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Today, there is a solid consensus in the international development community that “country ownership” is essential to promoting sustainable development in developing countries. Many donors also address ownership as essential to improving aid effectiveness. In this context, there have been continuous debates and emphasis on the importance of ownership. Meanwhile, the debates were further accelerated by the “Paris Declaration” to reform aid delivery and country ownership as an aid effectiveness principle.

Despite various attempts to better define ownership, the notion remains unclear and debatable. Furthermore, the development discourse is still largely dominated by international donors. Consequently, the ownership agenda is yet to be fully owned by developing countries – a serious development paradox. In the context of sub-Saharan Africa, clarifying the notion of ownership is especially crucial because weak African ownership is often quoted as a major contributor to disappointing development and aid results in the region.
This study explored the understanding and experiences of country ownership articulated by Tanzanian education stakeholders so as to construct a central notion of ownership in development. The findings reveal that Tanzanians have a vision that places communities and people at the core of national development in determining their own priorities and managing the local development process. Authority, autonomy, and resources are vital elements for effective ownership. The education stakeholders are, however, critical of the state of country ownership as practiced in reality. They cite the lack of decision-making power, control, and needed resources at different levels. Notably, aid dependency is perceived as a major impediment to Tanzanian ownership.

There is a dire need to reconsider the ownership agenda given the apparent discrepancy between the donors’ aspirations for ownership and the reality on the ground. The dissertation argues that national stakeholders should determine what ownership fundamentally means to them and what is required for them to pursue their own decisions. Country positions must be clarified locally through broad-based discussions and reflected in their development and donors’ aid efforts to reinforce confidence and autonomy at the country level. This study also demonstrates that Tanzania has distinct and unique conditions for ownership rooted in its development history.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

“Ownership” has become a central notion of the contemporary development discourse (de Renzio, Whitfield, & Bergamaschi, 2008). While international development paradigms and associated engagements have continued to evolve over the past decades, there is a solid consensus built among the international development community today that ownership is indispensable for long-term sustainable development. From the external donors’ points of view, as discussed by Lancaster (1999), ownership is also an important element to make development assistance more effective. In fact, the term ownership emerged from donor discussions around the effectiveness of development aid, and along the same line, the donor community often expresses its eagerness to ensure ownership of development by aid-recipient countries. Accordingly, as debates on aid effectiveness have progressed, whether or not aid recipients can demonstrate ownership over policy implementation has increasingly become a pertinent question and even a criterion for donor countries and international development agencies in determining aid provision to potential recipients. In this way, ownership has become a frequently used phrase and an inescapable agenda when sustainable development and aid effectiveness are discussed.

Just as international development is highly complex and multidimensional by nature, ownership of development is equally an intricate and profound topic. We tend to assume that we know what ownership refers to and use the term casually in the context of international development. However, as Molina (2007) discussed, we appear to understand ownership differently. As a result, external development partners, including
major donor agencies, have varied views and expectations, and take different approaches to ownership agenda across regions and countries. In recent years, though, given that global discussions and engagements on ownership are largely shaped within the context of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)-led aid effectiveness forums, this particular international initiative has begun to inform the international community regarding how ownership is interpreted, engaged with, and even assessed.

OECD’s aid effectiveness 2014 Progress Report indicates that “country ownership” means that development processes are led by developing countries themselves so that actions are tailored to their specific contexts and needs (OECD, 2014, p. 36). Despite the undebatable importance and recognition of country ownership as essential to facilitating national development, the OECD’s description of ownership remains somewhat limited. Moreover, the current debate in line with the Paris Declaration¹ appears to be still largely driven by the external donor community, not by developing countries – those expected to demonstrate ownership to receive Official Development Assistance (ODA).

Similarly, a fundamental question lingers whether the international development community has reached a genuine consensus on what country ownership implies in reality and is acting accordingly to promote ownership responsive to local needs and complex conditions prevailing in many aid-recipient countries in general. Ironically, empirical cases suggest that the contemporary aid architecture and intensifying external

¹ As a result of the second high level forum on aid effectiveness held in Paris in March 2005, the “Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness” was endorsed by the international development community as a platform to reform aid delivery and management (OECD, 2008b).
intervention rarely allow low-income countries, especially aid-dependent countries in Africa, to take leadership and be in charge of their own development discourses (Easterly, 2006; Fraser & Whitfield, 2009).

Having worked in sub-Saharan African countries for years, I have personally developed a concern about the state of development ownership in the region. Regardless of its indefinite meaning, ownership is a central notion in the field of international development today but has become a source of development paradoxes at the same time. Through my work experiences in sub-Saharan Africa, I have come to learn that ownership is an aspirational rhetoric mostly addressed by aid agencies and creditors, and not yet owned by local stakeholders in the countries where I worked. Now that the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) initiatives are coming to an end, the post-2015 agenda for Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) is eagerly debated in the international arena and aid-recipient country governments are scheduled to set their new development goals and actions for the next 15 years. In this context, country ownership, however it may be interpreted now, is likely to be claimed even more rigorously by the global community. Hence, it is crucial for both aid-providing and -receiving nations to address fundamental predicaments and cope with an ownership agenda that takes into account perspectives and experiences drawn from developing countries themselves.

This study is intended to explore and address aid recipients’ perspectives on ownership in a development context, and then to construct a notion of country ownership in accordance with the ideas and experiences drawn from local stakeholders in a sub-Saharan African country, namely the United Republic of Tanzania (hereafter Tanzania).
Although Tanzania is a republic composed of mainland Tanzania and the islands of Zanzibar, this study exclusively focuses on the mainland.

Today, sub-Saharan Africa encompasses 47 countries, which are located in or south of the Saharan Desert and collectively have a population of approximately 973.4 million (2014) (World Bank DataBank, 2015). Even though almost 50 years have passed since independence, many countries in the region are still highly dependent on international aid. Although Tanzania is not an exception, it is also renowned as a country that has been engaging in harmonization of development activities and relationships with external donors – which many assume should require ownership over related undertakings. Accordingly, the Government of Tanzania is sometimes referred to as significantly strengthening ownership over the development process.

I have worked in the education and the local government sectors in Tanzania for 4 years. During those years, even though I was always mindful of ownership issues, there were rarely opportunities for me to discuss development ownership with Tanzanian colleagues and to fully understand their thinking around the theme. To a large extent, therefore, it has become my personal inquiry and a professional desire to clarify a notion of country ownership with Tanzanian development stakeholders by discussing and extracting views and experiences from them. By constructing the notion themselves, Tanzanians should be better able to drive desirable changes and to make development efforts responsive to their own local contexts and priorities. And thus, the outcome should be ideally more tangible as well. Even if not so, the people should be accountable for whatever they decide to engage in on their own terms.
**Problem: Who Defines “Ownership”?**

Today, the international development community addresses ownership as an essential principle for sustainable development and also as a pertinent element for effective aid delivery. There is no doubt that any sovereign country, regardless of economic status, should determine and lead its own development discourse if development efforts are to generate tangible and sustained results. However, oddly enough, the notion of country ownership remains erratic and indefinite despite its absolute importance. One reason for this persistent elusiveness seems to be that ownership has been mostly defined by external development partners, and it is translated, more often than not, according to their own aid agendas and perspectives. Hence, the definition has remained questionable, especially to local stakeholders in developing nations. Given this paradox, it is not surprising that international donors in general have little understanding of how their client countries and local stakeholders understand and engage in ownership in their local development contexts.

This raises a question that the definition of ownership adopted along with the Paris Declaration may not necessarily or sufficiently reflect the thinking and conditions of aid-dependent countries, many of which are located in sub-Saharan Africa. The same can be said for how developing countries are assessed on their performance with regard to ownership under the Paris Declaration framework. In essence, there is a critical need for the ownership agenda to be reconsidered and discussed by aid-recipient countries and national stakeholders so that their position can be revealed, understood, and reflected in overall development and aid efforts taken at both international and country levels.
In recent years, it has been also increasingly argued that contemporary development and aid discourses are creating severe limitations or even resulting in undermining governments’ ownership rather than supporting it in sub-Saharan Africa (de Renzio et al., 2008; Whitfield et al., 2009). Regardless of indefinite understandings and definitions, therefore, if ownership is indeed weakening, this is a grave concern for the region as well as for the entire development community.

Given the paradoxical reality surrounding ownership in aid-recipient countries, this study examines how local stakeholders in Tanzania, those specifically involved in the education sector, perceive and practice ownership in reality. How local ownership can be ensured and promoted is a fundamental question that needs to be frankly discussed and addressed by the actors who are supposed to be driving national development discourses. In the course of investigation, this study also intends to articulate key elements that influence ownership within the context of education and development. In the end, international debates and engagement concerning country ownership should be primarily driven by developing countries themselves.

**Study Purpose**

The main purpose of this study is to explore the understanding(s) of ownership held by Tanzanians who are concerned with or engaged in education development. The term “education stakeholders” is used to refer to them in this dissertation. Ultimately then, it attempts to construct a notion of country ownership based on local stakeholders’ perspectives and given conditions clarified within the context of education development in Tanzania as an empirical case study in sub-Saharan Africa. While examining understanding(s) of ownership articulated by local education stakeholders, the study
critically analyzes vital elements that characterize ownership and also the current status of ownership in Tanzania. Articulating a country case study of ownership will help illustrate and deepen our insights into the prevailing complexities, diversity, and uniqueness of development issues in a country context in sub-Saharan Africa.

Moreover, the study scrutinizes and discusses what conditions are likely to be necessary for local stakeholders to exercise and manage locally defined ownership in the development discourse. Finally, it also attempts to draw on and address local stakeholders’ perspectives of what aspects should be looked at to assess their ownership, wherever needed, in the context of education development. Additionally, based on the findings on local ownership from a Tanzanian case study, recommendations are made to enhance more legitimate understanding and practices of country ownership at the local level. In the end, the study will provide in-depth, descriptive country experiences with development ownership in Tanzania.

**Study Questions**

In order to fulfill these purposes, the following five questions were framed to guide the study inquiry and my field research. They were posed to elicit local perspectives and practical experiences around ownership from those study participants involved in policy development and implementation processes in the education sector in Tanzania.

Q1. How do Tanzanian education stakeholders understand ownership in development?

Q2. Who are the primary constituents of country ownership over education development discourse?
Q3. In what contexts and how is ownership exercised?

Q4. What are essential elements that influence local ownership?

Q5. How do local stakeholders perceive their own ownership state?

The first question is fundamental to enable us to learn how local stakeholders understand ownership in general and country ownership in the Tanzanian development context. Oddly enough, local perceptions have been rather unknown to us, and so I would speculate that the majority of us working in international aid do not have much knowledge or insight in this respect. The second question is to clarify whom the Tanzanian stakeholders consider to be primary constituents of country ownership in the case of the education sector in Tanzania. Having been involved in decentralized education activities in Tanzania, I sensed that the positioning of ownership might be at lower levels – the community level in particular – as opposed to the central government.

The third question is to recognize and examine which development activity contexts engage local stakeholders’ ownership. For this inquiry, education sector undertakings, commonly conducted in a development process, such as policy making and education planning, were preselected to assess each context in terms of study participants’ perceptions and ownership practice. The fourth question is considered essential to understanding what ownership means to local stakeholders in reality and exploring how ownership can be encouraged and ensured in a more practical manner. The fifth question is intended to provide study participants with a chance to reflect and self-assess the state of ownership over education and development activities. The question helps both the study participants and the researcher to acquire a better insight into inner thoughts around ownership and construct an acceptable notion of ownership in the end.
Rationale

The significance of this study is that it explores and brings local perceptions and experiences of ownership upfront: what ownership means to local stakeholders and what lessons they have for us to learn. In the field of international development, there have been continuous debates and emphasis on the importance of ownership particularly since the 1990s. However, those debates have been mostly driven by external development partners, rather than by local stakeholders in developing countries. It is ironic that the term ownership is yet to be owned by those who should be driving their own development discourses. In the context of sub-Saharan Africa, clarifying the notion of ownership is especially crucial because weak ownership or a lack of ownership is often cited by external aid and credit providers as a major contributor to disappointing development and aid results in the region.

