieved. Neither teaching, nor school nor financial management skills are attained overnight. Certainty surrounding and the continual flow of external finance for the PEDP will facilitate the delivery and eventual attainment of the various constituent factors that are planned to contribute to the sector's development.

Complementary basic education is intended to absorb the out-of-school, over-age children unable to be accommodated within the gradualist approach taken thus far. Whilst tens of thousands of children have been registered for such education, only some 11,000 were enrolled in 2002, and strategy design and implementation have yet to receive sufficient attention.

External finance is likely to cover many of the shortfalls necessary for the Government to live up to its commitments. The World Bank, the EU, the Netherlands, SIDA, JICA, Ireland Aid, GTZ, Finland, Norway and CIDA are all contributing to the primary education sub-sector. DFID provides funding through general budget support, and Belgium and France intend to contribute to the sub-sector. Eight of these donors are expected together to contribute 60% of the PEDP budget over the next three years, not including DFID's budget support.

The first year of operation of the reintroduction of FPE in Tanzania clearly illustrates its great potential for the long-term development of the sector, but it also bears foreboding, with similar lessons from the past. It is recognised that primary education is insufficient in and of itself, and that for it to fulfil its macro, poverty-alleviating purpose, it is important that it be relevant and include practical skills. It is also recognised that its reintroduction requires that *simultaneous* attention be given to all the inter-related policies: recruiting and upgrading teachers, monitoring and supervising their professional development, the predictable and regular disbursement and appropriate use of capitation and development grants, school and financial management training, empowerment of school committees, etc. Capacity limitations, however, as elsewhere, constrain such simultaneity. In addition, given the gradualist approach taken by the PEDP, complementary basic education must be more than a second-best solution to out-of-school youth. In the balance, as ever, will be not only quantitative expansion and the qualitative content of basic education, but also the balance between what is essentially a centralised approach and the necessary decentralised empowerment for its appropriate implementation.

1.4 Uganda

Universal Primary Education (UPE) was introduced in January 1997 in Uganda. Education was seen as an important foundation of the Poverty Eradication Action Plan, the indigenous 'PRSP', of which the Education Sector Investment Programme (ESIP) was a key building block. Tuition fees were abolished for 6-12 year-olds, and this was intended to apply to a maximum of four children per family. In addition, disabled and orphaned children were to be given special

consideration. In practice, however, it was applied virtually to all children in this age group. Primary enrolment in 1996 was 2.7 million. By 2002, this had surged to 7.2 million pupils. Gross enrolment in 1995 was 74.3%. By 2000/1, gross enrolment had reached 135.8%, indicative of the considerable number of over- and under-age pupils enrolled. Net enrolment in the same year was 109.5%. UPE had been achieved.³ The commitment to UPE can be seen in the budget hikes given to education. Whereas in 1992, education comprised 12% of the Government's budget, by 1998, it had reached 25%, a figure which has been relatively stable since that time.

The goals of Education For All (EFA) comprise more than universal enrolment, and the story of this considerable Ugandan achievement needs to be tempered with the outstanding challenges that have been identified both in the ESIP Mid-Term Review (MTR) (Pfaffe) and the Evaluation of Impact of the UPE Implementation (Government of the Republic of Uganda, March 2003). Both documents address candidly the constraints, opportunities and challenges ahead in moving from UPE toward FPE. The Government of Uganda did not attempt to introduce free primary education in the first instance. Most of its resources went to school construction, instructional materials, and teacher recruitment and recurrent expenditure. Considerable family household expenditure on education remained: on clothing, exercise books, and school fund contributions. Indeed, the MTR points to the "drastic decrease in enrolment during the transition from P1 to P2 which might relate to the fact that schooling is simply not affordable for those who do not earn a cash income." (Pfaffe, p.43) In looking ahead to the introduction of FPE, three potential areas for government expenditure are highlighted: uniforms, school stationery and school feeding, though it is recognised that government could not underwrite all these costs. It is intended that discussion of the means of moving toward FPE will be comprehensive and inclusive.

External agencies have covered over 50% of the education sector budget, in grants, loans and technical assistance, including significant levels of general and sectoral budget support, virtually all of which has been closely tied to – if not explicitly conditional on – investment in UPE. This figure is unlikely to change. As ESIP II follows on from ESIP I, whose intent was to protect local ownership, the MTR has pointed out, ironically, the necessity of being 'alert to the dangers of repeating the perceived weakness of ESIP I', which was perceived as 'donor driven'. (Pfaffe, p.200)

The challenge of sustaining UPE will relate to the matching of the quantitative expansion with qualitative improvement as well as in improving access to post-primary schooling. The systematic monitoring of various qualitative indicators has underlined many of these challenges, such as reducing pupil teacher, pupil

³ However, it is still estimated that "13-18% of 6-12 year olds in Uganda are out of school" (MoES 2002).

