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Abstract

This is a study of teacher support for Universal Secondary Education in Uganda. Universal Secondary Education (USE), an initiative designed to increase access and quality in secondary education, began implementation in 2007. Although ample literature suggests that educational policies require the support of teachers to be successful, the USE policy was enacted without the input of the nation’s teachers. The purpose of this study is to examine teacher support for USE, and to determine the extent to which certain characteristics are associated with teacher support for the USE policy in Uganda. Forty-one teachers currently teaching in USE schools were interviewed in the Kampala district of Uganda. The results of this study indicate that although teachers generally support the goals of the policy, they raise concerns about the way the policy has been implemented in their schools. Teachers cite low salaries, limited instructional materials, inadequate school infrastructure, and decreased morale, as factors that have contributed to their lack of support for the implementation of the policy.
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Chapter 1
Problem Statement

Introduction

The literature suggests that teachers are the gatekeepers of educational reform, as they are the ones who oversee implementation at the classroom level. Educational reforms often fail not because they lack value, but because they do not gain the support necessary from school level actors. When teachers support a new reform, they are more likely to take the steps necessary to implement the reform in their classrooms (Datnow & Castellano, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Turnbull, 2001; Silin & Schwartz, 2003). Without teacher support for a new reform and teachers appropriating new policies in ways that help to meet the goals, an innovation may fail to achieve its intended goals.

Uganda is currently implementing a new policy of Universal Secondary Education (USE). USE has two goals: to bring more students into the secondary school system and to increase the quality of secondary education. Uganda is the first country in sub-Saharan Africa to undertake a policy of universal secondary education, and the policy has attracted the attention of the international community. Although ample literature suggests that educational policies require the support of teachers to be successful, the USE policy was enacted without the input of the nation’s teachers. If the USE policy does not have the support of the nation’s teachers who affect the quality of the education the students receive, it
may not ultimately succeed in meeting its goal to increase quality in secondary schools.

The following illustration, the Diagram of USE Policy Success, shows the relationship of teacher support to the eventual success of the USE policy. One goal of the policy is to increase quality of education. In the USE context, quality of education refers to student acquisition of knowledge, listed specifically as “transmission of knowledge, skills, and other values,” and “preparing students for the job world” (Liang, 2001). Many argue that the quality of education offered at the classroom level is dependent on how the teachers teach and manage their classrooms (Brophy, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1999; Fuller, 1999; Hill, Rowan & Ball, 2005; Michaelowa, 2002; Rockoff, 2004). However, how the teachers teach will depend on how teachers appropriate the policy in their classrooms. If the teachers do not support the policy, they may be less likely to commit to their role in the policy’s implementation, thus threatening the quality of the education offered to students. In this study, ‘teacher support’ refers to how receptive teachers are to a new reform and the extent to which they are committed to carrying out their roles in the implementation of the reform. This study will investigate the ‘Teacher Support’ component shown in this diagram.
Even though teachers are essential to the success of educational reforms in Uganda, the experiences and concerns of the teachers in USE schools were not systematically addressed. The opinions of headteachers, however, are known and indicate that the policy may be negatively affecting those working in schools. A study conducted by Chapman, Burton, and Werner (2010) found that headteachers in secondary schools supported the goals of the policy, but were not satisfied with the way the policy had been implemented. Headteachers indicated they were concerned that schools lacked the resources necessary to accommodate the large wave of children who were enrolling. Additionally, they stated that a lack of training opportunities for themselves and the teachers, and school overcrowding were problems associated with the reform.

Teacher support is necessary for educational reform, yet there is little evidence that teachers in Uganda were involved in the creation of the reform. This knowledge, coupled with the findings of Chapman et al. (2010) regarding
headteachers, suggests that USE may encounter resistance from the teachers working in USE schools. If the reform has increased the complexity of the teachers’ working situations, they may be less likely to support the reform or to commit to implementing reform efforts in their classrooms.

Many characteristics influence teacher support for reform. This study investigated how selected characteristics are associated with secondary school teacher support for Universal Secondary Education in Uganda. The propositions of this study are illustrated in a diagram that shows characteristics found in the literature to teacher support for educational reform. It is currently unknown if these characteristics are relevant for teachers in USE schools in Uganda since, to date, the opinions and experiences of the USE teachers have not been addressed. The results of this study will be used to offer suggestions for educational policy officials in Uganda who seek to understand why teachers support or do not support the USE policy.

**Problem Statement**

Although teachers play an important role in the success of new educational reforms, the USE policy in Uganda was developed and initiated without the input of the nation’s teachers. If the teachers do not support the USE policy, or are not satisfied with the way the policy has been implemented in their schools, the policy may fail to gain the support of teachers. If the teachers respond negatively to the implementation of the new policy, the quality of the education offered to the students may suffer, thus putting the goal of increasing the quality
of education offered in secondary schools in jeopardy. Without the support of the teachers, the policy may fail to meet one of if its intended outcomes, which could have broad consequences for the education of secondary students in Uganda.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which certain characteristics were associated with teacher support for the USE policy in Uganda and how these characteristics influence teacher support. The Diagram of Teacher Support proposed in this study is a heuristic used to show the characteristics that are associated with teacher support. The components of the Diagram of Teacher Support will be examined to determine if teacher support for USE is related to teacher knowledge of the policy, teacher experience with other educational policies in Uganda, and the working conditions of teachers in USE schools. The following research questions are to identify which characteristics contribute to teacher support for the USE policy and how each characteristic influences teacher support.

1. To what extent do teachers support the USE policy and the implementation of the policy?

2. What characteristics distinguish teachers that support the policy from others who do not?

3. How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE?

4. How do teachers cope with the changes in their working conditions brought about by USE?


Significance of the Study

Uganda is the first country in sub-Saharan Africa to institute a policy of universal secondary education. If the policy is deemed successful, it may serve as a model for other countries that are considering implementing similar policies. At this time, the policy has been in effect for four years, giving teachers the opportunity to settle into their positions as teachers in USE schools and adapt their practice to accommodate the changes imposed by the policy. This is an interesting time to gauge teacher support for the USE policy, as it is no longer new and teachers are more familiar with the impact of the policy on their classrooms than they were when it was first introduced in 2007.

The results of this study may be useful for educational policy makers in Uganda as they consider the impact and effectiveness of the USE policy. The results of this study may provide suggestions to policy makers at the Ministry of Education and Sports in Uganda (MoES) in the event that they decide to plan interventions to increase teacher support for and implementation of the USE policy.

Additionally, this study’s significance extends beyond the context of Uganda and sub-Saharan Africa. Educational policies are enacted all over the world, and teachers are on the frontlines of policy implementation, as they are the gatekeepers of reform at the classroom level. The Diagram of Teacher Support employed in this study can be used in other situations as a way to understand why some teachers support policies and others do not by examining which
characteristics influence teacher support. By considering which characteristics influence teacher support, policy makers and others concerned with educational policy implementation, can assess the teachers’ level of support for new policies and direct their efforts accordingly.

*Context of the Study*

To understand a particular policy, it is important to consider the historical and local contexts in which a policy is situated (Levinson & Sutton, 2001). Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, and Henry (1997) state “it is not possible to understand any of the stories [about policy] in isolation…There is always a prior history of significant events, a particular ideological and political climate, a social and economic context…which shape the timing of policies as well as their evolution and outcomes” (p. 16). In the forthcoming section, the international origins and political context of the USE policy will be examined, and a graphic organizer will be presented, the Diagram of Teacher Support, based on the literature and Fullan’s theory of educational reform implementation. The Diagram of Teacher Support will be used as a framework for understanding Ugandan teachers’ reactions to USE.

*The Push for Universal Secondary Education*

Universal Secondary Education (USE) is a policy issue that is currently receiving much attention in circles of international development and education. Attention to the USE policy can be traced to the international commitment made to achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the goals of
Education for All (EFA). Although the MDGs and EFA set targets that specifically pertain to primary education, the evolution of educational systems in response to the MDG and EFA educational targets have also influenced the post-primary education sectors in many countries.

The MDGs were originally developed in 1990 and then formally adopted by 189 countries in 2000. The overarching goal of the MDGs is to eliminate extreme poverty\(^1\) by 2015 (UNDP, 2006). The MDGs are very influential in determining how countries set and plan to reach educational targets, specifically those relating to primary education enrollment and completion. Much educational target setting in the developing world, following the creation of the MDGs and the original goals of EFA, has focused on achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE). One of the goals of EFA is that by 2015 all children have access to free primary education. As of 2005, it was estimated that as much as 70 percent of the education budget in countries that signed the MDGs had been allotted for primary school (Lewin, 2005).

The educational focus has slowly shifted from primary completion to post-primary quality and enrollment in many MDG-signing countries. As more and more children enrolled in and completed primary school, as a result of initiatives supporting the MDGs and EFA, international educational targets switched from universal primary education to universal secondary education. Investment in secondary education allows for greater economic growth, while also providing a

---

\(^1\) Extreme poverty is defined as “the proportion of people whose income is less than $1 per day” (http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/poverty.shtml)
means to sustain the gains provided by UPE (Lewin, 2005). Students who have completed post-primary school are more likely to be employed in the formal wage sector, and those working in the informal sector are more productive than their peers who did not attend secondary school (Liang, 2002). Additionally, once post-primary graduates are employed, the returns to secondary education, especially lower secondary education, are high (Liang, 2002). Liang (2002) reports that following primary school, for each additional year of school a person completes his or her average wage increases by at least 20 percent. Liang explains “secondary education yields considerable private returns, and provides opportunities to acquire attitudes, skills, and competencies that enhance the ability of young people to participate fully in society” (p.1). Lewin (2005) contends that countries that do not expand access beyond primary school may be in danger of failing to meet the target set by the MDGs to eliminate poverty by 2015. As the subsequent section will explain, this economic argument is a driving force behind the introduction of USE in Uganda.

Most countries in sub-Saharan Africa, however, have yet to develop long-term plans for post-primary education. To date, only one country, South Africa, has fully implemented a system of universal secondary education. Uganda is one sub-Saharan African country that recently has begun to promote secondary education. Uganda is currently implementing a policy for USE to increase development and sustain the gains in enrollment provided by UPE, in an attempt to decrease poverty and meet the MDGs.
**USE in Uganda**

In 1990, Uganda pledged to uphold the goals of EFA, and ten years later, in 2000, Uganda was one of the 189 countries that formally pledged to adopt the MDGs. In response to the objective stated in EFA to access to primary education, Uganda launched the UPE policy in 1997. UPE was designed to increase access to primary education and expand Uganda’s educational system so that the country would be in a better position to achieve its development goals. The objective of the UPE program is to “expand access to all children of school going age (6-12 years old)” (MoES, 2006, p. 4) and “establish, provide, and maintain quality education” (Bategeka, 2005, p. 2). Following the introduction of UPE, gross enrollment jumped to 132 percent between 1997 and 2006.

As Uganda’s primary education system grew, pressure was exerted on the country’s post-primary sector, specifically secondary education, to accommodate primary school graduates. The boost in primary school enrollment created what is referred to as the “UPE bulge” (MoES, 2008a, xi). The large numbers of children and adolescents who benefited from UPE policy were not being readily absorbed into secondary education or the job market. Transition rates from primary to secondary school were less than 20 percent in 1997 (MoES, 2006), meaning 80 percent of primary school graduates did not move forward in the system and into secondary school. UPE was considered to be highly successful in raising primary school completion rates in Uganda, and the success of the UPE program is one
key characteristic that ultimately contributed to the increased interest in secondary education in Uganda.

Uganda’s commitment to secondary education began in 2006, following nine years of UPE. The roots of the USE policy are political. USE was first mentioned during the presidential campaign of President Museveni in 2006. Museveni ran on a platform of universal secondary education, and he promised free post-primary education for all students who were qualified to enter secondary school. The USE policy was extremely popular with the people of Uganda, and Museveni was subsequently re-elected. After Museveni’s re-election, the MoES was quick to respond by granting the President’s wish to focus on secondary education. In 2007, the USE policy was officially created and endorsed by the MoES. It was defined as being “the equitable provision of quality secondary education to all Ugandan students who have successfully completed the primary leaving exam” (Lewin, 2006, p. 10).

It is important to keep in mind that the original purpose of USE was political in nature. The president needed a re-election strategy and offering free secondary education was attractive to his constituents. The official stated goal of the USE policy, however, is not to help the president to get re-elected, but rather to end poverty and help Uganda achieve the MDGs by increasing access to secondary school. Officially, the goals of USE are to increase the primary to secondary school transition rate to 80 percent by the year 2015 by providing tuition-free secondary education and to “increase equitable participation in quality
secondary education” (MoES, 2008d, p. 8). By specifically focusing on secondary education, the MoES states:

“USE will benefit future economic growth, ensure more equitable access to secondary education for boys and girls, and reduce poverty. It should result in closing the gap between Uganda and other competitor countries in the proportion of the labor force with successfully completed secondary schooling” (MoES, 2008a, p.42).

Experiences with Universal Primary Education

USE is currently in its fourth year of implementation in Uganda, and it faces intense scrutiny for many reasons. One reason for critique is that the USE policy has been implemented in the aftermath of the country’s UPE policy. Uganda’s UPE policy, implemented in 1997, is considered by some to be a great success, while others consider it a failure.

In regard to issues of access, UPE is largely considered successful. In Uganda, the UPE policy increased access for many children, particularly girls and poor students who otherwise would not have been able to afford the cost of attendance (Aguti, 2002; Deininger, 2000). Undeniably, access increased as a result of UPE as more children entered the primary system than ever before.

As access increased, however, great concerns over the quality of education offered under UPE surfaced. More students were able to enroll in school, yet the schools did not necessarily have the infrastructure to meet the needs of all the students. The demand for more teachers increased significantly yet on the supply side, Uganda could not keep up. The MoES reported in 2005 that the number of teachers increased by 41 percent after the introduction of UPE; however, at the
same time, enrollment of students increased by 171 percent between 1997 and 2004 (MoES, 2005). This led to very high student-to-teacher ratios in primary schools. Nationally, the number of students per trained teacher expanded from 38:1 to 65:1 in urban areas, and from 48:1 to 70:1 in rural areas (Deininger, 2003). Uganda is considered to have some of the highest student-to-teacher ratios in the world (Deininger, 2003; Merhotra & Vandermoortele, 1997).

With so few teachers and so many students, many people were concerned about quality, including Uganda’s own MoES, which stated “the quality of teaching has probably been affected by the adverse pupil/teacher ratio after the introduction of UPE” (MoES, 1999). An insufficient number of teachers were expected to do more work, often with fewer resources. High student teacher ratios can severely affect the quality of the education the students receive, as it can affect teacher morale and student achievement (Bennell, 2004; Bidwell & Kasarada, 1975).