Regardless of the consensus that ownership is essential to generating more tangible results in development, there is no common understanding of who should own what aspects of development and how. Clearly, there is ambiguity around the concept and usage of the term ownership. International donors, who provide ODA to low-income countries, in general lack a full understanding of local conditions and people’s needs in development. And, as Pomerantz (2004) claims, this often results in ineffective development and aid efforts. By the same token, there is a need for the international donor community to learn and appreciate how ownership is perceived, cultivated, and exercised locally in different country contexts in Africa. This study, therefore, attempts to facilitate dialogues with local stakeholders to contemplate the notion of ownership, and extract their views as well as country experiences around the theme. Creating a
A consolidated and clarified notion based on local understandings will be vital to reconsidering the contemporary aid structure and practices and share it with actors engaging in development work. Fundamentally, the aid relationship needs to be reformed by enabling aid recipients to take a stronger lead in the development discourse.

Equally important is that Tanzanian stakeholders working in education and development should explore and become more conscious about the ownership agenda themselves. It is my humble aspiration as an international development practitioner to be able to contribute to promoting this pertinent inquiry and a better understanding among local actors at the individual level through our dialogues and questioning together. This endeavor may lead to a wider and deeper engagement to establish a notion of country ownership that will fit in the Tanzanian development context. Ideally, findings and analytical results presented in this dissertation should stimulate Tanzanians, especially central and local authorities involved in education, to act on their envisioned ownership in development more vigorously.

Finally, now that the international development community is increasingly trying to measure the degree of ownership in aid recipient countries, this study also illustrates ideas expressed by Tanzanian stakeholders regarding what is to be looked at to assess their ownership in development. The discussion will provide food for thought for the international development community to revisit the definition of country ownership adopted along with the Paris Declaration. Addressing serious gaps between rhetoric and reality needs to be continued so as to raise awareness and also appreciation of external development partners about ownership envisioned and practiced by local stakeholders.
and further contribute to possible changes in how they address and approach the ownership agenda.

**Education as a Foundation**

Education is universally perceived as a foundation for human and national development. This is also clearly addressed in the 1977 constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania. At the time of independence, the country’s first president, Julius Nyerere, acknowledged three major challenges to national development: illiteracy, ignorance, and poverty. To cope with these challenges, education was recognized as an essential means to promoting human resource development for the nation. Accordingly, Tanzania has been prioritizing education as a national development agenda since Tanganyika’s independence in 1961.

In more recent decades, Tanzania has been a signatory to the major international development initiatives, namely the MDGs and the Education for All (EFA). Under these international frameworks, the Government of Tanzania has been making continuous efforts to achieve the development and education goals set for the target year of 2015. The country’s Vision 2025 and the National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (NSGPR) – two major policy and strategy documents and frameworks for national development – clearly address education as an instrument for promoting national development. To materialize those addressed aspirations and achieve education goals, the Government of Tanzanian produced the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP) earlier in 1997. Subsequently in 2001, the government abolished school fees for primary education to accelerate Universal Primary Education (UPE), which is a robust political agenda for the national government. As a result of all the endeavors made at different
levels, Tanzania has seen enormous improvements since the early 2000s, especially in expanding access to basic education. In fact, the country is reported to be among those sub-Saharan African states that have made the most outstanding improvements in UPE since 1999 (UNESCO, 2011). Despite this acknowledgement, Tanzania has not attained every MDG and EFA goal before the end of 2015 and is now resetting goals for the post-2015 SDGs.

Today, the Tanzanian people are well aware that education is a primary means for them to realize positive changes in their lives. While development paradigms shift over time, education has remained as a foundation for national development in Tanzania for the last five decades. Education is an integral part of the people and their daily lives. It is closely linked to development issues both at national and individual levels. For this reason, I decided to use education development with the expectation that Tanzanians have familiarity with and also value education, and thus they should be able to contemplate ownership in an education development context with more ease and eagerness.

**Outline of Dissertation**

This dissertation is composed of seven chapters. Following this chapter, Chapter 2 reviews literature to set a broad landscape of country ownership in development settings. It provides the overview on how the term ownership emerged in the field of international development, has been debated, and transitioned over the last two decades. A particular emphasis was placed on reviewing evolving discussions on ownership alongside the international aid effectiveness forums. In addition to the review focusing on ownership in a wider context of aid and development, Chapter 3 looks at key issues related to
ownership and development in the country context of Tanzania. Given that countries in general have diverse country conditions of their own, the chapter highlights some historical and socio-political elements that may account for the state of Tanzanian ownership over development. Then, Chapter 4 exemplifies how the researcher conducted the inquiry of ownership in education as a country case study of Tanzania. It describes the study process, primarily materialized with a qualitative approach, by reflecting on the (1) case study setting, (2) study design, (3) study participants, (4) data analysis, (5) my positioning as a researcher, and (6) limitations.

Chapter 5 presents and discusses the findings of this study carried out through the field survey in Tanzania. The data were collected from Tanzanian education stakeholders who are with central and local government administrations as well as the Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) sector. And, the findings are presented according to the five guiding questions as outlined earlier in this chapter. Chapter 6, on the other hand, reports another set of data collected from an additional survey conducted at the community level with the intention of verifying the outcome generated from the preceding survey. Furthermore, the chapter adds more elements and current issues, derived from consultative discussions with Tanzanians, which were vital in analyzing the study findings in more depth and also necessary to grasp the current landscape of Tanzanian country ownership.

Finally, Chapter 7 digests a central notion of country ownership, described and agreed upon by the local education stakeholders, as a result of mutual interests in the investigation of Tanzanian ownership of development discourse. It also addresses foreseen challenges to realizing the envisioned ownership, and then stipulates key
recommendations for promoting more awareness and legitimate practices of ownership in the context of development.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW – DEVELOPMENT OWNERSHIP

Introduction

This chapter sets a broad background to better understand and discuss the theme of ownership in a development context. In the field of international development and aid, the appearance of the term ownership can be traced back to the mid-1980s. The 1980s was the decade when countries in sub-Saharan Africa struggled with macroeconomic reforms, often associated with the Structural Adjustment Program (SAP), prescribed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. In the end, the 1980s was described as the “lost decade” for Africa given that many countries in the continent were largely drawn into deep economic stagnation and worsened living conditions for their population during the decade.

Since then, it has become indisputable that ownership issues cannot be separated from international aid, more precisely the ODA, to the region and relationships with external donors. Sub-Saharan Africa is, however, a vast and diverse region, and naturally, countries have different development conditions as well as experiences with aid and relationships with development actors. Hence, this chapter provides a backdrop to illustrate the nature of the ODA in general and then how the ownership agenda has been evolving while largely influenced by aid debates and reform efforts. Following the broader review in this chapter on the theme of development ownership, Chapter 3 sets out another pertinent country context focusing on development and aid in Tanzania, a focus of this case study.
Development Aid

Since the ownership agenda is closely related to development aid provided by international donors and financiers, it is necessary to clarify what development aid is. We use a few general terms interchangeably when describing aid provided to countries in need: foreign aid, international aid, and external aid. Following the end of the Second World War, international aid for development began to be practiced first to help war-torn Europe in reconstruction (Riddell, 2009). In 1946, the Bretton Woods institutes, namely the IMF and the World Bank, were also established. The latter’s initial mandate was to provide financial assistance to those countries in need of post-war reconstruction (World Bank, 2016).

In the late 1940s, the notion of aid and international cooperation for development gradually emerged (Riddell, 2007). Around that time, the United Nations (UN) began to advocate such aid, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was also adopted in 1948 (OECD/DAC, 2006). It was only in the mid-1950s, however, that governmental aid began to be more formalized and expand while donors’ attention shifted from reconstruction in Europe to the living standards and well-being in the developing world, including sub-Saharan Africa (Riddell, 2007).

Official Development Assistance (ODA)

In 1961, the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD was established to coordinate and promote development aid provided by donor governments (Riddell, 2007). Fifty years after its establishment with 11 country and organizational

---

2 The Bank’s International Development Association (IDA) was established in 1960 and grew to become the largest agency for concessional lending to low-income nations (Riddell, 2007). The World Bank has 79 IDA borrowers, out of which 39 are in Africa (World Bank, 2010).
members, the OECD/DAC is composed of 29 members today (OECD, 2016a). In addition to bilateral country members, aid forums under the DAC invite multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and the UN agencies. In this respect, the DAC serves as a forum for the international donor community to consult and coordinate among themselves aid policies and efforts for international development. And, the DAC defines official development assistance or ODA as Table 1 indicates:

Table 1: OECD/DAC’s Definition of ODA

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provided by official agencies, including state and local governments, or by their executive agencies; and ii. Each transaction of which: a) is administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective; and b) is concessional in character and conveys a grant element of at least 25 per cent (calculated at a rate of discount of 10 per cent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OECD, 2016b)

In brief, ODA refers to governmental aid, in the form of grants, loans, technical assistance, and debt relief, provided directly or via multilateral organizations to low-income developing countries primarily for economic development and welfare purposes. One distinction in the DAC’s definition of aid is an exclusion of private contributions provided to private foundations and NGOs (Riddell, 2007), which are major players in international development today. ODA data published by the OECD include part of the governmental aid channeled through NGOs, however.

Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Portugal, the UK, the US, and the Commission of the European Economic Community (OECD/DAC, 2006).
Purposes of Aid Provision

In principle, ODA is provided to other countries on a voluntary basis by donor countries (Acharya et al., 2004; Lancaster, 2007). Why do donor governments give development aid to others then? Lancaster (2007) classifies the main purposes of aid provision into the following four categories: diplomatic, developmental, humanitarian, and commercial. In her definition, diplomacy refers to international security and political interests abroad. Examples of diplomatic purposes used by Lancaster (2007) include the use of aid by the United States (US) as a tool to contest the Soviet Union during the Cold War and also an incentive to accelerate peacemaking in the Middle East. France, on the other hand, still maintains political influence over its former colonies and territories partially by using aid (Lancaster, 2007).

Discussing motives for aid-giving, Riddell (2007) presents six main domains that influence donors’ decision making as follows: (1) to help address emergency needs, (2) to assist recipients in achieving their development goals, (3) to show solidarity, (4) to further their own national political and strategic interests, (5) to help promote donor country commercial interests, and (6) to maintain historical ties. In addition, Riddell (2007) indicates that donors make decisions increasingly concerned with global public goods, terrorism, and the human rights records of recipient governments (p. 91).

While donor countries provide humanitarian and emergency relief aid in response to emergency and apolitical reasons, development assistance is operated on a different spectrum. In theory, development aid intends to help low-income countries make needed economic and social progress. In reality, however, as Lancaster (2007) discussed, donor governments tend to determine ODA provisions for reasons and motivations other than
development. Having reviewed different literature, Riddell (2007) characterizes the aid-giving of major donor countries as follows: Nordic countries are more altruistic, while American, British, French, German, and Japanese aid are more driven by economic, political, and security interests.

With the end of the Cold War, bilateral donors eased their political and strategic interests in determining aid provision (Lancaster, 1999). Equally, since poverty re-emerged as a global concern alongside the adoption of the Highly Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative and MDGs by 2000, more attention was redirected to the state of poverty and development in Africa. However, there has been a distinct tendency since the events of September 11 and increasingly in recent years for aid provision to be made with concerns over terrorism. Global security concerns are shifting donors’ rationale of aid provision back to a pursuit of geostrategic interests. Woods (2007) further argues that aid for human development is even at risk due to rapidly increasing aid channeled to new security imperatives after the September 11 attack.