classroom and pupil book ratios. Whilst improving, there is still a long way to go from the figures of 57:1; 98:1 and 6.7:1, respectively, for 2000/1. Similarly, whilst the enrolment figures are extremely encouraging, it is also recognised that some of the targets, such as a 100% survival rate for P7 this year, is simply unrealistic, moving from rates of 72-73% for current P1-P3 cohorts. Various measures have been introduced to help qualitative improvement. Teachers' needs are now being met in some respects through hardship allowances given to teachers in remote areas. The policy dilemma of moving toward increased post-primary access whilst still addressing primary quality will remain for some time. In April 2002, the MoES instituted a Task Force to design a Post-Primary Education and Training (PPET) policy and costed framework to make provisions for absorbing the UPE bulge into the post primary sector of education. Currently, the available post-primary schools and institutions can absorb 40-50% of the 400,000 students sitting for PLE.

1.5 Zambia

In 2002, the Government declared that education would be free for all pupils from grades 1 – 7. All user fees were abolished, and uniforms were no longer compulsory. Schools would still be able to raise funds, but no child could be denied access to school on account of costs. In the case of Zambia, the sequencing of different policy pronouncements and documents was different from some of the other countries: the SWAp came before the PRSP, which preceded a strategic plan for the sector. In 1999, the Basic Education Sub-Sector Investment Programme (BESSIP) began, building on the national educational policy of 1996, Educating Our Future. BESSIP was a sub-sectoral SWAp which guided development agencies' contributions to basic education, attempting to integrate and coordinate a variety of efforts and programmes. These have focused on school infrastructure, educational materials, teacher education, curriculum development, capacity building, HIV/AIDS prevention, equity and gender, and school health and nutrition. A strategic plan was finalised in 2003, facilitating the appropriate integration of the whole education sector. Work begun on a PRSP, provided the necessary, if belated, impetus for this plan. During the 1990s, the numbers of teachers had declined, due both to HIV/AIDS, as well as a policy of not recruiting untrained teachers. Concomitantly, pupil teacher ratios had worsened, from 37:1 in 1996 to 45:1 in 1998 and 47:1 in 1999.

Net enrolment rates fell through the late 1990s, from 70.4% in 1996 to 65.1% in 2001. Even with the inclusion of children in community schools, geared toward the most vulnerable, such as AIDS orphans, the net enrolment rate was 68.5% in 2001. For children in the intake year, aged 7, in 2001 it is estimated that 55.6% were not enrolled in schools. During the same period, gross enrolment rates also fell, from 85.0% in 1996 to 76.9% in 2001.

The strategic plan has set a number of targets for the sub-sector to be achieved by 2007, including an increase in net enrolment to 80% for Grades 1-7, an

increase in gross enrolment to 110% and an increase in completion rates in Grades 1-7 to 86%. Without a concomitant rise in teacher numbers, this will result in a further deterioration in the pupil teacher ratio from 52 in 2002 to 64 in 2007, increasing the class size from 36 to 45.

In the first year of FPE, 2002, primary enrolments grew by 7% compared with only 2% in the prior year, and gross enrolment increased to 81%, whereas in prior years it had hovered between 78 and 79%. The net intake rate declined in this first year of FPE, and the net enrolment rate increased by 1%, indicating that the enrolment gains were likely to be of children outside the official school-going ages.

The allocation for education of the disposable budget in 2002 has increased to 20.1% (up from 13.2% in 1996) although only about 17% was actually disbursed in 2002. Basic education's share of the education budget increased to 56% in 2000 (more if you count grades 8 and 9 which is 'full' basic.) Over the past five years, however, the education budget has remained at just over 2% of GDP. The additional funds currently targeted for education under the PRSP would increase the budget by 12%. The inclusion of external finance has been significant for capital development: capital expenditure rising from 1% to 19% of overall expenditure. Most of the government funding is through recurrent costs such as personal emoluments, recurrent departmental expenditure and a small contribution to educational materials. Zambia is likely to continue to require external assistance for considerable time to bridge the resource gap needed to finance basic education. Fifteen international development agencies are presently funding BESSIP, overall, contributing to about half its budget, although only five are directly financing the sector budget to any significant amount. In 2000, 27% of total education expenditure was externally financed.

It is still too early to judge the long term impact of the introduction of FPE in Zambia. However, there is concern that the quality of education does not deteriorate as greater access is afforded. Teacher attrition has been considerable, estimated at about 5% per year and whilst untrained teachers are not being hired in the Government schools, community schools have relied primarily on unqualified teachers. The graduates of the new Zambia Teacher Education Course (ZATEC) programme under BESSIP should produce sufficient numbers of teachers of newly qualified teachers, however.