Additionally, even though the teaching force in Uganda did experience a small increase after 1997, many of the new primary school teachers did not have any formal training, also an indicator that quality may suffer (Darling Hammond, 1997; Hill, et. al, 2005; Rockoff, 2004). In 2001, only 75 percent of the nation’s teachers had formal training, leaving 25 percent untrained (Aguti, 2002). UPE teachers were forced to cope with large class sizes and few resources, which greatly compromised the quality of the education being offered under the UPE
policy. Confounding this situation was that many of these teachers had little or no teaching experience.

Uganda is not the only country in sub-Saharan Africa that has received criticism for its UPE policy. Many other African countries that have implemented UPE-type policies have seen similar results with regard to teacher shortages and teacher quality. In some cases, the consequences were even more severe. In Nigeria, UPE was implemented in 1976, yet the country was also unprepared for the effects caused by the quick increase in enrollment. It was predicted that Nigeria would need to double its teaching force in 1976 in order to accommodate all the new students; however, three years after implementation, there was still a great need for teachers, and those who joined the teaching force were largely unqualified (Csapo, 1983). Nigerian classrooms were overcrowded, and unqualified teachers were generally unprepared for the conditions in which they were to teach.

In Tanzania, UPE has been blamed for being “the major cause of deterioration in quality at all levels of education” (Wedgwood, 2007, p. 386). As in the case of Uganda and Nigeria, the expansion of primary education in Tanzania led to a high demand for teachers that could not be met by the current supply. To recruit new primary school teachers, candidates were drawn from populations of individuals who often had not even attended secondary school themselves (Galabawa, 2001; Wedgwood, 2007). In addition to finding qualified teachers, the schools lacked sufficient classrooms, furniture, and textbooks.
Classrooms were overcrowded, and consequently, rates of teacher absenteeism grew. In 2004, nearly 80 percent of students who sat for the primary leavers exam in Tanzania failed, indicating a serious concern over the quality of the education students were receiving (Wedgwood, 2007).

In regard to UPE in Africa, it seems that history repeated itself. The lessons learned from Nigeria in the late 1970s and early 1980s were also evident in the cases of Tanzania and Uganda in the 1990s. A lack of resources, deteriorating classroom conditions, and a shortage of qualified teachers plagued each country during the course of its UPE implementation. The lessons learned from each of these three countries indicate that quality is a concern when there is a dramatic increase in access to education.

Criticisms of the UPE policy implementation in these three countries were still fresh as Uganda initiated USE in 2007. Subsequently, the Ugandan policy was implemented initially in a select number of government schools, those charging below 50,000 USH per student (Personal communication with Annie Sybil Galiwango, February 17, 2009). A full-scale launch affecting all government schools was scheduled to occur in 2010.

**USE: Implications for Teachers**

The most recent statistics available indicate that secondary enrollment in Uganda is slowly rising. As of 2011, the Gross Enrollment Rate (GER) was 27.7 percent, an increase from 20 percent in 2006 (Personal communication with Annie Sybil Galiwango, May 15, 2011). The Net Enrollment Rate (NER) was
24.2 percent, up from only 17 percent in 2006 (Personal communication with Annie Sybil Galiwango, May 15, 2011). However, one lesson learned from UPE is that increasing access and enrollment puts an enormous strain on the educational system, especially at the school level. This can affect the quality of education the students receive. It is not sufficient for students to only be enrolled in a school; they must have a place to learn and people to teach them.

Unfortunately, USE was implemented in Uganda despite predictions that the policy would face many of the same barriers that the UPE policy encountered.

First and foremost, USE was predicted to have a strong impact on the need for recruiting new teachers. One of the main challenges predicted for USE is the increased demand for high quality teachers, despite having a nationwide teacher shortage even before the policy was implemented (Lewin, 2006). In 2006, pre-USE, Lewin estimated that there were approximately 37,000 secondary teachers in Uganda, and assuming a student to teacher ratio of 60:1², 2,000 new teachers would need to be recruited and trained in the year 2007 to support USE expansion in government schools. Lewin (2006) projected that 45,000 additional new teachers would be needed by 2010 to meet USE targets. Yet from a financial standpoint, it would be difficult to meet this goal, since it would require a tripling of a salary bill, which had yet to be budgeted in 2006. From a practical standpoint, it would be difficult to find teachers to join a profession that was already understaffed, while also finding the means by which to train them and to attend to their professional development needs.

² 60 students per class is the recommended minimum class size for USE schools (MoES, 2008b).
As predicted, teacher shortages have been a problem for USE. In 2008, the MoES published a report detailing the challenges the USE policy would face in the future. The report includes information provided by all districts around the country that have USE schools. Not surprisingly, lack of teachers is mentioned throughout the document as being a continued challenge for the policy (MoES, 2008d).

Another consequence of UPE that was predicted to be a concern greatly affecting teachers in USE schools was that schools and communities lacked the infrastructure and materials to support the influx of new learners. Following UPE, teachers faced overcrowded classrooms and limited resources. This was also a great concern for USE as well, especially since the working conditions were considered to be subpar and inadequate even before the policy’s implementation.

The MoES reported that following an inspection in 2002, “it was generally found that in the vast majority of secondary schools, essential facilities including libraries, laboratories [etc.] are inadequate and substandard” (MoES 2008a, p.9). When discussing the future of the policy, Lewin (2002) emphasized that many new classrooms would have to be constructed to absorb the new students, since schools were already at or near capacity even before the introduction of the policy.

As of 2008, infrastructure and school conditions were still a concern for USE. “Lack of classrooms, laboratories, scholastic materials…latrines and water sources” were reported as continuing problems in USE schools (MoES, 2008d).
Until the infrastructure of the educational system can catch up to the new demand placed on schools by the increase in enrollment, teachers will likely find the working conditions at USE schools to be extremely challenging.

**Conclusion**

In summary, the purpose of this study is to investigate the extent that certain characteristics are associated with teacher support for the USE policy in Uganda and how these characteristics influence teacher support. This study will address the following questions:

1. To what extent do teachers support the USE policy and the implementation of the policy?
2. What characteristics distinguish teachers that support the policy from others who do not?
3. How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE?
4. How do teachers cope with the changes in their working conditions brought about by USE?

Chapter II presents a conceptual framework that examines how working conditions and other characteristics affect teachers, and ultimately affect teacher support for new educational reforms.
Chapter 2

Teacher Support: Conceptual Framework and Literature Review

Each year, many new educational policies are conceived and implemented around the globe. The literature suggests that many policies fail, not because they are irrelevant, but because they do not gain support from key actors during the implementation phase. This chapter will examine pertinent literature pertaining to teacher support in the Ugandan context, when applicable, and will also draw on the broader international literature surrounding issues of teacher support and educational policy implementation. A conceptual framework for studying teachers’ roles in educational reform is presented, followed by a review of supporting literature that helps to explain the characteristics that may influence teacher support for new educational policies.

Conceptual Framework

Fullan (2001) provides a useful theory for understanding the process of educational reform and the role of teachers. Fullan explains the process of innovation and why educational reforms often fail without teacher support. According to Fullan, there are three stages of educational reform: initiation, implementation, and institutionalization. Educational reforms often fail during the implementation phase because they do not receive support from those who play a central role in implementing the reform at the school level. When reforms do not receive teacher support, the teachers may not commit to their roles in implementing the policy.
The classroom teachers, as those working on the ‘front lines’ of implementation in the schools, play an important role in determining how successful a reform will be. Teachers fall into the group characterized by Lipsky (1983) as ‘street level bureaucrats.’ Street level bureaucrats are workers who interact directly with citizens in their line of work and have considerable impact on the lives of the people, as they are the ones who oversee the treatment being provided or the service people receive in the sponsored program. In this case, the reform is targeted to students, but must be carried out by the classroom teachers, since the teachers are the ones interacting with the students on a daily basis. For this reason, Fullan states, “educational change depends on what teachers do and think—it is as simple and as complex as that” (p.115). Teachers must ensure that students are learning, despite the changes that have occurred as a result of the policy, and teachers who do not support the policy may be less likely to respond positively to a policy’s implementation. Therefore, without teachers’ support for new policies, the reform may ultimately fail (Fullan, 2001; Silin & Schwartz, 2003).

Fullan (2001) argues that teacher support is best achieved in situations when:

1. The teachers understand the nature and goals of the reform and are committed to the change process.

2. The conditions of teachers’ work are “conducive to continuous development and prideful accomplishment” (Fullan, 2002, p.13).
These two components, as outlined by Fullan (2001), are the basis for the following diagram, which was created as a heuristic to examine the roots of teacher support.

**Figure 2**  
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Both of Fullan’s conditions that can lead to teacher support will be examined further and explained in greater detail in this paper. The two basic assumptions made by Fullan, which have been elaborated upon in this diagram, may provide a useful framework for examining the characteristics that contribute to teachers’ support for the USE policy.

**Teacher Support**

What is meant by the term ‘teacher support’? There is no universal definition as to what is meant by the term ‘teacher support,’ although it is a term widely used in education literature. Education researchers Silin and Schwartz (2003) explain that teacher support, or buy-in, is “the complex problem of mutual assimilation and accommodation through which teachers bring about change in today’s schools” (p. 1587). Teacher support is also thought of as being how receptive teachers are to the reform and to what extent teachers are willing to carry it out in its implementation (Fullan, 1992; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1996). Based on these definitions, support depends on whether or not teachers understand the reform itself and if they are willing to commit to their role in its implementation.

Throughout this study, the term ‘support’ will be used to describe a teacher’s level of understanding and commitment to educational reform. The definitions above, along with other pertinent literature, determine that the terms ‘support,’ ‘commitment,’ and ‘buy-in’ can be used interchangeably when
discussing the topic of teachers and educational reform. As these terms are used interchangeably in previously published literature, ‘buy-in,’ ‘commitment,’ and ‘support’ represent the same thing in this study. Each term refers to the degree to which teachers understand a reform both intellectually and emotionally, and the extent to which they are willing and able to undertake its implementation in their classrooms.

**Policy vs. Implementation**

In the Diagram of Teacher Support, support is broken into two separate categories: teacher support for the policy itself and teacher support for its implementation. The two are distinct based on the results of a study conducted by Chapman et al. (2010). Chapman et al. conducted a study with 256 head teachers and deputy head teachers in Ugandan secondary schools that assessed their opinions regarding the USE policy. The researchers found that many school administrators held opinions of the reform itself that were separate from their opinions regarding the implementation of the reform. Although 88 percent of administrators interviewed for this study said that they thought the USE policy was a good policy, 93 percent stated that they felt the policy was unsuccessful or somewhat successful in its implementation. Although head teachers expressed support for the policy, they did not necessarily express support for its implementation.

These results suggest that school level actors may perceive policy and policy implementation differently. On the one hand, they may like the policy and
support its goals; while on the other hand, they may be dissatisfied with how its implementation has been carried out. Other variations may exist as well. For example, there may be a situation where school level actors do not like the policy, but believe it has been well implemented, or are equally happy with the policy and its implementation. This distinction is an important part of understanding the teachers’ reactions to USE. If support from the teachers’ perspective is evident for the policy itself, but not for the implementation, the MoES can target strategies to help teachers cope with implementation. However, if teachers do not support the goals of the policy itself and they do not understand or support what the policy is trying to do, the MoES can consider strategies for helping the teachers to understand the goals of the policy and the reasons why the policy is necessary for advancing Ugandan education. As Fullan (2001) asserts, the teachers will be more likely to support the policy and subsequently carry out their roles in the classroom level policy implementation if they support the policy itself and if they believe the policy has been well implemented in their schools in such a way that their conditions of work are conducive to accomplishment and development.

When considering whether or not teachers understand the nature and goals of educational reforms, it may be relevant to consider personal characteristics of the teachers, such as how long they have taught and what their previous experiences are with educational policies and reforms (Huberman, 1989; Datnow, 1998). Additionally, according to Turnbull (2001), teachers’ understanding of
reform may be influenced by the extent to which they believe the administrators at their school support the reform.

Fullan (2001) also argues that teacher working conditions are influential in determining teacher support. Changes in conditions of employment and working conditions for teachers may negatively impact the work-life complexity of teachers, which can, in turn, lead teachers to be unsupportive of an innovation, and resist their role in a reform (Chapman, 2009b). Teacher working conditions can be understood as being several things. Teacher workload is an important determinant of the conditions of their work, such as how many classes they teach per week and the student to teacher ratio in their classes (Mulkeen, Chapman & DeJaeghere, 2005). Other working conditions can refer to the physical structures of the school and classrooms in which the teachers work. These conditions also account for whether or not teachers have the materials and resources necessary to feel like they can do their jobs well (Glass, 1982; Hansen & Corcoran, 1989; Firestone & Pennell, 1993). Thirdly, continued support and training also influence the conditions of the teachers work (Fullan, 2001; Kemmerer, 1993; Chapman & Miric, 2005). If the working conditions of teachers have deteriorated since the introduction of USE in their schools, teachers may be less likely to support the policy.

*Working Conditions*

Teacher support for reform is contingent on both teachers’ understanding the nature of the reform and its goals, and also whether or not teachers perceive
that their conditions of work are “conducive to continuous development and prideful accomplishment” (Fullan, 2002, p.13). The research explains that there is a relationship between workplace conditions and teacher attitudes, explained as teachers’ morale, and level of job satisfaction (Firestone & Pennell, 1993; Pennell, 2004; Weiss, 1999). This study posits that working conditions indirectly influence teacher support for new reforms by affecting teacher attitudes.

The terms teacher ‘morale’ and ‘job satisfaction’ are each different ways of describing teacher attitudes. In general, teacher attitudes are described by Evans (1997) as “a state of mind determined by the extent to which the individual perceives his/her job related needs are being met” (p. 883). If a teacher does not feel that his or her needs are ultimately being met or that they are threatened by a new reform, he or she will be less likely to support the reform and commit to his or her role in the classroom level implementation of the reform.

Conditions of work can also refer to both monetary and non-monetary incentives. Monetary incentives can be defined as the package of salary, allowance, and fringe benefits offered to teachers (Chapman, Synder, & Burchfield 1993; Kemmerer, 1990). This study will refer to these attributes as remuneration. Conditions of work that serve as non-monetary incentives for teachers include the physical resources available at the school, instructional resources available to the teachers, support and feedback teachers receive from the administration at their school and their peers, and opportunities for professional development that teachers are offered (Firestone & Pennell, 1993;
Kemmerer, 1990). The following section explains the various aspects of the conditions of work.