Along with the growing security concern on a global scale, international aid is increasingly discussed by the Group of 8 (G8) as well. This has a significant implication; the world’s most economically powerful nations recognize foreign aid and also, to a large extent, African development as a critical agenda and make aid available in a more coordinated manner. In essence, although aid-giving rationale is deemed to be a mixture of various intricate factors, official aid provision for development is primarily driven by donor countries’ political interests and to a lesser degree, but increasingly, influenced by collective political and strategic concerns. Thus, development aid is hardly neutral.
Debates on Country Ownership

Ineffective Aid in Sub-Saharan Africa

Behind the emergence of the term ownership was a growing recognition in the early 1990s that external aid had been largely ineffective in promoting growth and reducing poverty, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa (Lancaster, 2007; Riddles, 2007; Van de Walle & Johnston, 1996). Despite substantially increased official aid in the 1970s and macroeconomic reforms in the 1980s (Riddell, 2007), the state of development and poverty mostly remained the same or even became worse in a number of countries when the SAP regime ended in the early 1990s (Lancaster, 2007). Aid fatigue seriously affected those who had long provided development aid to countries in Africa but had not seen major improvements in the state of development and poverty (Lancaster, 1999; Pomerantz, 2004). With dramatically changing post-Cold War geopolitics and a deepening economic recession in the industrialized world, ODA continued to decline in volume during the 1990s (Lancaster, 1999).

It was in this context that discussions within the international donor community increasingly focused on reforming aid policies, instruments, and relationships with recipient countries, especially with those in sub-Saharan Africa. These discussions took place as an attempt to generate more tangible results from limited aid funding for international development (Lancaster, 1999). “There is a pressing need for more sustainable results and poverty reduction in Africa,” described Pomerantz (2004, p. 2). In this statement, Pomerantz meant the need to improve aid effectiveness felt by those working in development. Thus, poverty reduction in Africa and improving aid
effectiveness became a central concern among ODA providers from the mid-1990s onwards.

Along these lines, the donor community began to assert that ownership should be a prerequisite for promoting development together with a new partnership to be built with recipient countries. The notion of ownership practically emerged from the discourse in which donors keenly debated the necessity to improve effectiveness of their assistance to those in need. And, one can understand that the term ownership was a creation closely associated with poor performance of development assistance, as aid to sub-Saharan Africa particularly, and with the needs driven by the supply side. As a consequence, developing countries were rather excluded from the discourse on their own ownership issues when the subject arose for debate in the 1990s.

Conceptual Discussions

Along with the supply sides’ debates on aid, development practitioners and some academics began to discuss conceptions of ownership. In Improving Aid, Van de Walle and Johnston (1996) specified a lack of recipient ownership as one critical deficiency in the disappointing aid performance in Africa. Within this context, the authors imply that recipient governments and beneficiaries need to have a sense of owning development aid projects and programs in order to improve their performance in development. In more detail, Lancaster and Wangwe (2000) stated in Managing a Smooth Transition from Aid Dependence in Africa, “Ownership of aid programs and projects refers to the sense of engagement and responsibility on the part of individuals and groups in recipient countries for making aid-funded activities work” (p. 32). Helleiner (2001), who examined and assessed aid relationships in Tanzania in the mid-1990s, described country ownership as:
“Tanzania takes the lead and Tanzania fully owns the development cooperation programmes in terms of planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation” (p. 3).

In *African Economic Development: Cooperation, Ownership, and Leadership*, Johnson (2007) discussed ownership as a sense of owning development programs but at the same time stressed that the essence of ownership is the acceptance of full responsibility for the consequences of a development program. He notably suggested that ownership should encompass responsibility for consequences in development undertakings by countries. Then, Riddell (2007) argued in *Does Foreign Aid Really Work?* that immediate reasons for failures of foreign aid centered on recipient governments’ commitment to, and ownership of, activities and processes in building capacities and strengthening institutions. The author thus made a distinction between recipients’ commitment and a sense of ownership. This view may suggest that recipient-country governments may not necessarily have a sense of ownership even when the governments are committed to implementation. Possibly in a similar line, Molina (2007) pointed out in “The Ownership – Conditionality Paradox” that ownership is often understood by donor agencies as aid recipients’ adherence to a set of policies and reforms promoted by donors. This view of ownership is quite critical and should be addressed because it implies a double standard of the term ownership used by donors: rhetorical usage and actual expectation. This is exactly the point where my study problem lies.

Although various literatures have dealt with ownership since the term became aid rhetoric in the 1990s, it remains somewhat variable. It appears, however, that most of the earlier literature entails recipient country governments’ sense of ownership and/or
commitment to development programs and projects initiated and supported by external donors. As reviewed later in this chapter, since the aid effectiveness forum began to discuss and define ownership in 2005, more attempts have resulted in addressing and attempting to clarify ownership in more depth since then. Accordingly, there are more critical views and insights when discussing what ownership is in the context of development and aid.

This way, ownership in the context of development has received growing attention and been contemplated with a spectrum of international aid, and is primarily shaping the perceptions of external donors. Nevertheless, without a clear definition and a collective consensus, it is still ambiguous what exactly and whose ownership the term implies. Significantly and ironically, what has not been changed around the usage of ownership is that the ownership agenda is still disputed mostly by donors and from their perspectives.

**Debates on Aid Effectiveness**

At the turn of the new century, the global development community adopted the MDGs and the reframed EFA goals as major development and education targets for developing counties to achieve by 2015. Following the endorsement of the MDGs in 2000, mobilization of necessary funding became a grave concern for the international community engaging in development and poverty reduction efforts on a global scale. When international financiers gathered in the UN-led Financing for Development Conference in Monterrey, Mexico in 2002, an additional US $50 billion in ODA was estimated to be required per year to meet the MDGs, and it was accordingly agreed to
mobilize the required financing from more diversified sources (Lancaster, 2007; Riddell, 2007).

Responding to the dire need for aid financing to accelerate the efforts, the G8 also agreed in Gleneagles, Canada in 2005 that ODA provision, specifically for sub-Saharan Africa, would be doubled from US $25 billion to $50 billion a year by 2010 (OECD, 2010). As the commitment for supporting indebted low-income countries was reaffirmed, the international donor community asserted it would take decisive measures discussed earlier in the 1990s by harmonizing efforts to reform development and aid discourse. Thus, along with mounting global development challenges, aid effectiveness became an even more keenly debated agenda at the turn of the new millennium.

To determine the way forward, the High Level Forum on Harmonization was held in Rome in 2003. This forum was the first attempt to mobilize the global development community, both donors and developing countries, to discuss the aid effectiveness agenda together. The major outcome of the Rome Forum was to reach a broad consensus as the “Rome Declaration on Harmonization” to enhance harmonization of operational policies, procedures, and practices of different development organizations with those of partner country systems. Fundamentally, the consensus had to be reached in order to reduce transaction costs for developing country governments and to improve effectiveness of aid delivery, and thereby contribute to meeting the MDGs (OECD, 2008b).

Since then, a series of international forums on aid effectiveness followed: the Paris Forum in 2005, the Accra Forum in 2008, and the Busan Forum in 2011. Among them, the most notable is the High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, held in Paris in
March 2005, which set a broad framework to discuss, implement, and monitor actions to improve aid effectiveness in developing countries. Importantly, the term ownership began to be referred to more widely and collectively as country ownership along with these international forums on aid effectiveness.

**Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness**

The Paris Forum intended to intensify discussions concerning aid effectiveness. As a result of this particular forum, the international development community, represented by more than 100 nations and major international organizations, adopted the “Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness” as a platform to reform aid delivery and management (OECD, 2008b). In Paris, participating nations and organizations agreed to develop a genuine partnership between donors and aid recipients, so-called partner countries, while ensuring the latter countries will be in charge of their own development processes (OECD 2008b).

Within the Paris Declaration, five core principles are identified in the delivery of effective aid as follows: (1) ownership, (2) alignment, (3) harmonization, (4) managing for results, and (5) mutual accountability. The Declaration is grounded on these principles as described in Table 2. In relation to ownership, the Paris Declaration is a cornerstone on the grounds that country ownership was recognized as a principle of aid effectiveness, and this appeared to become a turning point where development actors at large, including aid recipients as well as non-state actors, began to take the ownership agenda more seriously. In the declaration, ownership is defined as effective [national] leadership over countries’ development policies and strategies, and coordination of development actions as described in Table 2 (OECD, 2008b).
Table 2: Five Principles for Aid Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ownership</td>
<td>Partner countries exercise effective leadership over their development policies and strategies, and coordinate development actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alignment</td>
<td>Donors base their overall support on partner countries’ national development strategies, institutions, and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Harmonization</td>
<td>Donors’ actions are more harmonized, transparent, and collectively effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Managing for results</td>
<td>Managing resources and improving decision making for development results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mutual accountability</td>
<td>Donors and partners are accountable for development results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(OECD, 2008b)

Furthermore, the international community also agreed to monitor country ownership to assess progress in aid effectiveness in aid-recipient countries worldwide. In line with the five principles, the Paris Declaration set out 56 specific commitments for both donors and developing countries to attain a set of targets by 2010. It also identified 12 key indicators to measure progress. According to the definition of ownership adopted under the Paris Declaration, country ownership is considered strong when countries have operational development strategies, such as Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS), that have clear strategic priorities linked to a Mid-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and are reflected in annual fiscal budgets of national governments (OECD, 2008b).

As far as ownership is concerned, the international development community set the target to be attained by 2010 as follows: at least 75% of partner countries have operational development strategies. To this end, three commitments for partner countries and one for their donors are specified as indicated in Table 3. The second commitment
listed for the former is designated to be one of the 12 indicators to assess overall progress of the Paris Declaration implementation (OECD, 2008b).

Table 3: Commitments to Ensure Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner countries commit to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Exercise leadership in developing and implementing their national development strategies through broad consultative processes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Translate these national development strategies into prioritized results-oriented operational programmes as expressed in medium-term expenditure frameworks and annual budgets (Indicator 1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Take the lead in co-ordinating aid at all levels in conjunction with other development resources in dialogue with donors and encouraging the participation of civil society and the private sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donors commit to:

4) Respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it.

(OECD, 2008b, p. 3)

Despite anticipated challenges, the implementation of the Paris Declaration was expected to steer commitment and capacity of aid-recipient countries in leading development process. In this respect, Van de Walle (2014) declares, “Country ownership was the corner stone concept of the Declaration” (p. 53).

**Accra Agenda for Action**

Subsequently, another high-level forum was held in Accra, Ghana in September 2008. The main purpose of this forum was to review the implementation of the “Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness” since its endorsement in 2005. Prior to the Accra Forum, a 2008 monitoring survey was conducted in 55 countries to collect evidence and consolidate an overview on the implementation of 56 commitments adopted in the Paris Forum (OECD, 2008b). The survey highlighted the following findings: Some good
progress was made; however, progress varied among partner countries and donors; notably, a large number of aid-recipient countries improved their management of public funds; and donor partners also improved coordination at the country level. Despite the progress made since the Paris Forum, the 2008 monitoring survey concluded that the overall progress was too slow and uneven to reach the targets by 2010 (OECD, 2008b). Progress on the ownership agenda was also rather limited – only 20% of the partner countries were assessed to have operational development strategies – as compared to the 2010 target of 75% (OECD, 2008b).

Based on these survey findings and country experiences shared, the Accra Forum concluded that the following three challenges ought to be addressed to accelerate the progress in aid effectiveness: (1) furthering country ownership, (2) building more effective and inclusive partnerships, and (3) achieving development results through mutual accountability (OECD, 2008b). In closing the forum, the international community agreed on taking concrete and monitorable actions, the Accra Agenda for Actions, to intensify collective efforts to improve aid delivery.