Efforts are being made to overcome the critical shortage of educational materials particularly a shortage of textbooks. Whilst reliance on parents to fund these costs has moved to Government, parents are still required to contribute to the schools' physical infrastructure and their maintenance. As access expands, the balancing act for Government will become trickier, as it will need to meet parental demands for quality whilst intake improves. Part of this challenge will be met by integrating into the basic school curriculum provision for the development by children of the skills that will enable them to contribute to society, to have access

to formal and non-formal employment opportunities, and to be able to continue learning through life. Whether the targets are met for reduced repetition and drop out, and increased learning⁴ will be telling.

2. Review of Countries' Experiences with FPE

There is clearly a lot of similarity across the five different countries' experiences with introducing free primary education. What is indisputable is that abolishing tuition fees overcomes some of the obstacles to attending school, as can be judged by the gross and net enrolment rate increases experienced in all the countries following FPE, but for Zambia. However, as the case study summaries show, a series of problems (some created or exacerbated by the FPE policies) remain. Added to these are the effects that HIV/AIDs has had on the education sectors of all these countries.⁵

Malawi, the first country to implement FPE, attempted a radical transformation, not dissimilar from its neighbour, Zimbabwe, at an earlier stage, at its Independence, when, unlike most of the continent, whose countries had achieved political independence much earlier, Zimbabwe attempted to catch up on its lost educational progress by expanding its system to achieve UPE virtually overnight. The enrolment increases of the order of doubling in only two years that were unique in the early 1980s were not to be repeated until the introduction of FPE, which comes as a resurrection of the educational trajectories of these five countries that failed to produce educated and literate populaces following their own independence. Yet, the lessons of this earlier rapid expansion in Zimbabwe ring true today. Access to education is highly coveted, and can be achieved rapidly by various combinations of policies - building more schools, lowering the costs to parents, supplying instructional materials, etc. But, access to quality education is what keeps pupils in those schools to which they've gained access. Unless quality is attended to from the beginning, high enrolment rates will not necessarily lead to an educated population. The Zimbabwe experience of one-third of its new schools becoming non-viable within the first five years of independence⁶ provides a warning for the more recent, rapid, quantitative educational expansion of these other countries in recent years.

Yet, educational quality is both elusive and difficult to achieve with anything like the rapidity that physical educational expansion can more rapidly achieve. Strategic plans can lay out, using key indicators, what is meant by 'quality', for

⁴ A major initial literacy programme has been expanded to all basic schools and is achieving much improved results. However, this is in contrast with minimal change seen in the National Assessment results over the period since the start of BESSIP.

⁵ Whilst the statistical details have not been included here, two areas greatly affected by the virus should be highlighted: the attrition rates of teachers and the increasing numbers of AIDS orphans.

⁶ Non-viable, because the parents of the students chose to send their children to different schools where they judged their children had better opportunities to learn.

instance, through the percentage of qualified teachers, pupil teacher ratios, pupil textbook ratios, increases in learning achievement, etc. The five countries have all realised the importance of educational quality; the challenge has been to create sufficiently quickly the increases in human resources, the networks of communication, management practices and behaviour that can reinforce, complement and build on the increased physical resources that have been provided, be they classrooms, textbooks, or, indeed, teachers.

With respect to what it is agreed is the linchpin of educational quality, the teachers, the five countries have adopted different policies toward teacher deployment. Malawi appointed untrained teachers, orientated them briefly, and only subsequently created MIITEP to provide the professional development they lacked. Zambia and Kenya decided not to deploy untrained teachers at the start of FPE. Zambia developed a new teacher education programme, ZATEC, and FPE was announced subsequently, and Kenya decided to map its teacher requirements before deploying new teachers. Tanzania recruited 9 - 10,000 teachers per year and then began to address their necessary upgrading. Uganda, similarly, focused on deployment before comprehensive, professional teacher development. However, with the exception of Zambia, FPE was announced with teacher development plans only detailed afterwards. We know that teachers require not only training, but also supervision and support. They also need the respect of the communities whom they serve, especially if decentralised management of educational development is to be realised. In Uganda, this has been understood, if not addressed satisfactorily to date:

Currently, most teachers enter the profession because they do not see any other alternative apart from unemployment, which also impacts negatively on the public perception and status of the profession. (Pfaffe, p.23)

There are issues here that go beyond the professional training of the teachers and have to do with the reinforcement and support given to them in ways that were taken for granted when teachers were role-models in society and when education was for the few, not for all. The challenge in bringing about free primary education for all that encompasses the quality dimension is that these support systems are not sufficiently developed when the support needs to be given, so that the access that is afforded on the one hand is often negatively counter-poised with poor quality on the other.