Monetary incentives

Remuneration.

Not surprisingly, there is a relationship between compensation and teacher attitudes (World Bank, 1995). Weiss (1999) found that there is a correlation between teacher perceptions of salary and their levels of morale and job satisfaction. When teachers believe they are being fairly compensated for their work, their morale and level of commitment to their jobs is higher. Conversely, when teachers believe they are not receiving a fair amount of compensation, their commitment to reform and level of morale is lower (Weiss, 1999). Additionally, remuneration is so important that in developing countries poor compensation is often cited as the primary reason for people not becoming teachers or for leaving the teaching profession (Lortie, 1975; Kemmerer, 1993; Mulkeen et al., 2005; Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984).

There is an interesting nuance surrounding issues of teacher compensation. Fair compensation is dependent on the teachers’ own perceptions. Chapman and Miric (2006) found that in many countries in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) regions, teachers regarded their salaries as being low, yet as a proportion of GDP, teachers’ salaries in the region were actually relatively high. The teachers in the MENA study are not alone. In a study of 57 teachers in the six African countries of Ghana, Ethiopia, Tanzania, Guinea, Madagascar, and Uganda,
DeJaeghere, Chapman and Mulkeen (2006) found that nearly all of the interview respondents did not feel their salaries were fair. In fact, many teachers stated that their current salaries should be doubled. The authors noted, however, that the reported salaries of the teachers actually suggest they are paid better than many other workers in the country. In every instance, even beginning teachers make at least twice the gross national income per capita. The results of these studies indicate that salary satisfaction depends on the teachers’ perceptions; if they feel they deserve more pay, they will feel under-compensated whether or not this is actually the reality in their home country.

In Uganda, compared to the GDP per capita, secondary teachers are considered to be fairly well paid (Liang, 2002). In 2001, the average salary of a Ugandan secondary school teacher was USH 2.86 million (US $1,787) (Liang, 2002, p. xii). Additionally, according to several scholars and the MoES itself, teachers in Uganda are overpaid and underworked (Liang, 2002, Lewin, 2006, MoES 2008d). In 2001, the average teaching load for a secondary school teacher was 22.5 periods per week, which was less than half of the 50 periods provided to students (Liang, 2002, xiii). Although teachers in Uganda may be considered fairly well compensated for the work they do, as the aforementioned studies of Chapman and Miric (2006) and DeJaeghere et al. (2006) suggest, teacher perceptions of salary are the only perceptions that matter. Teacher attitudes are influenced by whether or not they perceive they are being fairly compensated for the work they do. If they believe they are being overworked or underpaid (or
both), their morale will suffer and the teachers’ support for reform may diminish. Therefore, teachers’ perceptions of compensation may influence their support for a new reform, since support can be affected by teacher morale.

Non-monetary incentives

Non-monetary conditions of work that foster teacher commitment to reform depend heavily on the physical resources available at the school, instructional resources, teacher workload, support teachers receive from administration, and opportunities teachers have for ongoing professional development (Kemmerer, 1990; Firestone & Pennell, 1993; Mulkeen, Chapman & DeJaeghere, 2005; Rosenholtz, 1989). Poor working conditions have a large influence on teacher attitudes, as non-monetary working conditions are listed second to poor remuneration as the reason why teachers leave the profession (Kemmerer, 1993; Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz & Smylie, 1984;).

Physical resources.

In the Diagram of Teacher Support, the physical resources of a school are non-monetary incentives that contribute to the working conditions of teachers. Working conditions can affect teacher attitudes and teacher support for reform. The physical conditions at the schools where teachers work are important, as they can have a psychological effect on those who work there. If the physical working conditions are poor, teachers may not feel they can do their jobs adequately or effectively, thus causing resistance to reform (Hansen & Corcoran, 1989). Teaching in an undesirable facility may cause teachers to feel demoralized, and
symbolically, these facilities may suggest to the teachers that their work is not valued by others, leading to feelings of low morale (Firestone and Pennell, 1993). Physical conditions may refer to “reasonable facilities that are well-maintained and provide enough space” (Firestone & Pennell, 1993). In the context of developing countries, this includes the presence of libraries, computer labs, and restrooms for both women and men (MacDonald, 1999).

According to Firestone and Pennell, “teachers become distracted when there are leaks in the ceiling, doors that will not lock, poor heating, insufficient or poorly maintained desks, and other problems” (p. 509). The presence of restroom facilities for female students and teachers also can be an issue that affects student and teacher retention (Sankhulani, 2007). It is important that schools have physical structures that support teachers’ work and cause them to feel valued. Physical structures support teachers work and contribute to teachers’ morale, and morale may affect whether or not teachers support a new educational reform.

*Instructional resources.*

The Diagram of Teacher Support shows the connection between instructional resources and teacher support. Instructional resources are non-monetary incentives that affect teacher working conditions. Teachers respond more positively to reform when adequate supplies are available to support them in the implementation of the reform (Hansen & Corcoran, 1989; Firestone & Pennell, 1993). Instructional resources include textbooks, blackboards, computers, or other materials needed to teach a particular subject. For example, a science
teacher may require materials for a science lab or microscopes in order to feel they can adequately teach their lessons. A language arts teacher will need books that the students can use to practice reading comprehension strategies. The presence of supplies helps teachers facilitate their work and can also benefit student achievement. It also reduces the time teachers have to spend outside of their contact teaching hours figuring out how to get the supplies they need, or planning lessons differently to accommodate the lack of resources.

If teachers have the tools they need to teach, they will feel more confident in their abilities and will be more likely to accept a reform that requires them to adjust their teaching styles and behaviors. Without supplies, teachers may feel more stress or frustration associated with their jobs, thus leading to a lack of overall job satisfaction. Lack of supplies and teaching resources was cited by Coates and Thorson (1976), Kyriacow and Sutcliffe (1978), and Landsmann (1977) as a major reason why teachers indicated they found their jobs stressful. In turn, teachers reported decreased levels of job satisfaction. According to the Diagram of Teacher Support, decreased job satisfaction can influence teacher support for a reform. Therefore, it is important that teachers in USE schools feel they have enough instructional resources to carry out their duties.

Teacher workload.

In the Diagram of Teacher Support, teacher workload is another non-monetary incentive influencing working conditions. Teacher workload refers to class size, the number of courses taught, and the number of different classes
teachers have to prepare for (teachers refer to these as ‘preps’). Teacher workloads, however, much like salary, depend on the teachers’ perceptions. If teachers perceive their workload to be too large or unreasonable, their morale or motivation may be affected. It is important that teachers feel their workloads are reasonable. Reasonable workloads enhance teachers’ ability to prepare and adequately monitor student performance (Firestone & Pennell, 1993; Ingvarson, Barwick, Kleinhenz, Carthy, Beavis & Wilkinson, 2005; Johnson, 1990; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2001).

Class size is a component of a teacher’s workload that affects teacher morale (Glass, 1982; Smith & Bourke, 1992). When teaching smaller classes, teachers are able to provide more learning opportunities to meet the needs of individual students (Johnson, 1990; Molnar, Smith, Zahorik, Palmer, Halbach & Ehrle, 1999). Smaller classes also allow teachers to manage their classrooms and utilize more student-centered learning than in larger classes (Johnson, 1990). These strategies allow teachers to feel more effective and successful (Molnar et al. 1999). Smith & Bourke (1992) found that teachers who taught larger classes or more class periods were more likely to exhibit feelings of stress and had lower job satisfaction than teachers who perceived their workloads to be smaller or more manageable. Opinions on ideal class size vary greatly depending on the country and the context. According to Lewit and Baker (1997), an ideal small student to teacher ratio in the United States is 18:1, whereas a medium sized class is 22-25 students per teacher. In Uganda, the MoES recommends that the class
size/student to teacher ratio be 60:1 (MoES, 2008b). As the teachers are the ones whose perception of workload matter, depending on the context, a teacher may feel his or her workload is manageable or reasonable, even with a student to teacher ratio that is considered large by some standards.

A common practice influencing teacher workloads in developing countries is to have teachers work ‘double shifts.’ Double shifting is when some students attend school in the morning and others in the afternoon. Consequently, teachers who double shift teach more lessons. Although double shifting is often seen as a measure to increase the efficiency of teachers, it is a dangerous practice that has been proven to negatively affect both teacher morale and student achievement (Michaelowa, 2002). Michaelowa (2002) found in sub-Saharan Africa that double shift classrooms can lead to teacher absences and also have a direct impact on student achievement. The study determined that the negative effect of double shift classes is so strong that it can predict student achievement and teacher job satisfaction in class sizes of up to 100 students.

The teachers’ workload and class size of a teacher greatly influences his or her daily work life, which can influence teacher attitudes. Smaller class sizes and the absence of double shifting allow teachers to feel more effective and successful, which will increase teacher morale.

Based on the information provided by Ugandan headteachers, teacher workload may be an especially important characteristic determining teacher support for USE in Uganda. According to the study conducted by Chapman et al.
(2010), headteachers interviewed in 2008 expressed concern over the student-teacher ratios in their schools. Many headteachers indicated that they were concerned that the student-teacher ratios were too high, and there were not enough teachers to meet the needs of all the students in the schools. If teachers are also concerned, and believe their workloads are unreasonable, it may affect whether or not they support the policy. Additionally, if teachers cite heavy workloads as a concern, it would be important to determine what size workload teachers consider to be more reasonable. It is also possible that teachers would feel they could carry out their duties with larger workloads if the availability of physical and instructional resources increased. Understanding these nuances behind teacher opinions on workload may provide valuable information for the MoES if they seek to increase teacher support by addressing workload concerns.

Deployment.

In the Diagram of Teacher Support, deployment practices are listed as non-monetary incentives that influence teacher working conditions. They can also influence teacher attitudes, which could subsequently affect teacher receptivity to new reform. Deployment practices are also relevant in the African context when considering teacher attitudes and incentives. In Uganda, the issue of teacher deployment is important to consider because deployment can affect teacher morale. Deployment refers to the practice of distributing teachers to various positions across the country. Uganda, like many African countries, has an unequal
distribution of teachers, with many in certain areas and few in others. Generally, there are more teachers concentrated in urban settings and fewer teachers in rural areas and other locations that may not be considered attractive (Lewin, 2000; Mulkeen et al. 2005).

In Uganda, teacher deployment practices are generally intended to ensure there are enough teachers in schools. Ideally, deployment practices are enabled so that enough teachers are working at the school based on student enrollment and that the teachers are working in their area(s) of expertise (Chapman, 2009; Peil, 1995). In reality, however, teachers may be deployed to a certain setting based on administrative rather than professional considerations (Chapman, 2009; Rust & Dalin, 1990). Just because a teacher is qualified to teach a certain subject does not necessarily mean he or she will be deployed to a school to teach that subject.

In some countries, teachers choose where they want to work and some schools can advertise and recruit their own teachers. For example, in Lesotho and Swaziland, teachers can apply directly to the schools for employment (Mulkeen et al. 2005). In Uganda, however, teachers are deployed to their posts by the central government. Deployment practices may result in some teachers being forced to work in undesirable settings. According to Chapman, “teachers often have strong preferences about where they teach and often these preferences do not coincide with where they are deployed” (2009, p. 13). A setting may be deemed undesirable for different reasons: it is far away from the teacher’s family, the teacher is unable to speak the local language, accommodations may be poor,
healthcare is scarce, the teachers feel less safe, professional development opportunities occur less frequently, and workloads may be greater (Kirungi, 2000; Mulkeen et al. 2005). Some countries have incentive systems in place that help to offset issues of deployment. In these cases, incentives may be offered in the form of an allowance for teachers who work in rural or unpopular areas. Allowances may be offered in the form of subsidized housing, compensation for food, a travel stipend, or a hardship allowance (Kemmerer, 1990; Mulkeen et al., 2005).

An additional problem in Uganda is that in the north there is an on-going civil war. Teachers who are deployed to districts that are in war zones may feel especially unsafe and isolated. They also may be more hesitant to move their families to these areas. If deployment practices are viewed by the teachers as being unfavorable, their job satisfaction and morale may decrease, thus affecting their receptivity to embracing new reforms (Bennell, 2004). It is important to determine if deployment affects teacher support for USE in Uganda. If it does, and if teachers are concerned about how and where they will be deployed as a result of this policy, measures can be taken to determine what deployment procedures would be more acceptable to teachers working in USE schools.

**Professional development opportunities for teachers.**

Teacher professional development activities are non-monetary incentives that influence teacher working conditions in the Diagram of Teacher Support. There are two facets that make up teacher professional development opportunities: support and supervision from administration and peers, and in-
service learning opportunities. When faced with a new reform or innovation, teachers must feel that they have the skills necessary to implement the reform. Bandura’s (1977) efficacy theory helps to explain this concept. Efficacy theory explains that people who feel both confident and effective, or efficacious, are more likely to perform well when they are faced with a new challenge (Bandura, 1977; 1986). Additionally, efficacy may influence whether people choose to engage in a given activity. Since implementation of USE may provide a challenge for teachers, it is important that they believe they have the skills necessary to meet the challenge. If teachers believe they have the skills necessary to perform their duties in a reform’s implementation, they will be more likely to be motivated to commit to their role in the reform’s implementation.

Efficacy theory can explain why Fullan (2001) argues that professional development opportunities are a requirement for engaging teachers in reform implementation. He states, “in-service and professional development in support of specific innovations is usually found to be a critical characteristic for success” (p. 23). Teacher development also has a direct link to teacher morale. Baylor and Ritchie (2002) conducted a study of 94 classrooms in four states in the U.S. and determined that the availability of professional development opportunities could, indeed, predict higher levels of teacher morale.

Learning opportunities provided in the form of professional development activities can contribute to teachers’ commitment to reform by expanding their knowledge (Craig, Kraft, & Pleiss, 1998; Firestone & Pennell, 1993; Lockheed &
Vespoor, 1991). Rosenholtz (1989) found that professional development opportunities were a variable that could directly predict teacher commitment. Professional development activities give teachers the capacity needed to manage the changes effectively. These activities, provided by the school or government, also send a message to the teachers that they are valued and that they will be supported through the change. Professional development opportunities can include, but are not limited to, support and supervision from administrators, in-service training, and peer groups (Mulkeen et al., 2005).