In relation to the progress on ownership, Van de Walle (2014) explains that donors worked on an ownership agenda mostly through two distinctive aid modalities: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and direct budgetary support. The implication of this statement is that donors largely attempted to respond to their ownership commitment through the adoption of their partner country’s development strategy implementation arrangements, often described as PRS process, and the country systems. Along the same line, budgetary support is generally considered as a preferred modality that enables recipient-country governments to allocate budgets according to their policy
priorities. At the time of the 2008 monitoring survey, progress in this respect was still limited although donors were substantially shifting aid modalities to budgetary support and away from project support, which is, more often than not, perceived as donor-driven.

**Broadening Conception of Country Ownership**

Another notable development at the time of the Accra Forum was that the international development community recognized the necessity of widening the understanding of country ownership. “Discussions on the principle of ownership by partner countries are being more and more cast in terms of democratic ownership, emphasizing that consultative processes need to become more inclusive,” noted the OECD (OECD, 2008a, p. 24).

It is equally noteworthy that the OECD’s Aid Effectiveness Progress Report addressed the complexity involved in realizing the Paris Declaration principles, especially democratic ownership in aid-recipient countries. This is because such ownership requires a shift of power most notably from donors to recipients in the aid relationship but also within recipient countries between different parts of the government and towards civil society (OECD, 2008a, p. 25). Despite some encouraging results in strengthening country ownership, due to the nature of challenges involved, it was concluded that accelerated progress in the Paris Declaration would require much higher political commitment and leadership in both donors and partner countries while it does not yet have enough political resonance (OECD, 2008a).

The OECD Progress Report (2008a) outlines major lessons emerging so far in strengthening country ownership. First, as mentioned above, the Paris Declaration dialogue broadened the understanding of country ownership and recognized that tackling
this particular principle is much less technical than political in nature. Despite this pertinent recognition, however, the OECD cautions that stronger demand for reform from wider national stakeholders, e.g., parliaments, civil society, and the broader public, may take some time to evolve in partner countries (OECD, 2008a). Second, it has become clear that many countries and donors feel that there is a lack of clarity in the definition of ownership and that its measurement has limitations for capturing reality on the ground. Third, there has been a wider recognition that institutions in developing countries do not operate as those in OECD countries and that more insights are needed to analyze governance and what promotes and inhibits country ownership. Fourth, efforts to strengthen ownership are taking the governance agenda to new directions, most of which involve intensified support for capacity development in such areas as strengthening civil society, and tax and revenue mobilization (OECD, 2008a, p. 36-37).

Thus, the aid effectiveness forum proposed to widen the understanding of country ownership so as to encourage more inclusive participation by national actors other than central governments. In this way, the new term, “democratic ownership,” emerged from the Accra Forum. Notably, behind this important development was the intervention of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in dialogues on aid effectiveness. In fact, the High Level Forum in Accra was commended on the grounds that it had become a more open forum accommodating active participation of non-state stakeholders, CSOs in particular. It should be also noted, however, that the definition of ownership remained as partner countries’ owning [operational] development strategies.
Critiques of Definitions and Assessment of Ownership

Prior to the Accra Forum, a group of European CSOs, Alliance 2015, carried out country studies to examine the status of the five principles of the Paris Declaration. Among the examined cases, the Ghana study raised a concern with the limited interpretation of country ownership. The country study critically argued that Ghana’s context of ownership was mostly concerned with relational negotiations between the government and the two international finance institutions, namely the IMF and the World Bank, around the PRS process that was described as partially inclusive (Akwetey, 2007).

On one hand, the government and its development partners have been working toward better harmonization and alignment in line with the Joint Assistance Strategy. On the other hand, donors continued to exert significant influence over setting development priorities and targets under the agreed performance assessment framework by using conditionality (Akwetey, 2007).

Based on its study findings, InterAction, another CSO member of Alliance 2015, raised questions concerning the donor community’s rhetorical emphasis on country ownership and proposed actions to be taken specifically by the US government to support ownership. In “Country Ownership: Moving from Rhetoric to Action,” InterAction defines country ownership as “The full and effective participation of a country’s population via legislative bodies, civil society, the private sector, and local, regional and national government in conceptualizing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating development policies, programs and processes.” (InterAction, 2011, p. 2). Furthermore, InterAction (2011) critically points out that donors as a whole tend to seek results in the
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4 Ghana Joint Assistant Strategy (G-JAS) was prepared jointly by the Ghanaian government and development partners to effectively coordinate development undertakings in the country.
short term although the process for building country ownership is to be a long-term process.

The emerging concept of democratic ownership clearly implies that ownership should be consultative and ensure the participation of wider national stakeholders other than central governments. To some extent, these aspects have been already encompassed in the definition of country ownership adopted under the Paris Declaration. Yet, as Van de Walle (2014) highlights, the specified commitments for the ownership agenda are technically problematic in terms of measurement: (1) The designated indicator – Indicator 1 (see Table 3) – is to assess countries’ operational strategies by the extent to which a national government manages integrating strategic objectives and costing into its development strategy framework, and (2) Indicator 1 does not allow much consideration to be made regarding national stakeholders’ participation in the process. As already addressed by the Paris Declaration progress report (OECD, 2008a), the measurement is obviously restricted in capturing the reality on the ground.

**Busan Forum**

The fourth forum on aid effectiveness was organized in Busan, South Korea in November-December 2011. Concerning ownership, the Busan Forum further reaffirmed the aspects of inclusiveness of all stakeholders, including both state and non-state actors, to play differential roles in improving effectiveness of cooperation toward sustainable development – the end goal of collective commitments. In this line, the principle of ownership was reemphasized as vital to ensure successful partnerships for lasting and inclusive development that has to be led by developing countries and to be tailored to country-specific situations and needs (OECD, 2011).
Thus, aid effectiveness partners collectively agreed on the commitment to deepen, extend, and operationalize democratic ownership over development policies and processes through the forum in Busan (OECD, 2011, p. 3). Democratic ownership implies ownership beyond national governments and inclusive of parliaments, local governments, and civil society. It is important to note that the Busan Forum statement of December 2011 did not refer to country ownership but instead described “democratic ownership” by countries.

Another outcome from the Busan Forum worth noting is that the international development community agreed to set up an inclusive forum, “Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation,” in order to continuously monitor the implementation of commitments for aid effectiveness and also to accelerate global efforts to achieve 2015 MDGs at political level (OECD, 2011). As a voluntary and multi-stakeholder forum, Global Partnership provides a platform to ensure that development cooperation is to be based on the principles and commitments reassured at the Busan Forum and also to further strengthen global partnership for a post-2015 agenda for sustainable development. In 2015, Global Partnership was co-chaired by the ministers from Mexico, the Netherlands, and Malawi (GPE, 2015).

**Progress on Ownership Agenda**

Since the aid effectiveness targets were set for 2015 as the final year under the Paris Declaration framework, recent undertakings and progress on aid effectiveness were assessed in 2014. The Aid Effectiveness Progress Report 2014, produced by the OECD together with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), affirmed once again that the definition of country ownership should be broadened and more concerned with
roles and contributions of different stakeholders, including CSOs and the private sector, and no longer exclusively focusing on central governments (OECD/UNDP, 2014). The expression of democratic ownership, which emerged at the time of the Accra Forum and replaced country ownership at the Busan Forum, does not appear in the latest aid effectiveness report, however.

In the Progress Report 2014, country ownership is described as follows: “Country ownership means that country processes are led by developing countries themselves so that actions are tailored to their particular contexts and needs.” (OECD/UNDP, 2014, p. 36). Although technical issues still remain in terms of the measurement of such ownership, it is noteworthy that the last decade has seen historic attempts in thinking and defining country ownership on a global scale. As the 2014 report makes explicit, development actors acknowledge that country ownership is more complex and profound than central government’s ability to manage aid and aid relationships.

As far as aid effectiveness forums are concerned, however, caution is still required because ownership is understood as a means to make aid delivery more effective. It notably suggests that defining and assessing ownership remains on the side of donors. With this understanding in mind, the donor community now advocates that external partners should align their intervention with country policies, priorities, and systems to support ownership of their partner countries. Accordingly, the following indicators were adopted to assess country ownership at the time of the 2014 assessment: (1) Development co-operation focuses on results that meet developing countries’ priorities, (2) Aid is on budgets that are subject to parliamentary scrutiny, (3) Effective institutions – developing countries’ systems are strengthened and used, and (4) Aid is untied. The Progress Report
2014 claims that these indicators have been adopted based on some evidence that development assistance can encourage developing countries’ motivation to strengthen capacity and improve accountability for sustainable institutions when donor assistance is aligned with developing countries’ priorities and systems (OECD/UNDP, 2014).

The 2014 assessment results were consolidated based on the data gathered from 46 countries. In short, the progress report concluded that the overall results are mixed globally. As far as the ownership principle is concerned, however, country ownership continues to strengthen while the status as a whole was reported to be stagnant and behind the Paris Declaration target of 2015. To a large extent, the adopted indicators for ownership assessed aid providers’ performance in supporting country systems, alignment, and untied aid. Based on the outcome, the Progress Report 2014 made an argument that the maintained level of commitment for ownership should be understood as evidence to suggest that collective effort is likely to pay off in a long run in strengthening country systems and capacity, taking into account the latest progresses made despite the unfavorable aid conditions prevailing in many donor countries in recent years (OECD/UNDP, 2014). At the same time, more multi-stakeholder country dialogues are necessary, says the report, to further promote alignments with country priorities and systems (OECD/UNDP, 2014).

As for the broadened understanding of ownership – democratic ownership – under the aid effectiveness forums, a clear limitation remains in that the indicators to assess ownership can hardly look into evolitional aspects of ownership; the indicators still focus on performance of central governments and do not concern other national stakeholders. Moreover, there is still a fundamental question of whose priorities and strategies they are
when referring to country-owned priorities and strategies. In the case of Tanzania, for example, Harrison, Mulley, and Holton (2009) made an argument that there was no ownership of the PRSP outside of the Ministry of Finance. In the case of education as well, the same researchers discussed that there was little ownership of the Primary Education Development Program (PEDP) developed by the Ministry of Education while the process was largely driven by donors who in fact owned the PEDP (Harrison, Mulley, & Holton, 2009).

It has been 10 years since the Paris Declaration was adopted to improve effectiveness of aid delivery. This international initiative has successfully drawn much more attention and aspiration than ever before to promote country-owned development processes. However, the overall progress made so far has been challenging and mixed as the 2014 assessment concluded. As far as ownership is concerned, the aid effectiveness forums probably established the definite status of ownership as a development principle. Equally important is that the past 10 years of global attempts led to confirming once again that country ownership is extremely difficult to define and measure, and that continued efforts to do so cannot be isolated from issues related to the aid structure as well as relationships between aid-recipient countries and their donor partners.

**Attempts to Frame Ownership**

The aid effectiveness initiatives have so far reaffirmed the undeniable fact that development ownership is a complex and challenging concept and has not been fully agreed upon for its translation and practices. Despite some collective efforts made in line with the Paris Declaration, country ownership still remains a domain in need of continued discussion and scrutiny. Outside of the aid effectiveness fora, however, there have been
some attempts to clarify and assess country ownership from different angles over the past decade.

**True Ownership – Government’s Capacity for Policy Autonomy**

Having asserted that excessive aid dependency limits developing countries from exercising policy autonomy, Ohno, Shimomura, Ohno, and Nagasu (2005) questioned the notion of “true ownership” from the perspectives of recipient governments. For true ownership, the following three dimensions are said to be important: (1) goal of aid – a recipient government’s aid exit plan, (2) scope of ownership – capacity to manage relationships with donors as well as policy autonomy, and (3) creativity of ideas – capacity to choose from alternative policy prescriptions. The authors examined the extent of ownership exercised by three Southeast Asian countries: Thailand, Vietnam, and Cambodia. Among the three study cases, Thailand is reported to have demonstrated strong ownership and capacity in all the dimensions. Vietnam is capable of managing donor relationships while the policy management is said to be weak. On the other hand, Cambodia is rather weak in all aspects due to its excessive dependency on aid and external donors as well as a constrained capacity in public administration.