What has been challenging in all the five countries studied is that governments have had to weave their policies between the Scylla and Charybdis of satisfying development agency predilections whilst teasing out indigenous educational visions.⁷ They have had to do this in the context of developing their own

⁷ It is striking how similar are the educational development plans across the five countries. This would seem to belie 'national' visions that may be more aptly termed, 'capitol' visions, wrought from the constellations of development agency representatives and Government officials tasked

capacities to manage mass education and engendering sufficient community participation to ensure that education is responsive to local needs, that some of its management is appropriately devolved, and that communities can continue to make their important contributions to education, even if no longer in the form of tuition fees.

Uganda has often been treated as an exceptional case amongst sub-Saharan countries because its policies have been so successful. Indeed, UPE has been achieved there, and it has managed to attract sufficient funding from the development agencies in direct budget support to ensure overall costs are fully covered, with the World Bank breaking its mould and contributing to a pooled fund. A focus of ESIP II is now on the bridge to post-primary education, because of the huge strides made to date at the primary level. However, there has also been a welcome, but fairly recent shift to quality concerns, such as raising the efficiency of primary education, improving retention and attainment and lowering drop-out and repetition.

A factor that distinguishes Uganda from the other countries and may be related to its promise is that during the time of its civil war, the strings of centralised power – and administration – were cut in the formerly highly centralised Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES). This meant that *de facto* decentralisation occurred, on which was built the *de jure* decentralisation brought in by the Museveni Government. Establishing viable decentralised structures, in practice, is a long haul, involving extensive capacity building, not least in financial management in order to assure regular financial flows from central government. Uganda has succeeded in bringing this about, and the development community has been coordinated effectively and accepts the Government's annual reporting in its Education Sector Reviews.⁸ The need for such capacity building is recognised in the other countries' education development plans at least in theory, but it would seem that the achievements of UPE upstage these other very fundamental achievements in the support systems that have been created in countries such as Uganda.

The influence of development agencies needs to be recognised and assessed as an important factor in both shaping and implementing FPE, as well as the sequencing of various related plans and documents which have influenced the way development has occurred. In Zambia, the shift and sequencing from an education policy to a sub-sectoral education SWAp, to a PRSP to a strategic plan

with achieving the EFA agenda. (See Rose for an example of how 'community participation', one of the constituent factors of such education development plans, is played out in Malawi.)

⁸ The candidness of the MTR stands out, however, despite these achievements: "Notwithstanding the Government of Uganda's attempts at reforming the public sector, performance across the public sector continues to be affected by deep-rooted structural, systemic and organizational culture problems that are unlikely to be corrected through swift sector-specific interventions. Thus the relative slowness of affecting positive change in the education sector should be of no surprise." (Pfaffe, p. xvi)

for the whole education sector was the reverse of what occurred in Uganda, where though also beginning with an Education White Paper, the education policy was then incorporated within a PRSP, whilst a sectoral strategy and SWAp were being produced. Does this make any difference? In the case of Uganda, the injection of aid monies flowing to the education sector was integrated within the country's overall development framework. The education sector was clearly placed within a poverty reduction strategy. In the case of Zambia, the education sector - and the basic education sub-sector - were retro-fitted into a wider PRSP and the associated public sector reform and capacity building programmes after considerable, independent sub-sectoral work had been undertaken. In addition to education's important role in rights-based development, the reason that development agencies are focusing with renewed attention on education is because of its fundamental role in poverty alleviation. In this regard, it is ironic that the MTR for Uganda should comment:

Investment in UPE has overshadowed investment and interest in all other sub-sectors. Domestic political, bureaucratic and technical forces, and external conditionalities associated with Official Development Assistance (ODA) have converged around the over-riding and necessary objective of increasing primary school enrolments. This drive on the quantitative expansion of UPE has arguably inevitably been at the expense of the quality and efficiency targets originally seen as equally important aspects in the implementation of ESIP I. In ESIP II, when the focus will be shifted more to secondary and tertiary education, this relationship has to be taken into account and more productivity oriented indicators, such as increased economic growth rate, increased labor productivity, decreased unemployment rate, unemployment rate of primary secondary and/or tertiary graduates, have to be considered. Outputs of relevant studies should reveal how education and labor, how supply and demand, can be reconciled. (Pfaffe, p.xv)

Has a focus on primary education because of its role in poverty alleviation obviated a concern with education's connection with economic growth?

In all five countries, the Governments are dependent on external finance for funding FPE, and this looks likely to be the case for the mid- to long-term. Increasingly, sector-wide approaches (SWAps) including direct budget support have overtaken discrete projects as the dominant aid modality. There are various intentions behind such movements, not least the desirable, overall coordination of what in the past had been fragmented programmes given different support by different development agencies. Local ownership and leadership of the whole sector has also been a prime reason for using such aid modalities. However, as pointed out in Uganda's MTR, "such arrangements...can give ODA agencies even more policy influence than they...had before". (Pfaffe, p.202) They also require more educational planning

expertise than has been prevalent (or retained) in most ministries of education for some time.⁹

If we consider the circumstances surrounding the policy decision to introduce FPE in each of the five countries under study, there are many similarities. First, in four of the five cases, FPE was announced following the election of a new government. Uganda, the exception, was already in the process of seeing through major economic development following its civil war. The political kudos for announcing FPE, of course, is tremendous, irrespective of any larger design. Secondly, in all five cases, primary education was already a significant marker on development agencies' road maps for helping to contribute to poverty eradication, so introducing free primary education would likely attract the necessary external finance. Thirdly, the education sectors of all five countries had suffered similar declines due to a variety of factors, not least their indebtedness and poor economic prospects. Thus, the macro benefits of introducing FPE would seem to have been great in all five cases.