Support and Supervision from Administration and Peers: Support and supervision from administration and peers is one facet of teacher professional development opportunities that can affect the overall working conditions of teachers in USE schools. Teachers require supportive supervision during reform implementation (Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Kemmerer, 1993). Teachers need regular and on-going feedback about their performance from school level administrators and their peers (Chapman & Miric, 2005; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Kemmerer, 1993). Firestone and Pennell (1993) state that “feedback can enhance commitment to teaching […] by providing information that confirms successful efforts and signals problem areas needing change” (p. 503). In a situation where a new reform has been introduced, teachers need to know they are supported before, during, and after the implementation of the reform, both by the administration at their school and by their peers in the profession.
The effects of support and supervision are twofold. Support and supervision positively predict teacher support for new reforms, as well as teacher morale. A study conducted by Turnbull (2002) found that in the United States, school level administrative support for teachers could positively predict teacher support for new reforms. Additionally, Weiss (1999) explored the relationship between administrative support and teacher morale in the U.S. context. Weiss found teacher morale to be highest, and teachers most likely to be committed to reform, when teachers perceived that their principals communicated their expectations clearly, supported the teachers, provided instructional materials or management guidance and necessary materials, and evaluated the teachers’ performance fairly. Weiss examined how a variety of characteristics could predict teacher morale, and found administrative support to be the strongest of any variable considered.

Administrators should be highly visible and accessible to teachers (Brodinsky, 1984; Craig et al., 1998; Weiss, 1999). Supportive supervision can come in the form of regular visits by a supervisor, either a mentor teacher or a school principal, or a dialogue started during a staff meeting. Merely observing the teachers, however, is not as effective as when administrators or supervisors provide helpful suggestions for teachers and assistance to teachers in facilitating the teaching and learning process. Staff meetings provide an opportunity for teachers and principals to discuss ideas and concerns related to the teachers’
work. They also provide a venue for teachers to meet with other teachers to share ideas and discuss the challenges and successes of their work.

In addition to teacher-administrator interactions, teacher-teacher interactions can also be an important source of support for teachers. When teachers have the opportunity to interact with, and feel supported by other teachers, their morale, and subsequently level of job satisfaction, increases (Craig, et al., 1998; Rodgers-Jenkinson & Chapman, 1990). DeJaeghere, Chapman, and Mulkeen (2006) assessed the extent to which teachers, headteachers, and educational officials supported eight policy options in six African countries. They found that nearly 93 percent of teachers indicated that they supported the idea of increasing opportunities for interaction with their peers as a policy option to retain them when faced with teacher shortages. Peer-peer interactions, including mentoring programs, professional learning communities, and frequent staff meetings, allow teachers to receive feedback and support from their peers, which, in turn, can affect teacher efficacy and teacher morale.

Some sub-Saharan African countries, including Namibia, Guinea, Ethiopia and Uganda, have adopted methods of ‘clustering’ that provide professional development supervision and training for teachers. These ‘clusters’ provide opportunities for teachers to meet and share best practice ideas as well as receive training (Mulkeen & Higgins, 2009).

In 1993, the Teacher Development and Management System in Uganda implemented a program where primary schools across the country were grouped
into clusters. Each cluster was assigned to a coordinating center and school level teachers and administrators reported to the coordinating center periodically to receive training and to interact and share ideas with their peers. New teachers also were able to receive training at the clusters to meet certification requirements. By 1997, 50,000 teachers and 3,000 headteachers in Uganda were involved in various trainings provided by the program (Engles, 2001). The cluster-based approach was seen as being particularly helpful connecting teachers in Uganda who worked in rural areas where they had limited interaction with their peers (Engles, 2001; Mulkeen & Higgins, 2009).

**In-Service Opportunities:** In-service opportunities are another aspect of teacher professional development opportunities. In the Diagram of Teacher Support, teacher development opportunities are one aspect of working conditions. In-service training can help teachers negotiate a new innovation (Fullan, 2001; Kemmerer, 1993). Trainings are most effective for helping teachers cope with change when these trainings are perceived by the teachers to be relevant and practical (Ha, Lee, Chan & Sun, 2004). In-service training opportunities can have a direct link to teacher support for new reforms. Ha, Lee, Chan, and Sum (2004) found that teachers in Hong Kong were more willing and enthusiastic to implement a new reform in their classrooms after receiving a 15-hour in-service training that explained the goals of the new reform and outlined the steps in which the teachers could take to integrate the reform in their classes. The Hong Kong
teachers in this study had fewer concerns about the reform, its rationale, and what their role was in implementation than other teachers who had not participated in the in-service training.

In-service teacher training also is connected to increased teacher morale. After interviewing 31 teachers who participated in an in-service education program in London, England, Hartley, McFarlane, Gantley & Murray (1999) concluded that in-service teacher training opportunities boosted morale among participants. The authors explained that in-service training, in addition to providing curricular information valued by the teachers, provided a time when they could network with peers and share problems and experiences.

In-service training is also important in the African context, although it may not be as prevalent as it is in other regions of the world. During an evaluation of a cluster school program in Ethiopia that provided pre-service and in-service opportunities for primary school teachers, evaluators found that all of the teachers interviewed claimed that the cluster program had improved their overall attitude toward their job while also providing them with the skills they needed to be more effective teachers. Additionally, the principals interviewed reported that the cluster program had improved the teachers’ morale at all of their schools (Brehance, A., Taddesse, S., Woldaregay, J.W., 2007).

One example of a successful teacher in-service training that took place in Uganda is the School Improvement Program (SIP) launched by the Aga Khan Foundation in 1994. Aga Khan implemented the SIP in Kampala by creating a
centralized teacher resource center in Kampala, where teachers in UPE schools could gather for in-service training opportunities. The project serviced 377 teachers in Kampala who taught in 15 different schools. An evaluation of the program conducted in 1997 found that teachers who participated in the program said that participating had increased their morale, and also their pedagogical skills (Siraj-Blathford, I., Ogada, M., & Omagor, M., 1997). Indeed, in-service opportunities in all parts of the world are an important part of professional development opportunities for teachers because they can lead to an increase in morale, which can affect a teacher’s receptivity to a new reform.

This section provided an overview of the literature pertaining to teacher working conditions. Teacher working conditions are one part of the Diagram of Teacher Support that shows characteristics that contribute to teacher support for new educational innovations. Working conditions include monetary incentives such as salary and remuneration. Non-monetary incentives such as physical resources, instructional resources, workload, and deployment are also characteristics that influence teacher working conditions. It is unknown at this time if working conditions influence teacher support for USE and if so, which ones. It is possible that some working conditions are more relevant for increasing teacher support than others, yet it is unknown which conditions are most valued by the teachers in the USE context. It is important to examine which working conditions are reportedly most affecting the teachers’ attitudes and support for the
USE policy. The other part of the diagram, teacher understanding of the reform, will now be discussed and explained in the context of USE in Uganda.

*Teachers’ Understanding of the Reform*

In the Diagram of Teacher Support, there are two main characteristics that increase the likelihood that teachers will support a new educational reform. The first characteristic is teacher working conditions, which has been explained above. The second characteristic is teachers’ understanding of reform. As Fullan (2001) explains, teachers are more likely to support educational reforms when they understand the nature of the reform and feel committed to its goals. For teachers to understand the reform, they must be aware of the goals of the reform, and understand what the reform aims to do and how it aims to do it. They should also be aware of what their role is in the reform.

Fullan (1992) also suggests that when teachers believe the reform is a “practical” way to address a situation, they will be more likely to support it. Fullan explains that practical reforms are viewed by the teachers as being those which address salient student and teacher needs. For teachers to believe a reform is practical, they should believe the reform is necessary, the goals are important, and the implementation is realistic.

A teachers’ prior experience in education may affect how teachers view the reform, especially how practical and realistic they believe the reform is. Teachers who have been teaching longer and have experienced more innovations mandated by school-level and country-level administrators, may be more
skeptical (Hargreaves, 1996; Sikes, 1992). Hargreaves (1996) explains that teachers who are in their mid-to-late careers may become “disenchanted with change because of their experience of past change efforts to which they committed themselves, then saw the resources withdrawn, the focus shift elsewhere, or the innovators desert them for other challenges” (p. 17). Sikes (1992) addresses similar concerns for experienced teachers. Sikes talks about “experienced” teachers as being in their late 30s and early 40s. Sikes explains that more experienced teachers may be less likely to support a new reform because “when changes are introduced older teachers who have a longer term perspective often claim to have ‘seen it all before’. They point to the way educational fashions come and go” (p. 45). Teachers in Uganda with more experience may be less likely to support a new reform because their past experience with reform in education may have made them more skeptical. Additionally, teachers with less experience may be more open, since they may have dealt with less systematic change in their careers. Alternatively, newer teachers may not know how to respond to or cope with the demands presented in a new reform.

In addition to length of teaching experience, teachers’ previous encounters with and perceptions of UPE may also influence their attitude toward USE. UPE was a large-scale reform that affected schools throughout Uganda and received criticism for increasing access without maintaining or improving quality. The goals of USE are similar to those of UPE but in a secondary school context. If teachers have previous experience in education and feel their work has been
affected by the UPE policy positively or negatively, they may hold similar opinions of the USE policy. Also, there is a chance that even those without teaching experience, but who hold opinions on the UPE policy, will feel similarly about USE, since the policies are so similar.

As is the case of USE in Uganda, often reforms or new policies are presented to teachers even though teachers have played no role in the process of choosing a reform. In schools, changes are often mandated at the national level in Uganda, and the teachers are not always consulted before the reform begins school wide implementation. This presents a quandary since the success of the reform depends heavily on teacher support for reform implementation. If teachers do not think the reform is necessary or that the goals of the reform are not accurate or realistic, they will be less likely to support the reform and aid in its implementation.

Conclusion

Teachers play an important role in educational reform. Teachers are considered by policy makers and school change experts to be at the center of educational change (Datnow & Castellano, 2000; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2002; Silin & Schwartz, 2003; Turnbull, 2001). Teachers’ support for educational reform may ultimately lead to a reform’s success or failure by influencing how teachers appropriate the reform in their classrooms. To anticipate the extent to which teachers will support a new policy, it is important to determine which characteristics account for teachers support. This study will examine the
components of the Diagram of Teacher Support in order to identify characteristics associated with teacher support for Uganda’s USE policy.
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Methodology

Qualitative research methods were used for this study to provide a detailed understanding of how the implementation of the USE policy affects teachers’ working conditions and their support for USE. Qualitative research methods are used to develop a complex picture of a problem or an issue being studied (Creswell, 2009). Whereas quantitative research methods allow one to test theories by finding the relationship among variables, qualitative research helps to explain why people respond the way they do, the context in which they respond, and which deeper thoughts and behaviors influenced their responses (Creswell, 2007). This study sought to understand the nuances of teacher support and to discover how and why certain characteristics influence teacher support differently. Therefore, it was important to situate teachers’ responses in the context in which they exist.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with teachers in Kampala. Interviews allowed for a study of selected issues in detail and depth and allowed the researcher to “understand the world as seen by the respondents” (Patton, 1990, p.13). Interviews were the primary source of data collection for this study. The use of interviews gave the participants the opportunity to elaborate on their beliefs and experiences in ways that a quantitative survey would not. Interview data also provided salient quotes and stories where teachers described their experiences with the USE policy, and reasons why they did or did not
support it. The quotations from the teachers helped to place their responses into context. Field notes were also utilized to elaborate on the context of the schools and the teachers’ working situations in Kampala.

Sample

Selection of Participants

The sample was purposeful. Participants were nominated by the headteachers in the schools. The sample consisted of forty-one teachers who worked in USE schools in the district of Kampala. Kampala was the first district in which the USE policy was implemented. In other areas of the country, USE is still being slowly implemented, and it was important that data be collected from schools that have experience with the policy for a longer period of time. Because USE has been in effect for longer in the Kampala region, the teachers could speak to the changes they had encountered since the initiation of the policy in their school. However, because the teachers interviewed were all working in the capitol, issues surrounding deployment were likely different from their peers who teach in rural areas.

Teachers selected were English speakers currently working in seven of the eight USE schools in Kampala: Kololo, Kololo High, Saint Dennis Gaba, Natete Muslim, Mackay Memorial, Luzira, and Kitebi. The data gathered in the first seven schools indicated that the feelings of teachers were similar regardless of where they taught. Therefore, it was decided that it was unnecessary to interview teachers at the eighth school. Schools varied in size and had approximately 800-
2,000 students. There were between 30 and 50 teachers in each school. Interviews were conducted with between five and seven teachers at each school. Teachers were invited to participate in the interview if they had been teaching in the school for at least four years (this includes one year prior to USE implementation).

Participants taught a variety of subjects: language arts (60%), math (27%), history or geography (6%), Christian religious education (5%), economics (1%), and fine arts (1%). Fifty-one percent of the respondents were female, and forty-nine percent were male. Teachers had been teaching for an average of 8 years, and each participant had been teaching at their current school for at least four years.

Instrumentation

Interviews

Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is “meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit” (Patton, 1990, p. 278). An interview is a conversation with a purpose (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The purpose for conducting interviews is to allow the researcher to enter into the participant’s prospective and understand that person’s feelings, thoughts, and intentions about a certain phenomena (Patton, 1990). This study relied on interviews as the primary source of data collection. The data collected through interviews provided valuable information about the teachers’ experiences with USE. Interview questions were formulated around categories in the Diagram of Teacher Support, the proposed conceptual framework for this study. The interview protocol was piloted with two people who are teachers and native
Ugandans and are acquaintances of the researcher. Piloting the interview protocol in advance provided an opportunity for wording and questions to be changed so that they were relevant and culturally appropriate.

Semi-structured interviews with each participant lasted approximately fifteen to thirty minutes. The interview asked a series of questions and then probed more deeply using open-form questions to obtain additional information (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Semi-structured interviews were chosen for data collection because they allowed for open-ended exploration of topics that elicit responses provided in the unique words of the respondents. Additionally, using semi-structured interviewing can provide a greater depth of information that structured interviews (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003, p. 240).