The argument presented by Ohno et al. (2005) raises a pertinent question concerning the concept of ownership and a government’s capacity to exercise it. According to her argument, true ownership refers not only to political will and commitment to policy reform but also requires the central government’s capacity to manage policy choice and aid relationships. With this understanding of ownership, it is highly likely that many sub-Saharan African countries do not possess strong ownership with capacity in all the dimensions concerned. Yet, the authors exemplify Botswana as a
case of true ownership. The country used to be aid dependent at the time of independence but has been successfully managing policy choices and external as well as internal resources to minimize aid dependence for the last decades. With the ownership dimensions prescribed by Ohno et al., Botswana is an exceptional case of strong ownership demonstrated by the central government in sub-Saharan Africa.

**Leadership Willingness and Commitment**

The Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) and African Union (AU) discussed and assessed what country ownership means and how it could be operationalized within the context of poverty reduction, more specifically that of African engagements with PRSP process. Their exploration stems from one key lesson that policies and programs that are owned by people and their governments stand better chances of success in reducing poverty and achieving development (Mukandala, 2006, p. 3).

Within this context, it is stressed that successful ownership is primarily meant to be leadership willingness and commitment to policy and program implementation. Leadership is an essentially political process in which contested values are identified, articulated, and allocated, and thus leadership should be comprised of power and trust (Mukandala, 2006). For policy and programs to be owned by the people and the government, Mukandala (2006) argues that accountability of leadership is required in the following areas to maintain public interest and participation, in other words, trust in the process: political accountability, administrative (or bureaucratic) accountability, financial accountability, legal constitutional accountability, professional accountability, and external accountability (accountability of external agencies) (p. 3).
Having reviewed some country cases with the PRS processes, the ECA-AU discussion concluded that willingness and commitment, in their definition of country ownership, vary in degrees across African countries, which is in part a result of each country’s political economy. It is claimed that willingness to lead the process exists where the leadership has a strong political base and a high degree of legitimacy. Interestingly, it was also indicated that PRSs have been well accepted in countries where the leadership is already converted to the virtues of economic liberalization and a free market economy (Mukandala, 2006, p. 17). Although this argument of country ownership is rather limited in the sense that it only focuses on the PRS process, it well presents an attempt of framing ownership and discussing pertinent issues in the context of African development.

It should be cautioned, however, that the general understanding of ownership as commitment or leadership ignores how the policies were chosen and whose preferences are reflected in the policy choices. This is a very critical point not to be ignored, especially in the context of Africa, where donors have been largely dominant in policy discourse by using policy conditions for development aid and debt relief.

**Government’s Control over Policy Process and Outcome**

In examining country ownership in the context of sub-Saharan Africa, de Renzio et al. (2008) defined ownership as a degree of control that aid recipient governments are able to exercise over policy design and implementation. The authors argue that measuring the degree of ownership of African governments and distinguishing what is country-owned and what is donor-driven is extremely complicated (de Renzio et al., 2008). As frequently pointed out and as I have also witnessed in some African countries, donors
often play dominant roles in initiating, shaping, and determining policy formation and implementation in their recipient countries (Whitfield & Maipose, 2008). The researchers also claim that “Widespread deference to ownership disguises the fact that the concept of ownership] is endorsed as an aspiration by actors with quite different views about how the aid system should be reformed, and they use it to describe quite different phenomena” (Fraser & Whitfield, 2008, p. 4). Because of the controversy of donor dominance over policy discourse as well as varied interpretations, de Renzio et al. (2008) stress that ownership should be understood as control over policy process and outcomes, not simply as commitment and leadership in the pre-determined policy process.

When ownership is understood as control over policy process and outcome, the researchers argue that recipient countries in sub-Saharan Africa have little ownership (Fraser & Whitfield, 2008). This claim stems from a cross-country research conducted between 2005 and 2007 by the same group of researchers to examine the factors accounting for country ownership – or in the case of their research, aid negotiation power. In this study, eight sub-Saharan African countries – Botswana, Ethiopia, Rwanda, Ghana, Mali, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Zambia – were analyzed as case studies in order to grasp how each country’s political, economic, ideological, and institutional conditions have shaped the government’s relationship with donors and aid practices within each country’s context. It is recognized that these structural conditions have largely influenced recipients’ aid negotiation power, another account of ownership.

Based on their study analysis, the eight countries are arranged on a scale ranging from strongest to weakest in their ability to control their policy agenda and implemented outcomes. Botswana is reported to be at the top of the scale for the greatest control or
ownership while Ethiopia ranks the second. Rwanda is placed in the middle of strong and weak ownership. The remaining five countries are grouped as the weakest in control at the opposite end of the scale. The study exemplifies that Botswana and Ethiopia are characterized by advantageous structural conditions, which shaped their governments’ negotiating strategies while both governments also played a decisive role in translating these favorable conditions into negotiating capital (Whitfield, 2009). These study findings imply that the two countries’ strong ownership resulted from each country’s supportive structural conditions as well as certain traits of the national governments. It is remarkable and encouraging that these two African governments have been able to manage external aid and aid relationships rather than being managed by external donors and creditors regardless of the volume of ODA.

On the opposite end of the scale, the researchers found that the weakest ownership performing governments share the following common characteristics influencing negotiation power. First, the five country governments have tended to accommodate external intervention because policy negotiation is likely to be permanent. Thus, they opt to be subordinate to financiers so as to minimize the risk of losing finance but at the same time to maximize their own control over the country’s policy agenda. Interestingly, the researchers claim the reason for this subordinate position is a similarity in experiences of the countries in relationships with the IMF and the World Bank since the 1980s (Whitfield, 2009). Second, fragmented policy making and budgeting/planning structures in the countries also diffused governments’ overall control in negotiations with donors. Lastly, some African governments have developed intimate relationships with donors, and their political systems appear to be dependent on external aid to maintain their power.
(Whitfield, 2009). In essence, those five governments have shared their control over policy processes due to the following dimensional factors: political legitimacy, institutionally fragmented policy and aid management, and political dependence on aid. Due to these factors, the researchers dispute that in poor ownership-performing countries the central governments do not have enough incentives to risk losing aid and compromise in choosing joint-policy processes with external donors and creditors.

**Country Ownership – Case of Tanzania**

The same group of researchers examined the case of Tanzania in view of the central government’s control over aid negotiations with external donors. The investigation concluded that Tanzania’s ownership is rather limited on the grounds that the government’s control has been practiced mostly in managing aid and relationships with external donors and also that ownership is practiced by certain groups, not by the government as a whole (Harrison, et al., 2009). According to their study findings, the Tanzanian aid management system significantly changed from the one based on donor-dominated conditionalities and project ownership to a partnership between the government and its external partners. And, how the partnership functions has kept Tanzanian ownership politically dynamic (Harrison, et al., 2009). As far as aid is concerned, however, Tanzanian politics has opted to seek consensus on most issues with donors, not taking decisive positions. Yet, the researchers perceive the Tanzanian case as unique because ownership has been promoted through close relationships with external donors despite the country’s high dependency on aid and its donors (Harrison, et al., 2009).
While Tanzania has strengthened ownership in aid coordination and relationship, aid negotiation is a highly political process, and for that matter, the Tanzanian government probably tends to conform to financiers priorities in order to secure development finance. As pointed out by Harrison et al. (2009), the government is well aware of what is likely to be accepted by donors and creditors in the development process, which has probably made Tanzania a donor darling or a good adjuster but at the same time diminished its control to fully negotiate with external donors over policies and development program choices.

Control over policy process as well as aid negotiation, as reviewed above, is one way of looking at ownership that goes beyond the conventional understanding of leadership or commitment of recipient governments in implementing donor-funded development programs. Policy process and aid negotiation, though still broad areas, are apparently legitimate examples to suggest where ownership can be performed and demonstrated by central governments as opposed to the prevailing donor dominance in the development discourse, especially in contemporary policy dialogue, in sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover, these understandings and interpretations probably reflect a growing trend over the last decade in which donor intervention has shifted primarily from their parallel project-design and implementation to policy processes at large, which the international development community today claims to be country-led. Ironically, however, donors as a whole are intensifying their intervention in policy process through more harmonized development and aid arrangements at country level. And, this has increasingly become the source of development paradoxes, troubling various sub-Saharan African countries. Tanzania is not the exception in that respect.
What Is the Major Issue Behind the Ownership Debates?

Many of us, working in the field of international development, think that we know what ownership refers to and are in agreement on its meaning. However, as the previous literature review sections reveal, ownership is an extremely complex theme. Especially when it is described as country ownership, a critical question arises around whose ownership this is truly about. All these considered, it is not surprising that actors in development have different understandings and expectations as regards ownership. Thus, the notion still remains elusive all this time despite a firm consensus that ownership is indispensable in the context of development.

Molina (2007) discusses the contradiction associated with the concept of ownership and points out that “Ownership has often been understood by development agencies as government adherence to a set of policies and reforms which are not necessarily home-grown but rather imported” (p. 3). He goes on to argue that this understanding of ownership reproduces the power imbalances in donor-recipient relationships. As he may also suggest, there is an implication that relationships in aid are imbalanced by nature and that donors are likely to support recipients’ ownership only to the extent that they can remain involved in policy making in their recipient countries. On the part of country governments, however, they should be able to exercise their full autonomy over policy determination and outcomes derived from policy implementation. Rhetorically, they would not be directed or conditioned to certain policy choices by external donors. However, it is evident that many sub-Saharan African governments rarely object to donors and conform to policy conditions externally determined for them (de Renzio et al., 2008; Whitfield & Maipose, 2008).
Consequently, despite the aspiration contained in the rhetoric as well as the endeavors made by the international development community under certain initiatives, I would argue that promotion of ownership is largely ruled and often undermined by the same donors who claim recipients’ ownership over the development process. As also disputed by de Renzio et al. (2008), under the contemporary aid system, country ownership is constrained rather than strengthened in aid-dependent African countries. Whitfield and Maipose (2008) even assert that many African countries lost their ownership due to the structural conditions closely connected to today’s aid structure and policy dialogue, often described as the contemporary “PRS process.” In this process, financiers and donors still impose their policy choice and use policy conditions in a more concerted manner today (Whitfield, 2009).

Despite the notion of ownership, therefore, African governments are still unwilling to take stronger positions against donors’ conditioned aid and demand, which I have also observed in Tanzania. Some countries’ dependence on aid is significant today in the sense that the ODA provision is a vital source of the national budget for service delivery to their population. In the case of Tanzania, for example, since its commencement in 2001, general budget support (GBS) has become a major aid instrument and thus a source of the country’s fiscal budget. Although there has been fluctuation, GBS reached over 70% as a proportion to total grant aid the country received in 2006/07 and amounted to around 10% of the government’s annual budget on average until 2012/13 (ODI, 2012). Domestic revenue has been increasing, and thus the proportion of GBS to total budget steadily declines along with another trend that donors are reducing the volume of GBS recently (ODI, 2012). Yet, the level of financial
dependence on external aid still hardly allows Tanzania and other aid-dependent
governments to drive aid and development dialogues.

De Renzio et al. (2008) also point out that there exists an assumption regarding
the notion of ownership that donors automatically follow recipient governments if their
counterpart governments demonstrate ownership. In reality, this has not been the case as
far as actual donor performance in sub-Saharan Africa is concerned. Fundamentally,
though, donors barely trust recipient governments even when the latter are willing to take
the lead in the process. As Easterly (2006) rightly points out, trust affects every
dimension of engagements in international development. Pomerantz (2004) further argues,
“So despite a number of complicating factors affecting both donors and African countries,
there seems to be at least a minimal basis for establishing relationships of trust – and trust
is the foundation of influence.” (p. 21). There is enough evidence, I personally believe,
that trust is essential to build a constructive relationship and that such a relationship
positively influences development efforts. In this respect, there are two distinctive and
interacting domains in relation to trust and country ownership: governance and country
capacity.