It is, indeed, the macro benefits of FPE which are the focus of donor and recipient countries alike, but it is the micro challenges which loom large and require differential treatment. These micro challenges cover all aspects of educational development, from the vision of the educational system as a whole, to the relevance of the curriculum, the appropriateness of the examination system for recognising achievement and enabling selection for post-primary education, to teacher education, textbook production and distribution, school health and nutrition, to reaching the marginalised and most disadvantaged, to language policy, monitoring and evaluation, community participation, financial management, supervision, etc. Whilst the macro policies have been put in place, the micro challenges have not been addressed sufficiently. As could be seen in the summary of Uganda given above, quality considerations have been eclipsed by the quantitative push toward UPE, and the situation is not dissimilar across the other countries.

In understanding the greater policy leverage of development agencies, one usually thinks of policy writ large and its associated indicators, e.g. percentages of budgets going to primary education, the prioritisation of girls' education, etc. In practice, however, underlying any adoption of such overall policies are many smaller, sometimes implicit adjustments in the direction of the development agencies' requirements. These 'adjustments' can be seen in the language in which business is conducted. It is a language of economic and financial management rather than the language of an older, more traditional educational management. Thus, it is about indicators and performance, and value for money, and explaining expenditure patterns rather than patterns of learning and language and pedagogy. It is about analysing whether targets are achieved and not about the appropriateness of the targets in directing educational development. It is a language that only a few have learned, to their advantage

⁹ See Riddell.

and in their use of the language, to the advantage of the country's Treasury, where effectiveness brings additional finance.

To point this out is not to be overly critical, for major benefits have clearly occurred. It is necessary, however, to highlight the considerable behavioural changes that are required at all levels to achieve long-lasting and 'embedded' results, as individuals not only learn the language of external finance, but also its management. Reviewing the key documentation on each country's experience with FPE has to lead to the observation that one is witnessing earlier concerns about educational development resounding through the much louder discussions of targets, especially qualitative ones, not being met. Kendall has put her finger on this in commenting in the case of Malawi that, "civil society' in Malawi is too underdeveloped, too beholden to donors for support, and too politically vulnerable to really discuss forging a vision of education different than the donor vision." She goes on to detail a litany of characteristics, some positive, but many negative, that describe the current situation in Malawi, nine years after the introduction of FPE:

- Loss of national vision
- Corrosion of pupil, teacher, and parent relations
- Corruption (education for MP's poverty alleviation)
- Politicization of the school and its staff
- Decline in "respect for authority"
- Increase in educational access
- Decline in educational quality for the poor (increase in private schooling for the rich)
- Breakdown in school/state communication
- Decline in teacher professionalism
- Decline in the value of "being educated"
 - ◆ Few jobs; educated people are "just sitting"
 - ◆ More business opportunities for youth since democratization
- Increased demands on parents and pupils for labor inputs (Kendall)

Many of these characteristics could also be used to describe the experience of other countries under review and the changes resulting in part from their externally-financed educational development. Planning the backward and forward linkages of FPE clearly must involve economic, political and social considerations that would seem often not to be well orchestrated down at the village/school level.

There are certain lessons emerging from these different studies that need to be highlighted. First of all, it is clear that whilst implementing free primary education is seen as a sound macro policy, it needs to be integrated within a poverty reduction (and economic growth) strategy that anticipates and provides for the forward and backward linkages of the expanded system as well as of those children afforded education. This has implications for textbook production and

distribution, school construction and maintenance, teachers' conditions of service, the relevance of the curriculum, the role that examinations play, the provision of early childhood education as an important route into primary education, the transition rates to post-primary education, etc. Thus, a focus solely on primary education is but a starting point and not sufficient in itself.

Secondly, community participation should not be abused and used merely as a legitimisation of policies from on high, nor as a 'quick fix' for school construction nor as a less than transparent and "least-cost" form of cost-sharing. Village-level concerns do need to be heard, participation needs to be engendered, two-way communication needs to be developed, and the language of educational development should not be alienating. Satisfying the external financiers of free primary education should not have to mean that in effect, the system is fashioned to their designs rather than national ones, even though all parties' intentions may be otherwise. Development agencies, therefore, should not be blinded by the political agreements that enable them to invest heavily in free primary education unless the efforts to involve those thousands of teachers and students and their families in the regeneration of their national education systems are deeply rooted in the achievement not merely of "free education" but a form of education which maximises the human resource capacity of the country and the individuals who are educated.