Interview questions asked about teachers’ support for the USE policy and its implementation. There were several structured demographic questions as well. The open-ended interview questions allowed participants to share their views and perceptions of the USE policy and explain how and why certain characteristics influence teacher support. Interviews were recorded digitally in order to allow full interaction with the interviewee. Recording interviews allowed a return to the data several times for in-depth analysis and more detailed interpretation. All interviews were conducted in English. Figure 3 depicts how interview questions matched research questions.
## Figure 3  Interview Question Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Interview Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do teachers support the USE policy and the implementation of the policy?</td>
<td>11. On a scale of 1-4 how would you describe your level of support for USE? For its implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which characteristics distinguish teachers who support the policy from others who do not?</td>
<td>8. What are the goals and objectives of USE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. How successful do you think the policy has been in addressing its goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. How successful do you think the policy has been in its implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. How has USE impacted your school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. What is your average class size?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13a. What was it before USE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Do you feel you have the resources you need to teach all the new students coming to your school due to USE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE?</td>
<td>14. How has your work changed since your school became a USE school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. What is your class size?</td>
<td>13a. What was it before USE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do teachers cope with the changes in working conditions as a result of the new policy?</td>
<td>15. How have you coped with these changes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What could the Ministry of Education do to make your job easier?</td>
<td>16. Do you feel you have the resources you need to teach all the students coming into your school due to USE?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Field Notes**

Qualitative research aims to provide a descriptive and detailed understanding of the context in which a phenomenon occurs. Field notes are one way to capture the researcher’s insights and interpretations about what is happening in the setting, while also providing more contextual information about the setting of the study. To provide more information about the context in which the teachers worked, field notes were also utilized. Field notes described the physical aspects of the school such as how large it was, how many buildings were present, what the buildings looked like, the condition of the classrooms, bathrooms, offices, and other facilities, and what instructional resources were present in the classrooms and library.
Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using a matrix system created in Microsoft Word and Excel to facilitate coding and analysis. Both inductive and deductive methods of analysis were used. Some questions were analyzed inductively by examining the intensity of the emotions and opinions expressed during the interviews (Krueger & Casey, 2009). Other questions were analyzed deductively by examining the frequencies of the responses. Each question was analyzed slightly differently and some questions were analyzed both inductively and deductively.

Question one, to what extent do teachers support the USE policy and the implementation of the policy, asked participants to rank their level of support for the policy using a scale from 1-4. This question was analyzed by calculating the frequency of each response option.

The results from question one clearly show that most teachers support the goals of the policy, but not the way in which it has been implemented. Consequently, the findings from question one suggest that question two may have been improperly formulated. The findings suggest that a different way to approach this issue may have been to consider why the vast majority of teachers expressed limited support for the implementation of the policy.

Keeping this in mind, there are several ways question two was analyzed. A priori categories from the Diagram of Teacher Support were used to organize the data from interview questions that ask how certain characteristics influence teacher support. The categories were: goals and objectives of USE, importance of
goals, level of success in addressing goals, level of success in implementation, impact of enrollment, impact of class size, impact of deployment, impact of instructional resources, and impact on physical size of the school. Other categories were added, or the existing categories were confirmed throughout the process of data analysis.

Data in each category were examined using two of the data analysis techniques outlined by Krueger and Casey (2009), which are to determine the frequency and intensity of each category. A frequency was taken from each category to identify how often a theme was mentioned by one person. Intensity of each answer was also determined by examining how many people mentioned the same theme. When something was mentioned by many people, it indicated a stronger intensity than if it was simply mentioned by one or two people.

For question two, frequency and intensity of the answers in each category were used to determine which characteristics influenced teachers’ lack of support for the USE policy implementation. Salient quotes from teachers were also included in the analysis that described teachers’ emotions and opinions. These quotes also helped to illustrate the intensity of each theme.

Question three, ‘how do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE’, also used several of the a priori categories from question two to organize answers to the questions that ask about teacher working conditions. The existing categories were confirmed or changed, and additional categories were added if they emerged in the data during the process of analysis. The a priori categories
examined for this question included: impact of class size, impact of deployment, impact of instructional resources, impact of physical size of the school. For this question, both frequency and intensity of the answers were especially important. How often and how many people talked about the same thing was important to help illuminate the relationship between characteristics that affect working conditions and teacher support for USE. As with question two, salient quotes from teachers were also included in the analysis. These quotes provided more context for the teachers’ responses and allowed insight into teachers’ emotions and opinions about USE.

For question four, how do teachers cope with the changes in working conditions as a result of the new policy, there were also several a priori categories used for questions about coping strategies: work more hours, change instruction, assistance from school administrators, salary increase, instructional resources, and professional development opportunities. In addition to these categories, others were identified as they emerged during the process of data analysis. The frequency and intensity of responses to question four were analyzed in order to determine how teachers have been able to cope with the changes imposed by the USE policy. Understanding teachers’ coping strategies provided more insight into the relationship between working conditions and teacher support for the policy.

*Criteria for Rigor*

*Researcher positionality*
As a former elementary school teacher who has worked as a teacher and as a teacher professional development trainer in the United States, Honduras, Chile, Poland, and Ethiopia, I came to this study with a wealth of experience working in educational systems. My experiences as a teacher, working with teachers, and as a student of Educational Policy and Administration led me to study the USE policy in Uganda. I was interested in understanding how teachers in Uganda were affected by USE and I was eager to give a voice to the teachers, knowing from experience that teachers are often the last ones consulted when new education policies are implemented. I believe it is pertinent for teachers to have a voice in educational policy creation, implementation, and evaluation. My personal experiences in education certainly helped shape my study and I acknowledge them because I believe that my experience as a researcher cannot necessarily be separated from my personal experiences in education. I took as many steps as possible during my data collection and analysis to ensure that I did not let my own bias interfere with the results of my study.

_Credibility_

Several measures were taken to ensure that the findings were credible. Piloting the interview protocol in advance provided an opportunity for the wording and questions to be changed so that they were relevant and culturally appropriate. The interview was piloted with a Ugandan student who attends the University of Minnesota, and with a friend who works in the City District Education office in Kampala. Both have a background in teaching.
Additionally, I tried to spend as much time as possible with participants in order to build trust and gain rapport. I spent at least two to four full days at each school. While at a school, I spoke informally with the teachers and administrators before school, between classes, or during breaks. At every school, I was invited to join the teachers for lunch and during their tea break. My presence in the schools helped to establish rapport and allowed the teachers to recognize me and feel more at ease during their interviews.

When I interviewed and chatted informally with teachers, I was also able to draw on my own experience as a teacher and my experiences working with teachers in East Africa, in order to establish rapport with the participants in this study. However, when I began the interviews, there were occasionally instances when some teachers seemed more reserved and did not initially open up as much during the first questions in the interview. I tried to be intentional about reading the cues teachers were giving and I discovered that their reserve was often attributed to two things: they were either unsure of my involvement with the MoES, or they were not convinced that I, a young American researcher, understood their experiences as teachers in Uganda.

If I sensed that teachers were holding back because they were unsure about my connection with the MoES, then I tried to make it clear that I was not affiliated with the Ministry; I was simply conducting research for my own purposes. I found that once teachers understood this they became more relaxed and candid. When I sensed that the teachers seemed skeptical of my age and
personal experiences in education then I made a point of explaining my own expertise and establishing rapport by assuring the teachers that I was a colleague who had many experiences teaching, including teaching children in the African context. I also explained that I teach teacher education classes at a university in the U.S. When teachers understood that I was, in fact, an actual teacher, and I had some expertise and experience in education, they opened up more readily. In fact, some of the same teachers who seemed initially to be more reserved in our interviews often turned out to be the ones who revealed the most and went over the allotted time to speak with me about their own experiences.

Even though I tried to be deliberate in establishing rapport with the teachers, I acknowledge that there may have been cultural nuisances that I may not have understood. I tried to be intentional in my actions and observations in order to gain a better understanding of the culture in Uganda, and the specific culture in each school I visited. When I had questions regarding cultural practices I did not hesitate to ask one of my Ugandan friends in Kampala to help explain the nuisances of different situations.

Confirmability

Confirmability refers to the degree to which results can be confirmed or corroborated by others. Lincoln and Guba (1985) explain that researchers should leave “audit trail” for someone else, in order to determine if the conclusions, interpretations, and recommendations can be traced to their sources and if they are supported by the inquiry (p. 321). In order to account for confirmability, the
following procedures were employed that allowed for checking and rechecking of the data throughout the study. First, this study documented how the interview protocol was developed. Second, raw data was collected, which included electronic recordings of the interviews and copies of the field notes. Additionally, as the data was analyzed, the process of analysis was thoroughly detailed so that if someone chose to reanalyze the data they could do so based on the description of the process of analysis.

Lastly, during the coding process, I enlisted the help of two other people to confirm the way I had organized my codes. I wanted my ‘code confirmers’ to include someone who worked in the field of education and also someone who did not, to ensure that my coding made sense to people working in and outside of the field. I asked my father, a physician who traveled with me to Uganda, and a friend at the City District Education office in Kampala, to examine some of the interview data and determine if it had been coded correctly. I did this as a method of establishing inter-rater reliability. In all instances, my codes were confirmed by both of the code confirmers.

*Dependability*

To ensure that the approach was consistent and the results dependable, several dependability procedures were also employed. First, during data collection, when it was necessary, I requested a follow up in-person or phone interview with participants to further discuss their responses. These follow up interviews allowed me to clarify responses that were incomplete or inaudible in
the recordings. (Creswell, 2007). Also, during the analysis phase, each interview was listened to several times during the course of transcription. Additionally, interview transcripts were checked and double-checked to ensure they did not contain obvious mistakes made during transcription.

Transferability

Although the results of this study may help to illustrate and identify the issues that need to be considered in order to assess teacher support for USE. Understanding the experiences and concerns of the teachers from the seven schools in this study may provide useful and insightful information regarding teachers’ experiences with USE that may be applicable in other regions of Uganda, or other settings where USE may be implemented in the future.
Chapter 4

Results

The results of this study found that teachers generally supported the goals of the USE policy, yet most expressed limited or no support of the policy’s implementation. Teachers felt that USE had made the conditions of their work more complicated and stressful, yet their pay had actually decreased since the policy’s implementation. Teachers expressed that they felt unfairly treated since their non-USE teaching peers continued to receive additional allowances provided by Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs). This chapter explains the results in-depth by examining teacher responses to each research question. Teacher responses were analyzed by calculating frequencies or intensity and also by examining supporting quotations.

Research Question 1: To what extent do teachers support the goals of the USE policy? To what extent do teachers support the implementation of the USE policy?

Teachers were asked to rank their level of support for the goals of the USE policy and also for its implementation, using a scale of 1-4 (1: “do not support” 2: “somewhat support” 3: “support” and 4: “greatly support”). Thirty-seven people responded to the questions “to what extent do you support the goals of the USE policy” and “to what extent do you support the implementation of the USE policy.”
Of the thirty-seven respondents, thirty-five teachers (95%) said they support or greatly support the goals of the USE policy. Two teachers (5%) said they somewhat support the goals of the policy, and no teachers said they did not support the goals of the policy. Overall, teachers had a favorable opinion of what they believed were the goals of the policy itself.

When asked about the implementation, however, opinions drastically changed. Only three teachers (8%) said they supported the implementation of the policy. Twenty-six teachers (70%) said they somewhat supported the implementation, and eight people (22%) said they did not support the implementation. No teachers said they strongly supported implementation. There appeared to be a shift in the opinions of teachers. Although most people supported the goals of the policy, few people were in favor of the way it has been implemented. This chapter examines the reasons why teachers may approve of the goals of the policy itself, yet express feeling disenchanted with its implementation.

Research Question 2: Which characteristics distinguish those who support the policy from those who do not?

Most teachers said they supported the goals of USE, yet ninety-two percent of teachers expressed limited support for its implementation. The results clearly show that most teachers support the goals of the policy, but not the way in which it has been implemented. Consequently, the findings from research question one suggest that the way research question two was posed may not have
been relevant for this study. The findings suggest that a different way to approach this issue may have been to consider why the vast majority of teachers expressed limited support for the implementation of the policy. Based on the data gleaned from the teacher interviews, this interesting contrast can be attributed to teachers’ perceptions of the remuneration they receive and the conditions of their work. Teachers believe that their compensation (monetary incentives) and working conditions (non-monetary incentives) have negatively changed since USE was implemented in their schools. According to the teachers, both non-monetary and monetary incentives have drastically been affected by the implementation of USE.

Remuneration

Issues of remuneration were widely discussed by the teachers. When asked how the policy could be improved for USE teachers, forty teachers (98%) said teacher remuneration should be increased. Many interviewees brought up issues of remuneration several times during the course of the interview. A provision of the USE policy is that PTAs can no longer supplement the teachers’ incomes, as they do in non-USE schools, so the yearly supplement many teachers depended on in the past as part of their salary disappeared when USE was implemented in their schools. Many teachers explained that since the implementation of USE in 2006, their salaries have actually decreased because PTAs are no longer providing a stipend to teachers, as they did in the past and continue to do at non-USE government and private schools. The USE teachers interviewed in this study make an average of 400,000 Ush per month.
(approximately $170 USD). The PTA allowance is, on average, an additional 300,000 Ush per month ($100 USD), which is a sizeable amount (Hannon, 2009). Because of the disappearance of the PTA supplement, thirty-eight teachers (95%) in USE schools stated that they were working harder, but for less pay, as a result of USE. Teachers expressed feelings of inequity when they compared their workload and salary to their peers who taught in non-USE schools. One teacher explained, “we are earning just peanuts.” A second teacher’s opinion echoed those of many others:

You feel like an outcast teaching in a USE school. When you compare the teachers in USE schools to those who are in non-USE schools, USE schools are really lagging behind. In time, the teachers will shun the USE schools because of the loss of extra pay.

Salary was not the only issue discussed when teachers spoke of problems with remuneration. Additionally, teachers also said they would appreciate provisions being made for accommodations and transportation. Twenty-five teachers (61%) said that the policy would be improved if accommodations in or near the school were provided for USE teachers. Additionally, seventeen teachers (34%) said that transportation should also be provided in order to improve the policy’s implementation. Many teachers commute to school and transportation costs in Kampala are high. One teacher explained that although his salary is about 400,000 Ush per month, he spends roughly 200,000 Ush on transportation costs to get to and from school. If the MoES provided accommodations and/or
transportation for the teachers, it would increase their take home pay and help ease their financial burden.

Another issue of remuneration that was mentioned by three teachers (7%) is medical insurance. These teachers explained that having insurance so they could see doctors, or purchase medications cheaply, would help ease their financial burden.

The vast majority of teachers believed that remuneration is not sufficient. As this study explains, teachers believed that even though their workloads have greatly increased, monetary incentives have actually decreased since the introduction of the USE policy. This dynamic of de-incentivization has caused many USE teachers to feel demoralized, unmotivated, and dissatisfied.

Workload

Issues of remuneration were the most frequently mentioned reasons teachers had for saying that USE had negatively impacted their work life. Remuneration, however, was only part of the story. Non-monetary incentives for teachers have also drastically changed since the implementation of USE, causing teachers to feel a lack of support for the policy. Increased teacher workloads (number of lessons per week taught and number of students in each class) was mentioned by thirty eight teachers (93%) during the interviews as having been affected by USE.