Although governance draws much attention and fuels debates today, it is
noteworthy, that just like the concept of ownership of development, there is no concrete
consensus on what governance is and what good governance constitutes (Olowu & Sako,
2002). Since donors do not agree among themselves about the definition, Riddell (2007)
points out that they individually define good governance and set associated criteria for
aid. While the definition of governance still remains ambiguous, as Olowu and Sako
(2002) state, the policy process has been dominated by external donors, not by African
governments and their institutions. Donor dominance is obvious in one single fact: that the donor community made governance a key agenda abruptly following the end of the Cold War and the failures of structural adjustment lending. This again suggests that aid relationships are essentially imbalanced in development policy choice and priority setting. Overall, experiences with governance agenda in sub-Saharan Africa so far provide enough evidence of donors’ imposition on their own aid agenda while undermining ownership of recipient countries over policy choice and the discourse. Governance is clearly a donor-driven agenda, which has rarely enabled sub-Saharan African governments to digest and lead the discourse.

As for country capacity, Lancaster (1999) asserted that the strengths or weaknesses of recipient governments are even more important than the policy environment for the success of aid. She went on to argue that weak African institutions affected the way Africans manage aid and accordingly made aid and development less effective. Indeed, governance and institutional capacity have been increasingly adopted by various donor agencies as key criteria for the ODA provision. While there is much discussion on aid effectiveness, there is no doubt that aid should be more effectively delivered where there is an enabling environment for institutions and governance to function. By the same token, there is a high donor demand today for transparency and accountability for public finance management (PFM) and procurement procedures in their recipient countries.

These aspects of capacity within a government and public institutions are serious concerns for external donors, particularly for those who provide direct budget support, GBS and sector budget support (SBS), to recipient governments. Along with the adoption
of the Paris Declaration, donors agreed to use their recipient country systems, specifically financial and procurement systems, for aid delivery. Hence, capacity building within the public sector of governments and their institutions becomes a top priority, which determines reliability of the country systems and effective management of donor funds as well.

Thus, governance and institutional capacity, in other words, government’s trustworthiness, closely relate to the trust of funding agencies of their recipients. Credibility accompanied by transparency and accountability is definitely high on the agenda for country ownership. These domains are, however, very susceptible to donor intervention. As briefly touched upon, in Tanzania GBS became a major aid instrument. The Government of Tanzania specified budget support as the most preferred modality to strengthen its control over aid management and also to reduce transaction costs. Donors clearly saw this aid instrument as the way to go in Tanzania as well. As a consequence, budget support was adopted by the following 12 major agencies and countries: African Development Bank (AfDB), Canada, Denmark, EU, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Norway, Sweden, the UK, and the World Bank (ODI, 2012).

This notable level of modality adoption was, to some extent, an indication of the aspiration and trust that resulted in the relationship between the government and its external partners since the mid-1990s. In more recent years, however, the landscape of development and aid is changing in Tanzania. External donors and financers are questioning commitment and accountability for policy and reform implementation of the Tanzanian government. A few major financiers have already moved away from GBS (ODI, 2012). If trust is diminishing, there is no doubt these conditions will have a
substantial impact on Tanzanian ownership over development discourse as well. After all, as Pomerantz (2004) disputes, trust is a key ingredient for building and supporting country ownership.

**Summary**

As reviewed in this chapter, ownership of development largely emerged from the discourse driven by international donors in relation to their ODA provision directed to low-income developing countries, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa. Traditionally, donor countries’ official aid provision is largely determined by their political, strategical, and commercial interests instead of development and humanitarian motives. There is also a distinctive trend in recent years that aid is conveyed in consideration of global security concerns. Thus, governmental aid to developing country governments is hardly neutral by nature.

Meanwhile, at the turn of the millennium the ownership agenda came to the fore along with the global community’s adoption of the MDGs, EFA goals, and the Paris Declaration in particular. These global initiatives have fundamentally required more coordinated actions to enhance country-led efforts for tangible results in development and aid. At the same time, the contemporary aid structure and practice has intensified donor intervention in policy dialogue and even appears to undermine aid recipients’ autonomy despite the emphasized importance of country ownership.

The past debates and discourse on ownership proved that ownership is undeniably a vital agenda but equally complex and also challenging. Ownership is a contemporary development paradox. What makes this paradox complicated and often beyond our control is its intimate connection with aid-giving purposes, practice, and relationship;
how external development partners, especially ODA providers with different motives, interact with their aid recipient countries. And, it is in this context that I was determined to engage with my study inquiry and also set a landscape to illustrate today’s ownership issues, specifically that of Tanzania.
CHAPTER 3
LITERATURE REVIEW – TANZANIA

Introduction

As reviewed in the previous chapter, a group of researchers conducted a study to assess sub-Saharan African governments’ aid-negotiating power, in their definition of ownership, and the group articulates the outcome in The Politics of Aid. According to their research findings, different degrees of ownership have resulted across study-case countries in accordance with their varied structural conditions and governments’ characteristics (Whitfield, 2009). Very interestingly, though, Whitfield et al. (2009) argue that weak-ownership performers, including Tanzania, have one common trait: The investigated country governments all accepted SAP conditionalities and somewhat developed conformity to the conditioned aid as well as international financiers.

This research finding is significant because it suggests that countries have developed varied structural conditions over time, which may have been substantially influenced by how external actors intervened and interacted with their aid-recipient countries in the development discourse. From this perspective, it is necessary to grasp the ownership background specific to Tanzania and set a context to account for why and how Tanzanian education stakeholders have developed their perceptions of country ownership. Thus, this chapter attempts to draw some links from historical and socio-political perspectives in the country context of Tanzania. To start off, however, the following section briefly looks at the ownership case of Japan, which experienced quite a different country context more than a century ago.
Country Ownership: Case of Japan in Historical Perspective

Ohno et al. (2005) point out that ownership is not a new notion for Japan and that the Japanese have long embraced the notion as a self-help effort. Indeed, I myself gained familiarity with the term “self-help” while growing up in Japan. The country’s experience with ownership of national development is derived from a completely different historical context and global conditions as well. Yet, the Japanese case may provide some lessons conducive to Tanzania.

In the mid-19th century, shortly after the end of 270 years of isolation from the rest of the world, Japan adopted a modernization policy characterized by a self-help effort. “Self-Help,” a book written by Samuel Smiles, was translated and published in Japan in 1871 and became a best seller; several hundred thousand copies were sold at the beginning of the Meiji period (Shiba, 1994). The Meiji Government, newly established in 1868, was keen to catch up with the West and strived to build a modernized nation while largely investing on human resource development. To this end, the government dispatched its officials and future experts to study at higher education institutions in the US, the UK, Germany, and France to acquire the latest knowledge and skills. At the same time, the Meiji Government contracted more than 3,000 expatriates over time to work in Japan as technical advisors in selected fields. The largest number of experts was posted in the area of industrial technology although many were also employed in the human sciences, including religion, music and art. The average contract duration was three years. Many of them were recruited from the UK, France, Germany, Italy, and the US (Katano,
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5 Self-Help; With Illustrations of Conduct and Perseverance was published in 1859 in England. It emphasized the virtue of perseverance regardless of social class.
6 The Meiji period lasted from 1868 till 1912.
In principle, the government determined the priority areas and the source of knowledge and experiences they desired to learn from; for instance, the legal system in France, the navy in Great Britain, and the medicine, army, and constitution in Germany (Shiba, 1994).

Dr. William Smith Clark, who formerly taught at Amherst College and also served as the first president of Massachusetts Agricultural College (currently UMASS Amherst) founded in 1863, is one example of a foreign advisor who served the Japanese government in 1876-1877 and played an influential role in establishing the first agricultural college, Sapporo Agricultural College (currently Hokkaido University), in Hokkaido, an island in the northern part of Japan. At that time, Hokkaido was largely undeveloped, which required substantial efforts to develop new industries as well as to increase agricultural production. At the same time, the island was facing a threat of Russian invasion. Therefore, Clark was asked to assist the Japanese in establishing a system not only to educate students in agriculture but also to train them to be cadets (Katano, 2011).

This period of intensive recruitment and utilization of technical advisors and experts from abroad lasted about a decade following the establishment of the Meiji Government. By the end of those years when the country was eager to acquire knowledge and skills for modernization, those who studied abroad and learned from foreign technical experts in Japan took over roles initially played by their foreign advisors and experts. The efforts of the newly established government were supported by its strong desire to take ownership and to manage the self-help in the national development discourse during the 19th century. Although those foreign advisors played significant
roles, decision making firmly remained in the hands of the Meiji Government. It is notable that the leaders had the ability to plan and decide on modernization policy on their own (Katano, 2011). When applied to the context of country ownership, the Meiji Government demonstrated the control and capability of policy process as well as management of domestic and external resources effectively to transform the nation. It is also critical to acknowledge that the Meiji Government managed to finance development undertakings with its own domestic funds.

Europe, the US, the UK, and to some extent Japan engaged in a major industrialization period mostly between the 18th and 19th centuries. As a late comer, Japan was fortunate to gain technical know-how and effectively adapt knowledge and skills from more advanced Western nations for its own country context and needs. Due to the self-determination and strong will of the people as well as a robust policy implementation led by the national government, the country and global conditions at that time enabled Japan to transform itself rather quickly.

Rix (1993) further elaborated the key ingredients of Japan’s quick modernization process from the Meiji period onwards as (1) a deliberate adaptation and learning from the Western countries, (2) strong internal leadership and control, (3) conscious policies to promote education and national awareness, and (4) imperial expansion to support domestic economic growth (p. 15). Interestingly, this elaboration to some extent explains Japan’s ODA philosophy and the emphasis on self-help efforts of developing countries in pursuing economic growth. Japan’s particular philosophy in aid-giving, uniquely characterized by self-help efforts as a requirement for national development and for
ownership execution, stems from the country’s own experience in development and its discourse while largely built on socio-cultural values (Rix, 1993).

More than 100 years later, the world is under totally different conditions in every sense. Where development is concerned, one distinctive difference is that international aid has become a notable industry – a US $100 billion business and still expanding rapidly (Riddell, 2007) – since the end of the Second World War. Countries today cannot be isolated any longer from the rest of the world even if they wish to be left alone.

Riddell (2007) reasons that global affairs and relations have made the international community think that it is their obligation to intervene to protect citizens from extreme human rights abuses and poverty. As a consequence, once labeled as poor and distressed, a low-income nation is destined to be intervened with and guided around by the global community, and often by experts and technical advisors from the outside.

In this respect as well, despite the time difference, Japan’s experience in national development, largely supported by self-determined development priorities and policies, strategic human resource utilization, and self-guided efforts for implementation, may suggest some essential elements needed to generate and maintain country ownership in Tanzania and other developing settings.

Ownership in the Context of Tanzania

In relation to the aid effectiveness debates reviewed in the previous chapter, President Benjamin Mkapa of Tanzania made an opening address at the Rome Forum held on harmonization in 2003. This was a clear recognition back then that Tanzania had been a forerunner in aid harmonization and was perceived as a leading country in the aid effectiveness effort. Consequently, since the start of aid effectiveness fora, Tanzania has
been an active member country, largely representing aid-recipient country governments. Indeed, Tanzania has been associated with an ownership agenda not only in recent decades but since independence. In this context, it is essential to understand from historical perspectives how ownership issues emerged and have perhaps formed the country’s development culture.

**Julius Nyerere and His Philosophy**

Julius Nyerere served the nation as president from 1964 to 1985 and is regarded as the founder of the United Republic of Tanzania. The late Nyerere is the most respected political figure in the country, and even today Tanzanian people refer to him as Mwalimu, which means a teacher in Kiswahili, because of his profession as a school teacher and also because he taught the people his philosophy and principles for national development. Among his profound teachings was self-reliance – probably the most emphasized philosophical teaching by Nyerere throughout his presidency.