TABLE 1: SYNOPSIS OF 5 COUNTRIES' EXPERIENCES WITH FREE PRIMARY EDUCATION

Country	FPE Provisions	Gross and Net Enrolments	Finance	Role of External Agencies																					
Kenya	<p>January 2003</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free tuition and no school levies • costs remain: uniforms, exam fees 	<table> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>GER</u></td> <td><u>NER</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000/1</td> <td>94.0</td> <td>68.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>87.6</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>115.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"><u>Enrolment:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>6.0m</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>7.2m</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>	2000/1	94.0	68.5	2002	87.6		2003	115.0		<u>Enrolment:</u>			2002	6.0m		2003	7.2m		<p>Education: from 29% to 36% of govt budget; 55% of this on primary education</p> <p>6% of GDP</p>	<p>2003: WB approved \$50m; DFID \$21m; several other donors smaller amounts, bridging immediate gaps in advance of strategic plan</p>
	<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>																							
2000/1	94.0	68.5																							
2002	87.6																								
2003	115.0																								
<u>Enrolment:</u>																									
2002	6.0m																								
2003	7.2m																								
Malawi	<p>October 1994</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free tuition, books, stationery • uniforms not compulsory 	<table> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>GER</u></td> <td><u>NER</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1992</td> <td></td> <td>77.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1996</td> <td>138.0</td> <td>67.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000/1</td> <td>136.9</td> <td>100.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"><u>Enrolment:</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1993/4</td> <td>1.9m</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1994/5</td> <td>3.0m</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>	1992		77.0	1996	138.0	67.0	2000/1	136.9	100.6	<u>Enrolment:</u>			1993/4	1.9m		1994/5	3.0m		<p>Education: from 11% (1990/1) to 24% (1997) of govt budget; 65% of this on primary education</p> <p>5.4% of GNP</p>	<p>About 40% of primary education budget</p>
	<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>																							
1992		77.0																							
1996	138.0	67.0																							
2000/1	136.9	100.6																							
<u>Enrolment:</u>																									
1993/4	1.9m																								
1994/5	3.0m																								
Tanzania	<p>October 2001</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free tuition (7-10 yr-olds first, then extended) • no mandatory cash contributions • uniforms not compulsory 	<table> <tr> <td></td> <td><u>GER</u></td> <td><u>NER</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1999:</td> <td>63.0</td> <td>46.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002:</td> <td>100.4</td> <td>99.3</td> </tr> </table>		<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>	1999:	63.0	46.7	2002:	100.4	99.3	<p>Education: 25% of govt budget; 62% of this on primary education</p> <p>3.4% of GDP</p>	<p>Over 60% of primary education budget, not including direct budget support</p>												
	<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>																							
1999:	63.0	46.7																							
2002:	100.4	99.3																							

Country	FPE Provisions	Gross and Net Enrolments	Finance	Role of External Agencies									
Uganda	January 1997 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • free tuition (6-12 yr-olds) • costs remain: clothing, school feeding, scholastic materials, and school fund contributions 	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>GER</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>NER</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1995</td> <td style="text-align: center;">74.3</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000/1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">135.8</td> <td style="text-align: center;">109.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Enrolment:</u> 1996 2.7m 2002 7.2m		<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>	1995	74.3		2000/1	135.8	109.5	Education: from 12% (1992) to 25% (1998) of govt budget; 70% of this on primary education	Over 50% ODA
	<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>											
1995	74.3												
2000/1	135.8	109.5											
Zambia	February 2002 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • user fees abolished • uniforms not compulsory • fees can be levied by PTAs and boards, but no student can be denied an education because of cost 	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>GER</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>NER</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2001:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">76.9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">65.1*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td style="text-align: center;">81.0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">66.1</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <u>Enrolment</u> 2001 1.6m 2002 1.7m *68.5% including community school enrolment		<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>	2001:	76.9	65.1*	2002	81.0	66.1	Education: from 13.2% (1996) to 20.1% of government budget; 56% of this on basic education 2% GDP on education	About 50% basic education budget; 27% of total education expenditure (2000)
	<u>GER</u>	<u>NER</u>											
2001:	76.9	65.1*											
2002	81.0	66.1											

References

Africaonline Staff Reporter, "Zambia: Education policy punishes poor", 31 October 2001.

Al-Samarrai, Samer and Zaman. Hassan, "The Changing Distribution of Public Education Expenditure in Malawi", Africa Region Working Paper Series No. 29, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., March 2002.

Bernbaum, M. et al., Lessons Learned: Evaluation of USAID/Malawi Girls Attainment in Basic Literacy and Education (GABLE) Program, Academy for Educational Development, Washington, D.C., 1998.