Enrollment.
Teachers reported that their workloads have been greatly affected by an increase in student enrollment. In every school enrollment has greatly increased since the introduction of USE, which is precisely what the policy intended to achieve. In regard to enrollment, one teacher exclaimed, “it was like an explosion!” In each school enrollment has at least doubled, in some schools it has tripled or quadrupled. One school’s pre-USE student enrollment was 470 (in 2006); when I visited there were 1,740 students enrolled. This dramatic increase in enrollment has made the teachers’ work lives more complex, yet the incentives teachers receive has not increased.

Double shift.

Five of the seven schools where interviews were conducted have become ‘double shift’ schools since the introduction of USE. In the past, and in most non-USE schools, students attend school all day and their lessons are dispersed between the morning and afternoon periods. Teachers teach an average of 18 lessons per week and the school day began around 8:00 am and ended around 4:00 pm. Double shifting was introduced as a way for the schools to accommodate more learners. Schools that double shift have two separate groups of students who come to learn during the day. Some come in the morning and others come in the afternoon. The double shift school schedule means there is a full load for students who attend in the morning, and also a full load for students who attend in the afternoon. This enables schools to accommodate at least twice

---

3 Exact start and end times vary for each school.
as many students, although in reality they accommodate three or four times as many using double shifting.

As there are two separate timetables built into the school day, teachers are required to teach more lessons than before. Most teachers teach between 24-26 lessons per week, as opposed to the average of 18 they taught before USE. The lesson periods are shorter, usually 35 minutes, whereas before double shift they were around 50 minutes long. The school day in double shift schools is much longer than in the schools that do not double shift. The average school day in the five double shift schools where interviews was conducted lasts between 7:30 am and 6:00 pm. Most teachers are required to be at school all day. The long working days cause many teachers to feel worn out and depleted. One teacher spoke for many when he said:

We [teachers] are overstretched throughout the day because some students come in the morning and others come in the afternoon. But teachers work throughout the day until 6. It is quite taxing for a teacher to teach until 6. We need some rest also. When we go home we are exhausted.

Although the school days in most USE schools have been extended, and additional class periods have been added to accommodate the new students, class size in all schools has dramatically increased since the introduction of USE. The average class size reported in the seven schools was 67 students. Before USE, teachers reported their classes had an average of 45 students. Even though 67 is average, some classes are much larger. One teacher reported having up to 120 students in each class. The smallest class reported was 50, and it should be noted
that this class was a fine arts class, which is not considered a required course, like
math, science, and language arts. The classes can be so large, that one teacher
declared, “it feels like you are teaching in a lecture hall or a conference or
something.”

Student Concerns

Type of students/quality of students.

In addition to teaching more students and more lessons, teachers also
indicated that since USE, many of the new students who have enrolled are
academically weak, need more discipline, and are often absent and/or hungry.
These factors have caused teachers’ workloads to be more challenging. Fourteen
teachers (34%) said that the students who have entered school after the
introduction of USE are academically weak learners. One teacher explained the
phenomenon that many others discussed:

Students in USE schools don’t like to study. It’s like you are pushing them
to study. I don’t know whether it is the foundation from primary [UPE]
but they are not very bright. They are average or low learners and they
can’t communicate.

The teachers who mentioned that their students are academically weak
explained that since the implementation of USE, the entrance requirements
changed for students enrolling in USE schools. Before USE, students had to score
a minimum of 28 on the primary school exit exam to be admitted to secondary
school. In USE schools, the cut off can now be as low as 15. More students are
able to enroll, but the teachers worry that their foundation for learning is weaker
than students who enroll with higher exam scores. Many of these students come
from UPE schools. UPE schools were mentioned by two of the teachers (5%) as being a reason some students may be academically weak, since the UPE schools have formed a reputation in Uganda as being of lower quality than their non-UPE counterparts.

Teachers stated that having academically weak students makes it more difficult for them to teach, since the students in their classes may not have the academic foundation to understand what they are trying to teach. Additionally, teachers reported that students in USE schools are often promoted to the next grade regardless of their performance in school, whereas in the past they had to pass a year-end test with certain marks to be promoted. Promotion bothered one teacher who stated, “students are passing but are they actually acquiring skills? That is the question.”

Discipline.

Another issue associated with large numbers of students, and also students who may be perceived to be academically weaker than their peers, is discipline. When teachers were asked how their jobs had changed since the implementation of USE, discipline issues were mentioned by eighteen people (44%). According to the teachers, the large numbers have also added classroom management challenges that were not present in the past. One teacher explained the feelings of many when she said:

Discipline is a problem. You can’t kick kids out if they aren’t performing well and they can’t repeat a class. They have to be in school whether they are performing or not performing, whether they are disciplined or not disciplined.
Teachers perceive that their classrooms are harder to manage, and class control is more difficult than in the past. One teacher mentioned finding it difficult to teach because “they [the students] like talking a lot.” Another said that since the start of USE, “there has been more foolery business. They [the students] like fooling teachers. They don’t see the value of education yet.” When asked why the students are less disciplined, one teacher said that she believed it was because they know they will be promoted regardless of their grades or behavior, and also stated that because the students were going to school for free, she believes they appreciate the education less. “You usually value something you pay for,” she said, insinuating that the students value their education less than their peers who contribute financially.

Student welfare

Another change teachers have noticed in their students since the implementation of USE is that many do not eat lunch, thus causing them to feel hungry and fatigued in the afternoon. One provision of USE is that schools can no longer provide a free lunch for students. Students have the option of paying for their lunch; however, since many of the students who attend USE schools come from families who are poor, their families do not provide lunch and/or do not pay for the school lunch. Teachers expressed a great deal of concern for the welfare of hungry students several times during the interviews. In fact, when asked how the USE policy could be improved, eight teachers (20%) said that having students receive a lunch at school would be an important way to improve the policy.
The teachers explained that hungry students are less motivated and more lethargic in class. However, the teaching was not the teachers’ only concern; they expressed great concern for the students’ welfare on the whole. One teacher recounted an experience where a student had fainted in class. Since the teacher was not a medical professional, she was not exactly sure how to handle the situation and she decided to administer CPR. The student revived quickly, but the teacher was very shaken by the incident. When asked if this was the only time a student had fainted in class due to hunger and fatigue the teacher responded, “No, it happens at this school often. Many students have collapsed because they are hungry.”

Absenteeism.

Ten teachers (24%) noted that student absenteeism had increased since the implementation of the policy. The teachers explained that the drop-out rate at their schools seemed to be higher, despite the fact that students were not paying. One teacher explained that in a typical day there can be as many as 5-10 students absent during a lesson that is supposed to have 70 students, nearly 15 percent of the class. A third teacher said that although students may skip school, many will show up again during exams. During exams, he said, “all of a sudden you see students you haven’t seen in weeks. They will sit for the exams so they can be promoted [to the next grade] without doing the work.” It is interesting to note that even though USE provides a relatively free education, that does not seem to guarantee that students will stay in school.
Infrastructure

Although teachers in all schools reported that enrollment had drastically increased since the implementation of USE, only teachers in two schools said that additional classrooms or other buildings had been constructed by the government. Moreover, the teachers in these schools were quick to note that even with new facilities, the school infrastructure was inadequate for accommodating the number of new learners.

In one other school, the teachers reported that they themselves had built a new classroom for the school because they were desperate to have more space. The teachers constructed the make-shift classroom from wood, and it stands in the middle of the school courtyard. An observer can easily tell that this ‘building’ does not fit in with the rest of the structures. It appears as though it was constructed quickly as some of the boards that constitute the walls are not lined up, the windows do not have any glass, and the roof has been patched together with scraps of tin.

One teacher at this school gave me a tour and was chuckling uncomfortably as he led me through the two classrooms that are in the make-shift building. He said that he worries that the building is not safe and will collapse at any moment. He explained that it was the best they could do, and they built it themselves after they solicited help from the government but were not granted funds to build additional classrooms. He said lessons can be held under trees
during the dry season, but during the rainy season there has to be a place for the students to sit indoors.

Inadequate infrastructure was mentioned by 21 teachers (51%) as being a challenge of the USE policy. Additionally, when asked how USE could be improved, improving facilities was mentioned by 22 teachers (54%). Teachers said that their schools need additional classroom space, new science labs, and also more toilets to accommodate all the new students.

Hygiene and sanitation were of concern for five teachers (12%). In one school, a teacher explained that hygiene quality is poor. He described a situation where broken urinals were overflowing onto the school grounds because they were backed up. Another teacher said that her school often has the water shut off, so on some days there is no water in the restrooms at all. Also, the teachers said that there simply are not enough restroom facilities for all the students and the teachers. This leads to instances where the toilets overflow (as the example mentioned above), and some students leave school so they can find a place to go to the bathroom, particularly the female students. Some of these students do not return once they have left.

*Instructional resources*

According to the teachers, both physical infrastructure and instructional resources are lacking in their schools. When the teachers were asked if they had enough instructional resources to teach the students since the implementation of USE, the answer was a unanimous “no”. Lacking instructional resources was
mentioned by 38 teachers (93%) as being a challenge of the USE policy.

Additionally, when teachers were asked what would be the most important way to improve the policy, 15 respondents (36%) said that the MOES should increase the availability of instructional resources available to teachers. Specifically, teachers said they needed many more textbooks, library books, and teaching aides. One language arts teacher explained that she rarely is able to use books in class, simply because there were not enough of them to go around. She said that the curriculum states that students must read a certain novel, but there only ten copies of each novel at the school. She explained:

[Before USE] I could take 10 books and use them, But now, 10 for a class of 80…it does nothing. It just creates chaos because there are so few books compared to the number of students. They have to work in groups and share the books but with eight students sharing one book it does not work. Not everyone has the chance to read and they act up when they aren’t the ones reading.

Science teachers also stated that the schools need more science labs to accommodate all the new learners. One science teacher explained his current teaching situation:

I think the labs were meant for 30-35 students. Now we have to accommodate 70 in one class. We just push the students in there. They fit but the squeeze each other. It is very congested.

This teacher explained that if the students do not get enough time performing experiments in the lab, they will be in danger of failing their year-end exams, since there is a practical component to the science section of the exams. He also said that some students will skip class when the class is scheduled to use the lab.
He said he thought that was because they did not like being squeezed into the classroom. In this particular school, there was only one lab for 1,100 students.

The question, *why do the vast majority of teachers not support the implementation of the USE policy*, can be summed up in two main points: the teachers do not feel they are adequately compensated, and their work life has become more challenging since the implementation of USE. These two characteristics of teacher support were mentioned by the most teachers. The number of lessons they teach, the students who enroll, and the lack of physical space and instructional resources, were all specified by teachers as being factors that have increased their workloads, and consequently the complexity of their work life. To put it simply, the vast majority of teachers do no support the implementation of USE because they believe they are doing more work for less pay.

*Teacher perceptions of policy goals*

Interestingly enough, even though most teachers were supportive of the goals of the USE policy, very few teachers, when asked, were able to explain what the actual goals of the policy were. The overarching goals of USE are defined as: “the equitable provision of quality post-primary education to all Ugandan students who have successfully completed the primary leavers exam” (MoES, 2008a, p. 13). Many teachers, however, did not realize that increasing quality is even a goal of USE, and two teachers (5%) said they did not know any of the goals of the policy.
When asked what the goals of the USE policy were, responses generally fell into one of four categories: increasing equity (88%), increasing quality (5%), creating a political advantage for the ruling party (3.5%), or nation building (3.5%). Some respondents listed as many as six goals. Others could only think of one goal, and as was stated earlier, two people admitted they had no idea what the goals of the policy actually were.

Although one of the two main goals of USE is to increase quality of education, only five percent of teachers knew that. Additionally, the goals of USE are not explicitly stated as being to help create political advantage or nation building; however, seven percent of teachers thought they were. The teachers’ answers to this question indicate that there is confusion around the intent of the policy. However, despite having little if any understanding of the goals of the policy, teachers are generally very supportive of whatever they think the goals are.

One of these teachers said “I don’t know [what the goals are]. I just assume. I would love it if someone came and told us what they are and how to do what we need to do.” When he was asked to comment on his support for implementation he said, “I don’t know if it is good or bad because I don’t know what I’m supposed to be doing.”

Research Question 3: How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE?
As previously discussed, teachers feel their working conditions have changed since the implementation of the USE policy. Teachers’ salaries have decreased, their workloads have increased, the type of students they work with has changed, and they feel they do not have the physical space, nor the instructional resources needed to teach to all the new learners in their classes.

How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE? Fullan (2002) has argued that working conditions greatly affect teacher support and that teachers are most likely to support a policy when they feel the conditions of their work are conducive to continuous development and prideful accomplishment. Working conditions can impact the teachers’ attitudes. In the case of USE, the working conditions have changed drastically; thus impacting the teachers’ morale and their overall attitude toward teaching. A decrease in motivation and morale was mentioned by 25 teachers (61%) interviewed for this study as being a challenge of the policy. Some comments made by different teachers, that are representative of the sentiment of the group of teachers interviewed were: “motivation is lacking in USE schools,” “USE makes us [teachers] feel like we are second hand teachers,” “the teachers need motivation. They do not feel appreciated.”

Additionally, some teachers claimed that the policy had not only left them feeling unmotivated, but also demoralized. Five teachers (12%) said that they felt demoralized by the USE policy. One teacher said that many people have left teaching because the policy has left them feeling demoralized:
It [teaching] is harder in a USE school. If you move at the pace of a child who is a slower learner you lose on the end result. Our education system is result-oriented. A teacher who teaches students and they get better results— they are a good teacher. Why? Because our system looks at the end result and they don’t look at the process or who you are teaching. Only your test scores. That demoralizes us. Especially the teachers who are teaching students who are weak. Those teachers end up losing in the system and eventually they get out of the system.

When teachers feel unmotivated, unappreciated, and demoralized, it can affect their willingness to support a new reform, and thus they may resist their role in a reform’s implementation (Firestone & Pennell, 1993; Weiss, 1999; Fullan, 2001; Chapman, 2009b).

The teachers in this study reported a decrease in monetary incentives. Weiss (1999) asserts that when teachers perceive they are receiving fair compensation, their morale is higher and their support for new reform is greater. In the case of USE, the decreased compensation has caused the teachers’ motivation and morale to suffer. In some cases, teachers said they do not put in as much effort as they know they should (preparing lessons, managing students, grading papers) because they pay is low. One teacher explained, “teachers don’t have much interest. They aren’t motivated financially so they do their jobs haphazard.” Another teacher said that because of the low pay, “teachers do teach but not wholeheartedly- not with all they can give to the students.” A third person stated, “the teachers need a big time [monetary] motivation for numbers like this.” Twenty teachers (49%) stated that they have a hard time supporting their families on the salary they make teaching. Additionally, since USE teachers do not receive
an additionally allowance from the PTA, they feel that they are being treated unfairly, since their non-USE teacher peers receive a higher salary.