Following the republic’s foundation in 1964, Nyerere began his quest for reviving the traditional African values that had been diluted by the social, political, economic, and cultural value systems imposed by the colonists (Major & Mulvihill, 2009). In the same line, Nyerere keenly argued the irrelevancy of the education system brought in by the British. The system, according to him, had emphasized western values and was not responsive to the needs of the country and its people, and therefore, Tanzanians ought to change their mindsets and set up an education system culturally relevant to the country (Major & Mulvihill, 2009).

Nyerere also believed that the economic system inherited from the British, the capitalistic system, emphasized individualism at the expense of the community. Since
capitalism encourages competitiveness rather than cooperativeness among the people, it generally widens income disparity and thus results in inequality in a society. Western values based on capitalistic ideas, Nyerere asserted, cannot reconcile with African values (Major & Mulvihill, 2009). Alarmed by all these negative factors, the first president embarked on his advocacy for African socialism where people traditionally work together to generate collective benefits for their community. Hence, Nyerere sought to revitalize a traditional value – the cooperative spirit of _ujamaa_ or familyhood in Kiswahili.

Nyerere’s aspiration was to establish a self-reliant socialist nation, which became the central objective of Ujamaa (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003, p. 60). He described socialism to be pursued in his country as follows:

> This is the objective of socialism in the United Republic of Tanzania. To build a society in which all members have equal rights and equal opportunities; in which all can live at peace with their neighbours without suffering or imposing injustice, being exploited, or exploiting; and in which all have a gradually increasing basic level of material welfare before any individual lives in luxury (Nyerere, 1968, p. 340).

Nyerere’s philosophy concerning national development was accompanied by three basic principles: equality, freedom, and unity. He believed an ideal socialist state must be characterized by these three essentials that have been part of the traditional African social order (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003). Consequently, Nyerere considered _ujamaa_, a traditional social institution in Africa, as a solution to the challenges faced by Tanzania upon independence. According to Ibhawoh and Dibua (2003), a unique feature of Nyerere’s socialism is the total rejection of class struggle; it is not class struggle but the extended family system that is the basis of African socialism. This family system and the communalism of traditional African societies were the root of Nyerere’s Ujamaa philosophy.
Arusha Declaration and Self-Reliance Policy

Having been adopted by the ruling party, the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), in January 1967, the Arusha Declaration addressed the development agenda for Tanzania to become a self-reliant socialist state. As already discussed above, Nyerere defined socialism based on the country’s context (Mesaki & Malipula, 2011), and translated his philosophy into basic principles and self-reliant policies. In the declaration, he urged the population to be free from poverty through collective efforts and the usage of own resources as much as possible in order to attain full independence or self-reliance. In this respect, the declaration described how dependence on external aid for development would dilute the Tanzanian people’s independence and ability to choose political policies of their own. As a guiding reference, thus, the declaration emphasized human resource mobilization and engagement especially in agriculture. Furthermore, it also addressed socialism, self-reliance policies, and good leadership of TANU as prerequisites for national development efforts (Nyerere, 1968).

Along with the Arusha Declaration, the Ujamaa philosophy came to the fore. The Tanzanian government embarked on the quest to tackle poverty and economic independence primarily through strengthening the government’s direct control over the economy; nationalization as well as villagization for the rural sector. As emphasized in the declaration, rural development was central to the goal of self-reliance, and to this end, the villagization was adopted as a core scheme under Ujamaa (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003). Ujamaa villagization aimed at transforming rural societies into cooperative villages economically and socially driven by the collective efforts of villagers, the majority of the population in Tanzania (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003). Then, increased agricultural
production had to be sought to replace external finance for development and international balance-of-payment with an end goal toward becoming self-reliant.

**Education for Self-Reliance**

In the context of Nyerere’s African socialism, education was considered one pillar to promoting self-reliant development through collective efforts. Kassam (1998) classifies Nyerere’s education philosophy into two dimensions: education for self-reliance and adult education. Education for self-reliance requires an education system designed to allow Tanzanian children to acquire skills and values well applicable to rural settings in order to improve rural life (Kassam, 1998). Together with teachers, pupils were also encouraged to participate in the planning and decision-making process for productive activities to be pursued (Kassam, 1998).

In line with this philosophy, Nyerere sought to reform the basic education system in the country and succeeded in substantially broadening access to primary education in rural areas. The country achieved nearly universal primary education (UPE) – 98% in Gross Enrollment Rate (GER) – in 1980 under the policy seeking equitable provision of education for all. UPE was an integral part of socialism and self-reliance programs envisaged in the Arusha Declaration, says Galabawa (2001). To achieve UPE, basic education was mostly financed with domestic funds given that Tanzania was not receiving much aid from external donors at that time (Galabawa, 2001). Secondary education was, on the contrary, largely restricted since it was intended to educate a limited number of Tanzanians who would serve the majority in public services (Nyerere, 1968). “[E]ducation given in our primary schools must be a complete education in itself,” believed Nyerere (1968, p. 280).
Meanwhile, adult education was also an important means to promote and practice African socialism. Education for adults was intended, primarily to help them learn ways to improve life as well as to help them understand the national policies of socialism and self-reliance (Kassam, 1998). In this respect, adult education adopted activities that encouraged learners to make their own decisions and implement the decisions for themselves. As the most renowned education initiative undertaken by Nyerere, adult literacy programs were carried out primarily in Ujamaa villages throughout the 1970s. Even with the economic hardships experienced by the country back then, Tanzania attained one of the highest adult literacy levels in Africa in the early 1980s (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003).

**Legacy of Nyerere’s Philosophy and Ideology**

Despite the aspiration of and rigorous efforts led by Julius Nyerere, the Ujamaa policy was mostly abandoned by 1975 due to the villagers’ resistance to move into cooperative villages even when it was declared compulsory later for the rural population to join Ujamaa villages (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003). Today, Ujamaa is often critically reassessed on the grounds that Nyerere’s socialism policy failed to achieve self-reliance for the Tanzanian people in the end. His education reform efforts were also considered less than successful even though some impressive achievements in basic education resulted in the 1970s and early 1980s.

In spite of varied perceptions, Nyerere’s socialism and self-reliant policies had a tremendous impact on the population, and to some extent, his philosophy influenced other African nations as well (Mesaki & Malipula, 2011). Addressing Nyerere’s legacy, Mesaki and Malipula (2011) state, “At the heart of Nyerere’s core values was an
affirmation of the fundamental equality of all humankind and a commitment to the building of social, economic and political institutions, which would reflect and ensure this equality.” (p. 95).

Again, although this institutional building could not be quite achieved, Tanzania is today well recognized as one of the most politically stable and socially united countries in Africa. His philosophical teachings and consistent emphasis on self-reliance have been somewhat embedded in the Tanzanian people’s minds as well as their value system when it comes to national development. And, as discussed by Kassam (1998), education appeared to play a significant role in shaping the foundational backdrop of socioeconomic development and self-reliance, which seemingly has a long-lasting impact on the Tanzanian way of thinking and values.

**Aid Relationships**

Harrison et al. (2009) assert that aid is at the center of the political system in aid-dependent countries. This has been also the case with long-time aid-dependent Tanzania. Largely affected by the global economic crises, the country’s economy began to tremble in the 1970s; and was worsened by the costly war with Uganda that took place in 1978-1979. Despite the economic crisis faced by the country, President Nyerere continued to reject the adjustment lending and conditionality advocated by the IMF and the World Bank. The political support for the Arusha doctrine, however, gradually diminished as the economic crisis further threatened the country (Harrison et al., 2009). When aid from bilateral donors also declined sharply by 1985, Nyerere decided to step down from the presidency. The new government led by President Ali Hassan Mwinyi, who eventually
supported macroeconomic reform, began to undertake structural adjustment in accordance with the agreement made with the IMF in 1986 (Harrison et al., 2009).

In the course of macroeconomic reforms and proceeding with economic liberalization, however, Tanzania experienced serious corruption cases, which resulted in a suspension of aid and worsening relationships with international donors in the mid-1990s (Harrison et al., 2009). Harrison et al. (2009) describe bilateral donors’ demand to the Tanzanian government to confront corruption as a tougher line than the macroeconomic adjustment conditions imposed by the IMF and the World Bank (p. 275). To recover trust from the donor community, rebuilding the aid relationship appeared among the political agendas addressed and promised by Benjamin Mkapa, a presidential candidate of Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM) in the country’s first multi-party election held in November 1995.

Meanwhile, Gerry Helleiner, a Canadian economist, was commissioned by the Government of Tanzania to investigate the aid relationships troubling Tanzania then. The independent committee, headed by him, produced the so-called “Helleiner Report” in 1995 and proposed 22 recommendations to improve the relationship between the Tanzanian government and its donors. Helleiner (2001) indicated that the independent committee was requested to clarify the concept of ownership by the government. In retrospect, Helleiner (2001) notes that the terms of reference for the independent committee described ownership as widely accepted as a cornerstone in the relationships between African countries and their donors. He further comments, “The ownership question acquired greatly increased salience in discussions of development problems and practices during the mid-1990s, not least in the African context where successes with
IMF/World Bank-driven structural adjustment programmes and donor-driven projects seemed so scarce.” (Helleiner, 2001, p. 252).

The new government, formed in late 1995 and headed by President Mkapa, embarked on macroeconomic reform in 1996. Significantly, the president also began to work on the recommendations made by the independent committee with a view toward rebuilding the damaged relationships with external partners as well as strengthening ownership over development engagements (Helleiner, 2001). In January 1997, a government and donor workshop was held to discuss the way forward to improve the relationship, which led to a set of agreed notes on actions to be taken (Harrison et al., 2009). Helleiner (2001) further explains that in the course of reforming relationships the guiding principle was to be “Tanzania takes the lead” and “Tanzania fully owns the development cooperation programmes in terms of planning, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation” (p. 254).

According to Helleiner (2001), while the core objectives were agreed upon to transfer ownership of development programs from external donors to the Government of Tanzania, there were some problems anticipated that would slow down reforming aid relationships and attaining the transfer of ownership. Among them was a potential disagreement on what exactly ownership of national programs meant to the recipient government and external partners. Moreover, it was agreed that only collective donor performance would be evaluated in the course of ownership transfer. Under this arrangement, some donors largely acted on lip service and donors’ persistent technical assistance was thus perceived by the Tanzanian government as detrimental to local ownership, recalls Helleiner (2001). Helleiner addressed the donor-driven process and
their attitudes by quoting, “…ownership exists when they [aid recipients] do what we [donors] want them to do but they do it voluntarily” (Harrison et al., 2009, p. 275).

Tanzania’s country case of aid and its relationships presents evidence that aid is at the center of the country’s political system. Having engaged in aid relationships, in 2002, the Tanzanian government produced a “Tanzania Assistant Strategy” (TAS) to restore ownership and leadership in designing and implementing development programs (Harrison et al., 2009). TAS outlines actions to be taken by both the Tanzanian government and its donor partners, which were to be monitored by the designated group of members from both parties. In 2003, the group further developed an Action Plan for TAS to strengthen joint efforts focusing on the following areas: improving predictability, integration of aid into budget, harmonization of processes, and capacity building for aid management (Harrison et al., 2009).

The above case demonstrates political commitment and efforts taken by the Government of Tanzania to improve aid relationships and aid outcomes (Harrison & Mulley, 2007). Indeed, the government articulates the TAS as its own initiative aiming at restoring local ownership and leadership (United Republic of Tanzania, 2000). Equally important with this Tanzanian case is that donors as a whole were also concerted in engaging with the actions addressed in the TAS to improve their aid practices (Harrison et al., 2009). The TAS Action Plan clarified priority areas for both the government and donors to tackle; notably, capacity building for aid management was among them (United Republic of Tanzania, 2000). Again, this country case may well illustrate the argument that Tanzania has strengthened ownership through close relationships with its donor partners.
Harmonization and Alignment in Education

Another critical dimension closely associated with the aid relationship is the development aid structure in which the Government of Tanzania and its donors actually interact with one another to execute and manage aid, supposedly under the lead of Tanzania and in accordance with the agreed actions and division of labor articulated in the TAS. Alongside the TAS and clarified actions, efforts were geared into harmonization in development activities and alignment to Tanzanian development strategies and country systems. In terms of aid modality, the Tanzanian government clearly indicated its preferred modality as GBS over any other modalities in the Joint Assistance Strategy (JAS). JAS was initiated with leading development partners (DPs), namely the UK Department for International Development (DfID) and the World Bank, to further improve donor coordination (Harrison et al., 2009). As a result, aid modality and aid practice overall were dramatically transformed during the 2000s in Tanzania (Kamei, 2005).