DFID ESSP Malawi, PRASS Project, and Centre for Educational Research and Training, "The Education Sector Support Programme, Malawi and Participatory Rights Assessments", Workshop, Lilongwe, 22-24 October 2002.

Durston, Susan and Nashire, Nice, "Poverty and Education: A Case Study of Implementation Strategies of an Education Programme in Malawi", Draft Paper Presented to the Oxford International Conference on Education and Development, 9-13 September 1999.

Extension of Strengthening of Primary Education Project Phase III (SPRED III Extension), March 2003.

Government of Tanzania, Ministry of Education and Culture, Education Sector Country Status Report (Tanzania), Final Report, February 2001.

Government of the Republic of Malawi, Ministry of Education, Sports and Culture in Collaboration with UNICEF, Free Primary Education: The Malawi Experience 1994-98, December 1998.

Government of the Republic of Malawi, National Strategy for Community Participation in Primary School Management, "The Move Beyond Bricks Towards Community Involvement in Whole School Development", December 2002.

Government of the Republic of Uganda, Ministry of Education and Science, Basic Education Policy and Costed Framework For Educationally Disadvantaged Children, October 2002.

Government of the Republic of Uganda, Ministry of Education and Science, "Terms of Reference for a Consultant to Prepare a Comprehensive Progress Report to Inform the Second National Stakeholders Conference on the Implementation of Universal Primary Education", for forthcoming May 2003 Review.

Government of the Republic of Uganda, Ministry of Education and Science, Evaluation of Impact of UPE Implementation, Final Draft Report, March 2003 for Forthcoming Review.

Government of the Republic Of Uganda, Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Uganda's Progress in Attaining the PEAP Targets - in the Context of the Millennium Development Goals, Background Paper for the Consultative Group Meeting, Kampala, 14-16 May 2003.

Government of the Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Education, "The BESSIP Core Performance Indicators Trend Report, 1999-2002", Preliminary Report Submitted by BESSIP Coordinator to the End of Year BESSIP Review Meeting, 17 December 2002.

Government of the Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Education, Strategic Plan 2003-2007, Education In Zambia 2002, Situational Analysis, Draft, October 2002.

Government of the Republic Of Zambia, Ministry Of Education, Strategic Plan 2003 – 2007, 31 January 2003.

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania Education Sector Development Programme, Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP), PEDP Stock-Taking Report, Draft 1, 26 May 2002, including Annex 1 Drop Out Rates 1997-2002, Annex 2 Expenditure Analysis for Classroom Construction Mtwara District, Statistical Tables 1A-XA, PEDP Stock Taking Report Mtwara District.

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, Basic Education Development Committee, Education Sector Development Programme, Primary Education Development Plan (2002-2006), July 2001.

Government of the United Republic of Tanzania, President's Office, Regional Administration and Local Government, Primary Education Development Plan 2002-2006, Annual PEDP Performance 2001-2002 National Monitoring Report, Second Draft, September 2002.

HakiElimu, What the Papers are saying about Girls' and Women's Education: Achievements and Challenges, News Clippings (June 2002 – March 2003), Dar es Salaam.

HakiElimu, What the Papers are Saying about Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) Finances, News Clippings (September 2002 – January 2003), Dar es Salaam.

HakiElimu, What the Papers are Saying about Teachers and Teaching, News Clippings (July 2002 – February 2003), Dar es Salaam.

HakiElimu, What the Papers are Saying about the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP), News Clippings (April - September 2002), Dar es Salaam.

Heyman, Cory "Continuous Assessment for Teachers", The Newsletter of the Improving Educational Quality Project, American Institutes for Research, *Washington, DC*, Spring 2001.

“Implementation of Free Primary Education Development Plan: Voices from the Community”, Save the Children Foundation, ND.

Jere, Docks R, Chilora, Henri G, Kasambara, Joyce, Kaphesi, Elias S, Kamangira, Yoas T, Maliakini, Steven M, and Mabeti Francis, “Democracy and Quality of Primary Education in Malawi”, The Quality Link, American Institutes for Research, Number 19, 2002/3, Washington, D.C.

Jimbo, Paul, “Free Primary Education At Risk in Kajiado”, The East African Standard, April 5, 2003, Nairobi .

Kadzamira, Esme and Rose, Pauline, “Educational Policy Choice and Policy Practice in Malawi: Dilemmas and Disjunctures”, IDS Working Paper 124, University of Sussex Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, 2001.

Kaunda, Zikani and Kendall, Nancy, “Prospects of Educating for Democracy in Struggling Third Wave Regimes: The Case of Malawi”, Volume 4, Number 1, Education for Democracy in the Post-Development Era: What Will the Curtain Reveal? December 18, 2001, (<http://www.tc.columbia.edu/cice/articles/zknk141.htm>).