Although monetary incentives are an important characteristic affecting teacher morale, non-monetary incentives are also extremely relevant. Chapter II also discussed how non-monetary incentives also influence teacher support for a new reform. Hansen and Corcoran (1989) assert that if the physical working conditions are poor, and resources at the school are lacking, teachers may not feel they can do their jobs adequately or effectively, thus causing them to resist the reform. It is important that teachers feel their workloads are reasonable. Reasonable workloads enhance teachers’ ability to prepare and adequately monitor student performance (Johnson, 1990; Firestone & Pennell, 1993; PriceWaterhouseCoopers, 2001; Ingvarson, Barwick, Kleinhenz, Carthy, Beavis & Wilkinson, 2005).

Teachers in USE schools believed that their schools lack the proper infrastructure to accommodate the students and that they lack the instructional resources needed to teach effectively. Additionally, USE teachers reported that they believe their workloads were not reasonable. One teacher said, “We teach 24 lessons a week and in the past we only taught 18.” When asked what he thought would be a reasonable workload he replied, “18 to 20. More than that and we can not prepare properly for our lessons and grading is almost impossible.” The drastic increase in workload has also caused the teachers’ morale to suffer; which in turn has affected their support for the policy.
The changes in monetary and non-monetary working conditions as a result of the implementation of the USE policy may have greatly affected the teachers’ support for the USE policy. Teachers did not feel the conditions of work are conducive to allowing them to do their jobs well, and their morale and motivation is low, which may be causing them to express less support for the policy’s implementation.

*Research Question 4: How do teachers cope with the changes in working conditions?*

Teachers were exasperated with how the USE policy had drastically changed their working conditions; however, many said they have developed strategies to cope with the changes brought about by the policy. One coping strategy teachers mentioned was simply to work more than they had in the past. Thirty-nine teachers (95%) said they generally work more hours since the implementation of the policy. The working day for most teachers extended as a result of double shifting, so they teach more lessons per day and per week. As a result of having larger class sizes and more lessons, thirty-six teachers (88%) said they spend more time outside of school grading student assignments than they did before USE.

The increased number of students’ assignments to grade was frequently mentioned during the interviews. Fifteen teachers (37%) said that because of the large numbers of students, they simply cope by giving fewer assessments than in the past. Three people (7%) explained that they would previously assess the students on a daily basis but now that has changed to weekly or bi-weekly. Two
math teachers (5%) said that in class they assign fewer problems for the students to complete, and one teacher (2%) said she has the students grade themselves otherwise she cannot keep up with the excessive grading.

Three teachers (7%) said that they work at more than one school in order to make ends meet financially. Although only three teachers (7%) admitted this during the interview many of the teachers interviewed indicated that they know many USE teachers who work in multiple schools. One teacher stated, “USE teachers will always need to find a side income to survive.” Therefore, in actuality, the number of teachers who participated in this study that work in more than one school may be much higher than three.

Also, some teachers explained that they willingly work longer hours grading and meeting with students outside of their designated timetable. Four teachers (10%) said they come to school on the evenings and weekends to help students who are struggling or to catch up on grading. One teacher’s comments echoed the sentiments of the four:

I think this is the busiest profession…from morning to evening, Monday to Monday. Sometimes I come in on Saturday to do some consultation and do some practical work outside the class timetable. Otherwise the work would never get finished.

When asked if she was compensated for the extra hours she works outside of school the teacher said, “no, it is just a sacrifice you make to help the children catch up.”
Teachers have also coped by adjusting their pedagogy. Some teachers did not specifically say how they had changed their teaching, but said they “improvised” with lessons and materials when necessary in order to accommodate the new learners. When asked how she improvised one teacher exclaimed, “you have to be creative [in your teaching] to survive!” Some examples of improvisation included: having students create their own graph paper in math class because there was not enough graph paper for each student, drawing maps on the board in geography class since the school did not have maps the teacher could use, and finding materials to teach a lesson when none were available at the school.

Other teachers were more specific about how they had changed their teaching practice to accommodate the changes brought about by USE. Twenty teachers (49%) said that they taught less ‘hands-on’ lessons than in the past because of the large class sizes and now they resort to using a lecture style more. Less hands-on was explained as involving the teacher writing more on the chalkboard than doing demonstrations, and using dictation practices that include more lectures. They also explained that there is less one-on-one time with each student than in the past. One teacher explained, “hands-on is very rare now because of the big numbers.” Another teacher said, “because of the big numbers you can hardly talk to individual students. Student-centered practices are not as effective.”
Although twenty teachers (49%) said that they used less hands-on, student centered teaching methods, seven teachers (17%) stated that they were in fact trying to include more hands-on work for the students. These seven teachers (17%) said that they try to implement cooperative group work into their lessons, although several of the teachers noted that it is sometimes difficult to manage the groups because the classes are so large. One language arts teacher explained that he likes to break up the class into groups of 20 to form discussion groups. He gives each group questions to work on and discuss. He said this format usually works fairly well, but that depending on the group of students it can be hard to manage all the groups, and since classroom space is limited there is not always enough room for the students to work in groups.

Two teachers (5%) mentioned that they try to co-teach with other teachers who teach the same subject in their department. So instead of having one person in the room, two teachers work cooperatively to teach a lesson. One person teaches and the other monitors the students and helps control behavior. One teacher explained that co-teaching “helps minimize the noise making and discipline in class.” Both teachers, however, mentioned that it is very difficult to find other teachers who have a free lesson and who are willing to spend their free lesson assisting in someone else’s class. Four additional teachers (10%) said they would like to try team teaching, however, it is not feasible given the teaching timetables at their schools.
Although USE has made the working conditions more challenging for teachers, many teachers have developed coping strategies. Most teachers indicated they work longer hours than before USE, some give fewer assignments or teach in a less student-centered manner, others teach using more hands-on teaching methods that in the past, and a few have tried to team teach with their colleagues when it is possible. Coping strategies may help to make the work more manageable for teachers who are struggling with the changes that have been imposed by the USE policy.

Some of the coping strategies mentioned by the teachers may also trigger concerns over the quality of education the students are receiving. By utilizing less student-centered teaching, and having less time to plan lessons and assess student learning, the quality of the education the students receive might be compromised in the long run. Therefore, although teachers have found ways to cope with the changes brought about by the USE policy, not all of their coping strategies may be in the best interest of the students. Since the goals of USE are to increase both access and quality, having students simply attend school is not enough. If quality decreases as a result of the measures teachers must take in order to carry out their duties, the goals of the policy may also be compromised.

**Conclusion**

The results from this study indicate that teachers generally like what they believe are the goals of the USE policy, yet they are less happy with the way the policy has been implemented. Teachers are not enthusiastic about the policy’s
implementation because it has increased the amount of work they do, yet also decreased the incentives they receive. These characteristics have affected teachers’ support for the implementation of the policy by causing the teachers to feel demotivated and/or demoralized by the policy. The teachers believe they are doing more work for less pay than their peers who work in non-USE schools. Teachers, however, have found various ways to cope with the changes the policy has created. Coping strategies include working more hours, attempting to team-teach, and using different pedagogy than in the past. Chapter V will discuss these findings and the implications of this study.
Chapter 5
Discussion

In this chapter the results that address the research questions are summarized, the findings are situated in the literature surrounding teacher support, theoretical and practical implications for the findings are discussed, and the limitations of the study are presented.

Summary of the Results

This study set out to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do teachers support the USE policy and the implementation of the policy?
2. What characteristics distinguish teachers that support the policy from others who do not?
3. How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE?
4. How do teachers cope with the changes in working conditions?

To what extent do teachers support the USE policy and the implementation of the policy? The majority of teachers (95%) support or strongly support what they believe to be the goals of the policy. When asked the extent to which they support the implementation of the policy, however, the teachers’ responses changed drastically. Ninety-two percent said they do not or only somewhat support the way the policy is being implemented.
Findings suggest that a search for differences between those who do not support the policy and those who do may be better formulated as a search for the reasons such a vast majority of teachers do not support the policy. Findings indicate that when USE was implemented in schools the teachers’ workloads’ increased, and their work lives became more complex, while their pay decreased. USE teachers had to do more work for less pay.

Not only did the teachers report that they were teaching more students and more lessons, but as a result of the USE policy, they were doing so with fewer resources and facilities. Additionally, teachers believed that many of the new students who had enrolled in school were under qualified, poorly behaved, and lacking motivation, since the USE policy lowered the cut off rate for the secondary entrance exam. Teachers also worried about the welfare of the students themselves, since many students do not eat lunch because USE does not allow schools to provide it. As a result of lunch being eliminated, many students spend most of the day feeling tired and fatigued. All of these characteristics led many teachers to believe that they were being penalized for working in a USE school.

How do these characteristics affect teacher support for USE? The increased workloads and decreased remuneration led teachers to feel demotivated and demoralized. According to the teachers, USE was not leading them to feel their work was “conducive to continuous development and prideful accomplishment” conditions that Fullan (2002) argues are essential to gaining teacher support for a new reform. In fact, many teachers said that the implications
of USE in their schools had the exact opposite effect. Teachers’ support for the implementation of the new policy was hindered by their belief the policy was making their lives more difficult. Also, since their colleagues who were teaching in non-USE school had not experienced a reduction in pay, or a drastic increase in workload, USE teachers expressed feeling that they were being treated unfairly.

_How do teachers cope with the changes in working conditions?_ Despite the difficulties teachers have encountered, many have found ways to cope with the changes brought about by the USE policy. Teachers developed different strategies for coping. Some strategies were pedagogical in nature, and others were more general coping strategies. Some teachers said that they improvised when necessary, others said they used more lectures and less student-centered pedagogy. Others said they used less lectures and _more_ student-centered pedagogy. Teachers also reported giving fewer formal assessments than in the past and some tried co-teaching with colleagues.

_Situating the Findings in the Literature_

The results of this study support the argument made by Fullan (2002), who claims that teachers are most likely to support a reform when they believe the conditions of the work enable them to continually improve and feel successful. In the case of USE, teachers do not support the way in which the reform has been implemented, precisely because the reform has produced negative working conditions and a situation where the teachers do not feel valued. The teachers do
not believe that the policy allows them to work under conditions that allow them to feel continuous development and prideful accomplishment.

This study further confirms the argument that working conditions, along with both monetary and non-monetary incentives, can affect teachers’ morale (Coates & Thorson, 1976; Landsmann, 1977; Kyriacow & Sutcliffe, 1978; Glass, 1982; Johnson, 1990; Smith & Bourke, 1992; Molnar et al. 1999; Sankhulani, 2007). Many USE teachers expressed dissatisfaction with their jobs and low morale, which they attributed to their increased workloads, poor working conditions, and reduced pay.

Finally, this study supports the argument made by Chapman et al. (2010) that school level actors may perceive policy and policy implementation differently. The results of this study indicate that teachers support the policy goals, but not the way it has been implemented in their classrooms.

Knowing teachers generally support the policy goals but not its implementation may be useful to the MoES. If the MoES is interested in garnering more teacher support for USE, and improving quality in secondary schools, they now know that their efforts should be concentrated on improving the working conditions of the teachers.

*Theoretical Implications*

This study was based on a Diagram of Teacher Support, which is grounded in the literature on teacher support for educational policies. This heuristic proposes how working conditions and understanding of reform may
influence teachers’ overall support for a new educational reform. Based on the results of this study, however, the Diagram can be modified to create a more compact model. For example, although the model shows working conditions and teacher understanding as holding almost equal weight in influencing teacher support for educational policies, the results of this study suggest that teacher working conditions may actually be more influential in determining teacher support. Working conditions, specifically remuneration, workload, and instructional resources, were the characteristics most frequently mentioned by teachers as being affected by the USE policy. In the revised model ‘working conditions’ is displayed more prominently because it appeared to be more salient in this study.

Additionally, some aspects of the Diagram were not widely mentioned by teachers, and others were not mentioned at all during the teacher interviews. For example, deployment is included on the Diagram, yet during the interviews, teachers did not mention dissatisfaction with deployment specifically. This may be because in Uganda deployment is systematic and teachers are accustomed to not having a say in where they teach. Or perhaps they have accepted that they will be deployed wherever the Ministry decides. It is also possible that since these teachers were working in and around Kampala they did not express dissatisfaction, whereas perhaps a teacher deployed to a war-torn area of the country, such as Gulu or another village in the North, may have explicitly expressed stronger opinions about deployment practices.
One characteristic of teacher support that was not previously accounted for in the Diagram of Teacher Support, but was illuminated in this study, is that teacher perceptions of student welfare may also influence their support for the implementation of the USE policy. During the interviews, many teachers said that this policy has negatively affected student welfare. Student welfare, however, is not addressed in the original heuristic. Many teachers expressed concern for the students in the USE schools, since they do not receive lunch anymore as a result of the policy’s implementation. Teachers said they worried about students being hungry and feeling fatigued during class, which also affects the students’ ability to concentrate and learn. ‘Student welfare’ has been added to the new Diagram, since in this situation it was relevant. Concerns surrounding student welfare were an unanticipated finding of this study, yet they make sense given that one provision of the policy was to eliminate free lunches for students.

Additionally, the monetary incentive section has been changed to include accommodations and transportation, two characteristics that were widely mentioned in the interviews but were not included in the original Diagram.

Understanding of Reform

The Diagram of Teacher Support suggests that teachers’ previous experience in education and UPE may influence teacher support. However, it does not explicitly show how teachers’ understanding of the goals of the policy can influence their support for the policy itself or its implementation. In the case of USE, teachers liked the goals of the policy; however, when probed as to what the
goals were, many teachers displayed a limited understanding of what the policy actually aimed to accomplish. It would be interesting to determine if knowing the actual goals would lead to even more support from teachers, or less.

Another section in ‘understanding of the reform’ is ‘previous experience in education.’ Teachers in this study had at least four years of teaching experience. Some teachers had as many as 20 years of experience. No novice teachers were interviewed. Due to the characteristics of the teachers, it is not possible to determine from this study if years of experience was associated with teacher support for the policy or its implementation.

The box on the Diagram of Teacher Support that indicates ‘previous experience in education’ was not particularly relevant to this study; however, in future studies it may be worth determining if years of experience influences teacher support. This section should not be eliminated, yet in this particular study it was irrelevant.