Kay, John, Kanjala, Billy and Makoko, Felix, “Supporting School Improvement and Teacher Development: An Account of the Malawi School Support Systems Programme (MSSSP)”, A Paper Presented to the International Congress of School Effectiveness and Improvement, York, Toronto, Canada, 5-9 January 2001.

Kendall, Nancy, “Comparative Approaches to Understanding Educational Change: A Case Study of Educational Democratization in Malawi”, Paper Presented at the 2003 Annual Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, New Orleans, March 2003.

Kinunda M.J., UNESCO consultant, “A Review Paper for Discussion on the Development of the ESDP/PEDP/EFA Framework 2002-2015”, Dar es Salaam, August 2001.

Kremer, Michael, Moulin, Sylvie, Namunyu, Robert, “The Political Economy of School Finance in Kenya”, Work in Progress, The World Bank, April 22, 2002.

Kunje, D, and Lewin, K. M., “The Costs and Financing of Teacher Education in Malawi”, MUSTER Discussion Paper No, 2, Centre for International Education, University of Sussex, 2000.

Lewin, K. M., “Counting the Cost of Teacher Education: Cost and Quality Issues”, MUSTER Discussion Paper No. 1, Centre for International Education, University of Sussex, 1999.

Ligomeka, Brian, “Malawi Education: Free primary education backfires”, AFRICANEWS, May 2002.

Maarifa Ni Ufunguo, Cost Sharing: A Case Study of Education in Kilimanjaro, Arusha, February 2001.

Maarifa Ni Ufunguo, Financing Education in Kilimanjaro: The Story Continues.....Cost-Sharing: A follow up to the 2000 Study: A Case Study of Education in Kilimanjaro, Arusha, January 2003.

Mkapa, H.E. Benjamin William, Speech by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania at the National Ceremony to Inaugurate Classrooms Built Under the PEDP, Mtopwa Village, Newala District, 20 September 2002, The Guardian, September 23, 2002, Dar es Salaam.

Musonda, Lawrence, BESSIP Coordinator/Acting Director Planning & Information Directorate, Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Education, Bessip Performance Highlights 1999-2002, Powerpoint Presentation, December 16, 2002.

Ochieng, Zachar, "Kenya Education for all: a pipe dream", AFRICANEWS, May 2002.

Pfaffe, Joachim Friedrich (Team Leader), Final Report of the Mid-Term Review of the Education Strategic Investment Plan (ESIP) in Uganda, 23 January 2003.

Riddell, Abby, "Learning Needs of Ministries of Education in SWAp Environments", Paper Presented at IIEP Seminar on Recent Issues in Educational Planning, IIEP, UNESCO, Paris, 4-6 December 2002.

Rose, Pauline, "Community Participation in School Policy and Practice in Malawi: balancing local knowledge, national policies and international agency priorities", Compare, Vol. 33, No. 1, March 2003, pp. 48-64.

Standard Correspondent, "Unicef to Fund Free Primary Education", The East African Standard, January 16, 2003, Nairobi.

Sumra, Suleman, HakiElimu, "Implementing PEDP: What are Voices from the Community Telling Us?" A Reflection Paper for CARE International in Tanzania, October 2002.

Tembo, Benedict and Ndhlovu, Gershom, "Zambia Government strives to increase access to education", AFRICANEWS, May 2002.

UK Department for International Development, Draft Project Submission,

UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, Integrated Regional Information Network, 2Kenya: Feature - The challenge of providing free primary education", February 7, 2003.

Unesco Institute of Statistics, Participation Rates in Primary Education by Country and Gender 1998-2000, March 2003.

UNESCO, EFA Global Monitoring Unit, The 2002 Education for All Global Monitoring Unit Report: EFA - Is the World on Track? UNESCO, Paris, 2002.

USAID, Office of Sustainable Development, Bureau for Africa and Center for Human Capacity Development, Bureau for Global Field Programs, Field Support and Research, DHS EdData Education Profiles for Africa: Data from the Demographic and Health Surveys

World Bank, Africa Region, Kenya, Eritrea and Somalia Country Unit, Human Development Sector Unit, Kenya Education Emergency Support Project, Project Concept Document, February 6, 2003.

World Bank, Africa Regional Office, Tanzania-Primary Education Development Program, Report No. PID10068, 2001.

World Bank, Development News, "Tanzania Plans To Restore Free Primary Education", April 2, 2001.

World Bank, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management 2, Country Department for Uganda, Africa Region, The Republic of Uganda Public Expenditure' Review, Report on the Progress and Challenges of Budget Reforms, Report No.24882-UG, September 23, 2002.

World Bank, Staff Appraisal Report, Malawi Primary Education Project, Report No. 15127-MAI, Human Resources Division, Southern Africa Department, Africa Region, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., December 21, 1995.