Additionally, some teachers interviewed mentioned UPE specifically when talking about the background of some students who attend USE schools. Teachers mentioned that students who came from UPE backgrounds were less prepared than their peers who had not attended UPE schools. None of the teachers interviewed had experience working in a UPE school. It is unknown if any teachers have children who attend or attended a UPE school. Therefore, for this study, the section of the Diagram of Teacher Support that says ‘previous experience with UPE’ was not relevant. In future studies of educational policies,

---

4 Teachers with less than 4 years of experience.
however, it may be helpful to assess the teachers’ previous experience with other policies in order to determine if that experience influences their opinions of the policy in question. The section may be adapted, however, to read ‘previous experience with education reform’ when studying other policies in other countries. Based on the results of this study, a new, more parsimonious Diagram of Teacher Support has been created:

**Figure 4** New Diagram of Teacher Support
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The revised Diagram of Teacher Support gives more weight to working conditions than understanding of the policy. It also excludes the section on deployment, but adds a section called ‘teacher perceptions of student welfare’. Additionally the section ‘previous experience with USE’ has been changed to read ‘previous experience with educational reform’ so that it might be applicable in other contexts. This Diagram can be changed and adapted depending on the culture and context of a reform. It may prove to be a useful tool to help policy makers understand teacher support for educational policies in many different contexts.

Implications for Uganda

It is encouraging for the MoES that teachers are generally supportive of the goals of the policy. Teachers’ opinions on the implementation, however, are troubling because teachers are extremely influential in determining the quality of the education offered. The Diagram of USE Policy Success posits the relationship of teacher support to the overall success of the USE policy, and illustrates how teacher support is influential in the success of educational reform. Since the goals of the policy are to increase both access to and quality of secondary education, if quality suffers, USE may not achieve its goals.
As the literature reviewed in Chapter I and Chapter II explains and the Diagram of Policy Success illustrates, the quality of education offered at the classroom level is in large part dependent on how the teachers teach and manage their classrooms (Brophy, 1988; Darling-Hammond, 1999; Fuller, 1999; Michaelowa, 2002; Rockoff, 2004; Hill, Rowan, & Ball, 2005). Fullan (2001) states, “educational change depends on what teachers do and think—it is as simple and as complex as that” (p.115). How the teachers teach will depend on how teachers appropriate the policy in their classrooms. If the teachers do not support the policy, and they are not willing or able to commit to their role in the policy’s implementation, the quality of the education offered to students may be threatened. If quality suffers in USE schools, then USE may not achieve its dual goals of increasing post-primary access and quality.

The stated driving force behind promoting secondary education in Uganda is to decrease poverty. The USE Annual Progress Report (MoES 2008a), which outlines the overall goals of the USE policy states, “USE is necessary to benefit
future economic growth, ensure more equitable access to secondary education for boys and girls, and reduce poverty. It should result in closing the gap between Uganda and other competitor countries in the proportion of the labor force with successfully completed secondary schooling” (p. 42). If the quality of the education the students receive is compromised by the USE policy, however, promoting secondary school may not have the desired outcome of reducing poverty that the Government of Uganda hopes. It is questionable whether access to education without quality is really access (Bergquist, 1995). More students may be receiving a secondary education, yet if the students are not acquiring the skills they need to be productive members of the Ugandan and international workforces, Uganda will continue to be in danger of not meeting the Millennium Development Goal of reducing poverty by 2015, despite the efforts it has made to expand secondary education.

Implications for Education Policy

Although this study specifically examined teacher support for the USE policy in Uganda, the results of the study are far-reaching and can be applied in many different contexts. By understanding which specific characteristics influence why teachers do or do not support a policy, policy makers can provide targeted interventions that address the specific issues the teachers have with new policy. If policy makers are able to successfully address teachers’ concerns prior to implementing a new policy that may affect the teachers’ work life, the policy is more likely to achieve its intended goals.
Depending on the given situation, gaining teacher support may involve educating teachers on the goals of the new policy, providing more professional development opportunities, or purchasing more instructional materials. Yet gaining teacher support may also be more complicated. Depending on the complexity of the policy and how much the teachers perceive a policy impacts their work life, to gain teacher support policy makers may want to consider providing additional monetary incentives, or decreasing teacher workloads. These options may be more complicated, and more costly, but may be necessary to gain teacher support for a new reform. If governments seeking to implement education reforms are committed to improving education, it is important to consider the opinions of the teachers who are called on to implement these reforms. Without incentives, the teachers may not be willing or able to carry out their duties in implementation.

The Diagram of Teacher Support is applicable in many contexts when studying educational policy. It can be modified, as needed, to be as relevant as possible given the cultural considerations and context of the reform.

As the first country in sub-Saharan Africa to undertake a policy of free, universal secondary education, Uganda has the opportunity to be a model for other countries that may be considering implementing similar policies in the near future. If USE is hailed as a success, it could have far reaching implications, particularly for countries in the developing world. If one way to eliminate poverty is to increase access to and quality in secondary schools, and USE can accomplish
that, then similar policies may be undertaken in other countries in Africa and beyond based on the Ugandan model. Conversely, if USE is not hailed as being successful and is criticized for increasing access but adversely affecting quality, Uganda’s USE policy will not be a model for other countries, and the policy may prove to be a waste of time and resources.

**Limitations**

This study had several limitations. First, only teachers from seven of the eight USE schools in Kampala were interviewed. Additionally, participants were not randomly selected to participate in this study.

Because the teachers were not interviewed from other districts or rural areas in Uganda it may be interesting in the future to study teachers in non-USE schools or from other areas of Uganda, both rural and urban. Teachers at USE schools in rural areas may have different perspectives than their Kampala-based colleagues. According to some of the teachers that were interviewed in Kampala, the USE schools in rural areas have been even more impacted by USE than those in Kampala. Although not speaking with teachers in rural schools and in other areas of the country is a limitation, it may cause concern that the USE schools in the district that is considered by the participants to be better served than others are also experiencing many issues. One can only wonder if teachers indicated that the schools in Kampala are overcrowded and under-resourced, what is the situation like for USE schools outside of this district? If the teachers interviewed stated that
conditions are worse in other areas, particularly in rural areas, then knowing the severity of the conditions in the urban capital is troubling.

Future studies may include a larger sample size and examine teacher support for USE in other districts in Uganda, including both rural and urban areas. Another direction for future studies may involve interviewing teachers in both USE and non-USE schools. Speaking with USE and non-USE teachers in Kampala and other areas may provide a more holistic picture of what teacher support looks like in all of Uganda.

**Broader Implications**

In addition to calling attention to the concerns of the teachers in USE schools, this study also illuminates the large and complex issues that can arise when countries seek to implement politically motivated policies. The case of USE shows that when policies are conceived as political tools, and implemented without the infrastructure and finances necessary to ensure they can achieve their intended goals, they may not ultimately succeed. Furthermore, in some instances the reality may be that a policy was not even intended to succeed. When a government implements a politically motivated education policy, the ultimate goal may not be to improve education, rather, to gain votes and maintain appearances.

USE was implemented in 2007 despite warnings from economists that it would be extremely expensive to implement and maintain to control for quality. One of the lessons learned from the UPE policy, implemented in 1997, was that
enrollment rose greatly but came at the cost of quality. The government knew before they implemented the policy that it would be expensive, and that quality might suffer as it had with UPE, yet the policy was implemented anyway. In regard to improving quality, it can be argued that the USE policy was doomed to fail from the onset.

A logical question to ask is: Why did Uganda implement USE despite warnings that there would not be sufficient resources to ensure the policy would achieve its goals? One explanation may be that the policy was never intended to increase both access and quality in secondary schools. USE was a political maneuver conceived during a presidential re-election campaign.

Although the stated goals of USE are to increase both access and quality, in reality perhaps the only goal that was particularly relevant to the Museveni administration was access. By increasing access to secondary education, the Museveni administration could declare that the policy was successful. To outsiders looking in, and to the thousands of parents who were previously unable to enroll their children in school, the increase in access may also appear to be a great success. However, if the ultimate goal of increasing quality in secondary education is still pertinent to the government, the issues illuminated by the teachers will need to be addressed in the future, since teacher support can affect quality.

The USE policy also provides a current example of how short-sighted thinking in policy making can be detrimental. Sometimes by solving one problem
another problem is created in its place. In the case of USE it is clear that access was the goal that received the most focus during implementation. However, by focusing solely on providing more access to schools, the policy created consequences for the teachers, the ‘street-level bureaucrats’ who played a vital role in the school level implementation of the policy. As access rose, teachers’ workloads grew considerably larger and their moral suffered. Also, by stripping the PTAs of their responsibility to supplement the teachers’ incomes, the teachers lost pay, which also greatly affected their morale and subsequently led to their lack of support for the policy. This loss in pay created a perceived inequity between teachers in USE schools and their non-USE teaching colleagues. The increase in workload coupled with a simultaneous decrease in salary left teachers in USE schools feeling as if they were being treated unfairly compared to their colleagues who taught in non-USE schools. The perceived inequity greatly affected teachers’ morale and was another negative, unintended consequence of the policy.

Teachers were not the only people to experience negative, unintended consequences resulting from USE policy. The USE policy took many financial burdens off of the parents, including their responsibility to pay for school lunch. However, by taking this responsibility away from the parents, student welfare inadvertently suffered. When it no longer became the parents’ responsibility to pay the school for lunch, the school lunches disappeared. When the children were no longer fed at school many ceased to be fed at all during the school day. The
parents saved money, yet consequently many children had to attend school feeling hungry and fatigued.

The experience of USE highlights how short-sighted thinking during the planning process can produce negative, unintended consequences. Yet another lesson learned from USE is the importance of involving stakeholders in the policy making process. USE was conceived without the input of the nation’s teachers and had consequences that negatively impacted teachers working in USE schools. It is possible that some of these consequences could have been predicted and avoided if teachers were involved in the policy making process from the onset. For example, teachers likely would have predicted that a dramatic increase in class size would make their jobs exponentially more difficult and sometimes unmanageable. A government official might not understand the dire consequences of having a huge class of students, yet a teacher would know the impact based on personal experience.

Education policy makers in all countries should consider involving teachers in the policy making process, given their role as gatekeepers of educational reform and the ones on whom classroom level implementation ultimately depends. Teacher opinions should be considered before, during, and after the policy is conceived. It is not only important to involve teachers in the policy making process, but also to enlist their advice and support during the policy’s implementation, to determine what is working and what is not. Gaging teacher support after implementation may be too late. If teachers perceive the policy has
negatively impacted their work life and motivation, it may be difficult to fix these problems after the fact. Policy makers should be proactive by seeking teacher advice and counsel early on, to help ensure that a new policy or educational reform receives the support it needs from those on the front lines, the teachers.

Conclusion

Teachers are the gatekeepers of educational reform. In Uganda, however, teachers did not play a role in developing Universal Secondary Education, a large-scale education policy that claims to have twin goals of increasing access to and quality of secondary education. This study was the first of its kind to systematically address the concerns of USE teachers in Uganda. By understanding why teachers support or do not support a policy, policy makers can choose to plan interventions targeting problems that have been addressed by the teachers.

According to the findings in this study, teacher support for the implementation of the USE policy is lacking. There are many strategies the MoES can employ to gain teacher support, if they so choose. Based on the findings of this study, the main problems that can be addressed are increasing teacher remuneration, making workloads more manageable, and providing more instructional resources. Additionally, including teachers in the policy making and evaluation processes can provide valuable insight to the MoES, while simultaneously allowing teachers to feel valued and to allow their voices to be heard.
The reality of USE, four years later, is that access has risen but concerns over quality have emerged. Schools are understaffed, teachers underpaid, and resources are scarce. It remains to be seen whether or not the government of Uganda is interested in rectifying these problems. The USE policy provides an example of how the dilemma between politics and policy can play out. The question Uganda will need to consider in the future is whether or not the goals of increasing education in order to decrease poverty outweigh the goals of advancing the political agenda of the ruling party. Until this dilemma has been addressed, the USE policy may continue to lack the support of teachers necessary to implement the policy, and Uganda may fail to meet the MDG of eliminating poverty by 2015.
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Appendix A

Interview Protocol

Introduction read to participants: Thank you for offering to participate in the study of Teacher Support for Universal Secondary Education in Uganda. This interview will take about one hour. Your answers will be used as part of a dissertation study to understand teachers’ experiences with the USE policy. I will be recording this interview and all of your responses will be kept confidential.

Demographic questions:

1. School demographics
   a. Name of School:
   b. School enrollment
   c. Number of teachers
   d. Average class size
   e. A or O level

2. Name of teacher:
   a. Which courses do you teach?

3. Number of years you have taught?

4. Years at this school:

5. Degree/highest level of education attained:

6. How many courses do you teach per week?

7. Do you have any other jobs at the school?

Interview:

8. Please explain to me what the goals and objectives of USE are and why USE was implemented in Uganda.

9. How successful do you think the policy has been in addressing its goals? Why or why not?

10. How successful do you think the policy has been in its implementation? Why or why not?

11. On a scale of 1-4, with 1 being “Do not support” and 4 being “Greatly support” how would you describe your level of support for the USE policy? For its implementation?
12. How has USE impacted your school?

13. What is your average class size?
   a. What was it before USE?

14. How has your work changed since your school became a USE school?

15. How have you coped with these changes?

16. Do you feel you have the resources you need to teach all the students coming to your school due to USE?

17. What could the Ministry of Education do to make your job easier?

18. Do you plan to continue teaching after this year? For how many more years? Why/why not?

Thank you for your time and help in giving me a greater understanding of your experiences with the USE policy.
Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

Teachers Support for Universal Secondary Education

You are invited to be in a research study of teacher support for USE. You were selected as a possible participant because you are currently a teacher in a USE school. I ask that you read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study. This study is being conducted by Jessica Werner, a graduate student at the University of Minnesota.

Background Information

**The purpose of this study is** to examine teacher support for the USE policy in Uganda. Information provided by teachers that participate will provide knowledge about teachers’ experiences with, and opinions of, the USE policy.

Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview conducted by the researcher.

Risks and Benefits of being in the Study

The study has no risks and no benefits.

Confidentiality:
The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report that may be published, no information will be included that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:
Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

Contacts and Questions
The researcher conducting this study is Jessica Werner. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact her at (612) 270-1108, gray0282@umn.edu. Other questions may be directed to Dr. David Chapman, Jessica’s academic advisor and a professor in Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota, at chapm026@umn.edu, (612) 626-8728.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s), you are encouraged to contact the
Research Subjects’ Advocate Line, D528 Mayo, 420 Delaware St. Southeast, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455; (612) 625-1650.

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.