Quickly changing aid practices were especially prominent in the education sector. This phenomenon resulted alongside the high priority given to primary education by both the government and DPs, largely rationalized by the MDG and EFA initiatives. Equally important was the intention of both parties to improve education in line with the Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) principles (Kamei, 2005). This emerging notion was applied to the implementation of the newly developed Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP). The PEDP was produced and launched in 2001 as a first sub-sector development program based on the whole sector program – Education Sector Development Program (ESDP). The majority of the donors supporting education at that time concentrated their
support on primary education because of the emphasized UPE goal. Prior to the development of the PEDP, donors’ aid in education was mostly delivered through project support. The Tanzanian education sector accommodated a large number of external donors who intervened with different approaches and agendas. And, the given circumstance provided the Tanzanian government with a rationale to pursue the SWAp in this particular sector.

In terms of aid modality, the Government of Tanzania was explicit in its preference for budget support. In the education sector, however, a pooled fund specified for the PEDP implementation was created upon commencement of the sub-sector program. Not only aiming at harmonization of development activities, the government notably abolished primary school fees in 2001. This political action necessarily made the country keen to boost public funds directed to primary education. Thus, the GBS replenished a desperately needed recurrent budget for primary education while the PEDP pooled fund financed dramatically expanding education activities at the school and community level. In 2002/03, the MTEF indicated that 18 countries and aid agencies supported the education sector through education-earmarked budget support (Kamei, 2005).

To a large extent, primary education or the PEDP became a platform through which Tanzania and its external partners capitalized endeavors and resources in engaging in SWAp, a new approach to aid and development, strengthening country systems, and aid relationship. There was a strong feeling shared among the education sector partners, including both the government authorities and donor agency personnel, that they were working together for a collective objective: to improve the state of education in Tanzania.
Clearly, education donors saw Tanzania as a model country and desired to make the country a success story of aid reform. Given this background, President Benjamin Mkapa opened the first aid effectiveness forum, the High Level Forum on Harmonization in Rome in 2003.

Ownership Case in Education

In examining the Tanzanian country case of aid negotiation power, Harrison et al. (2009) concluded in *The Politics of Aid* that the case of Tanzania demonstrated how a country has uniquely shaped ownership alongside a shared development discourse with external donors. They further assessed that this was clearly the case with the education sector, in particular, where donors took a stronger lead in policy formulation than their Tanzanian counterparts. As a consequence, “…the Ministry of Education has been largely sidelined from the process, with little ownership of what is seen by many as a donor-driven Education Sector Development Plan.” (Harrison et al., 2009, p. 286). The abolition of primary school fees was also part of the education policy reform proposed by the World Bank. Despite the initial resistance, Tanzania acquired US $150 million credits from the World Bank for the education sector by accepting the reform requirement (World Bank, 2010).

According to the country study, the education sector had conditions different from those in agriculture and health sectors in terms of relational dynamics. This analysis suggests that, even within the same country, varied degrees of ownership can result depending on given conditions and players involved. Overall, however, the Tanzanian case study clearly attests that aid relationships have substantial influence over the Tanzanian government and line ministries’ policy choices as well as their ownership
behaviors. “Tanzania serves as evidence that ownership can be constructed through ‘partnership’ between state and donors.” describe Harrison et al. (2009, p. 295). Even though donor dominance was apparent, based on my experiences, I also consider that the Tanzanian ministries in charge of basic education have somewhat strengthened their ownership in aid management and relationship through their struggles and the interaction with external DPs at the country level. This partial ownership, however, appears to have been gained at the expense of full autonomy in the development discourse.

Local Governance and Decentralization Policy

While Tanzania was struggling in rebuilding aid relationships, the government also embarked on reform programs to strengthen governance in the 1990s. Among the key reform programs is the Local Government Reform Program (LGRP), which commenced in 1998 (Tidemand & Msami, 2010). Tanzania has since been working on decentralization in line with the Decentralization by Devolution (D by D) policy. Thus, the notion of devolution is central to development efforts as well as decentralized governance in Tanzania.

Tidemand, Olsen, and Sola (2008) categorize decentralization into the following three main types for the use of their decentralization study in East Africa: (1) deconcentration, (2) delegation, and (3) devolution. Deconcentration shifts administrative responsibilities from central governments to lower administrative authorities and is described as the weakest form of decentralization. Then, delegation concerns the transfer of decision-making and administration of public functions from central governments to semi-autonomous organizations that yet remain accountable to the center. Lastly,
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7 The major reforms encompass legal sector reform, public services reform, public finance reform, and local government reform (Tidemand & Msami, 2010).
devolution is said to be a more comprehensive type of decentralization and devolves
decision making, finance, and management to quasi-autonomous local governments
(Tidemand, Olsen, & Sola, 2008).

Significantly, the Government of Tanzania addressed its vision to make local
governments more autonomous in its guiding policy paper of October 1998 entitled
“Policy Paper on Local Government Reform” (Tidemand et al., 2008). This local
government reform and decentralization policy is generally known as the so-called ‘D by
D’ policy. Through D by D, devolution of power to local governments is to be aimed.
This track also requires the central government to transfer resources to its local
counterparts (Tidemand & Msami, 2010). Devolution through the LGRP was expected to
improve quality of public service delivery at decentralized level and ultimately reduce
poverty in the country with focuses on the following four dimensions – political
devolution, financial and administrative decentralization, and changed relations between
the central government and local government authorities (Tidemand et al., 2008).

Behind this reform is a belief that the LGAs are better positioned to mobilize
participation of local communities and citizens in planning, budgeting, and implementing
development programs at a decentralized level. And, a locally led development process
will facilitate democratic governance and improve public services in the country
(Chaligha, 2008). Along with the institutional arrangements in place in accordance with
local government and sector legislations, LGAs are mandated and central to the delivery
of basic social services at district and village levels (Tidemand et al., 2008), including
basic education service delivery.
Earlier in the 1990s, a primary agency responsible for local government and the LGRP was established within the president’s office as the President’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PO-RALG) by transferring responsibility from the former Ministry of Local Government. This was perceived as an obvious indication of a high priority given to local government reform by the Tanzanian government. Subsequently, the office for RALG was transferred to the prime minister’s office and renamed as the Prime Minister’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG). The LGRP implementation was expanded into a more full scale in 2000 onwards after a series of keen discussions had been carried out within the government as well as with DPs concerning the implementation arrangements of the first 5-year reform program.

PMO-RALG explains that through the LGRP the Government of Tanzania intends to strengthen local authorities and transform them to be effective instruments of economic and social development at local levels (PMO-RALG, 2015). The main long-term goal of the reform program is to contribute to the government’s efforts to reduce the proportion of Tanzanians living in poverty. Thus, the purpose of the program is described as to improve quality, access, and equitable delivery of public services, particularly to the poor, which is also aligned with the country’s NSGPR (PMO-RALG, 2015).

While strong initiatives seemingly emerged within, in terms of funding, the LGRP was heavily funded by international donors and also depended on external advisors for its implementation (Tidemand et al., 2008). With external funding, a LGRP technical team was set up, and a secretariat was also in place in Dar es Salaam to coordinate the program implementation. The technical team was composed of both international and local
consultants (Tidemand et al., 2008). Following the initiation of the second phase of the LGRP (2008-2013), however, as part of the mainstreaming effort and transferring LGRP implementation responsibility to the PMO-RALG, technical advisors who composed the LGRP technical team were also transferred to the PMO-RALG to be based in Dodoma from Dar es Salaam.

The decentralization reform in Tanzania has to be understood as part of a broader governance reform in economic and political liberalization, point out Tidemand et al. (2008). While the PMO-RALG is the central ministry responsible for the LGRP implementation, actual reform activities have been carried out across through various sector reforms, including those in education, health, and agriculture. Today, D by D is a solid agenda largely advocated by the LGRP and also addressed by the country’s Vision 2025. In reality, however, D by D has been only partially realized so far. While an emphasis is placed on devolution of powers to the LGAs by the local government reform and decentralization policy, Tidemand et al. (2008) point out that different sector reforms engage in decentralization to empower end-users and the private sector. This implies that there is a discrepancy in efforts to empower local governments at large.

In 2012, the first 10 years (1998-2008) of the LGRP implementation was evaluated to assess its impact. The evaluation result suggests that there have been some improvements in terms of the capacity of LGAs as well as service delivery. In fact, the outcome shows that citizens’ satisfaction concerning public services indeed improved, especially those in basic education. Despite these improvements recognized, the evaluation findings critically drew the conclusion that the LGAs have not been
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8 Tidemand and Msami (2010) report that measurable improvements were found in planning, budgeting, and financial management.
empowered significantly since 2000 due mostly to their lack of autonomy (Tidemand & Msami, 2010). The bottleneck is, as strongly argued by Chaligha (2008), that the central government has remained a primary decision maker for fiscal and human resource deployments for LGAs. After all, the D by D policy has not been able to attain its primary purpose – to make LGAs autonomous and strengthen local governance. Based on the lessons learned from the LGRP implementation, it is becoming apparent that more decisive actions are necessary for LGAs to become autonomous in decision making and allow more time and resources to further strengthen capacity to be accountable for service delivery and local development.

**Summary**

This chapter reviewed and discussed essential elements in relation to development and aid since independence in the country specific context of Tanzania. From a historical perspective, Tanzania is characterized with a distinctive philosophy and ideology advocated by the country’s first president, Julius Nyerere. His Ujamaa policies for self-reliant development and socialist state building appear to have impacted Tanzanian thinking and the valuing of self-reliance or country ownership. Although external aid conditionality was largely resisted during Nyerere’s time, subsequently increased aid dependency and relations with development financiers since the mid-1980s onwards appear to have shaped the central government’s partial execution of country ownership in the contemporary development process. In this respect, political economy in aid and development has been a major driving force for the last three decades.

At the same time, Tanzania’s partial ownership and the status as a good adjuster has perhaps created a room for external donors to invest on the country to make it a
model of coordination and partnership and also for the Tanzanian government to access needed development funds in a compromise of its full control. In addition to aid relationships, it is equally important to acknowledge that, in more recent decades, the decentralization, or the D by D policy, has been eagerly engaged in as an essential component of Tanzanian development efforts. While it arguably remains a form of deconcentration rather than the intended devolution, decentralized governance and development structures appear to be diffusing ownership agenda and associated challenges across different levels. Uniquely, however, national development still centers around villages and rural communities in Tanzania.

The literature review on development ownership in a wider context and that of Tanzania presented in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 not only illustrate the relevant contexts but also informed my study questions, research methods, and the selection of study participants in order to investigate the theme of country ownership from Tanzanian perspectives.
CHAPTER 4

STUDY SETTING, DESIGN, AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The main purpose of this study is to explore the understanding(s) and perceptions of development ownership held by Tanzanian education stakeholders so that a notion of country ownership can be better clarified and built with the local stakeholders. To this end, the study primarily employed a qualitative approach, due mostly to the nature of research questions, so as to construct an in-depth understanding of unique conditions as well as perspectives of ownership embedded in political, social, and education contexts in Tanzania. Semi-structured individual interviews were the primary research method, followed by focus group interviews, to further derive local perceptions and experiences from the context of basic education and schools. Subsequently, consultative discussions were also organized to deepen the analysis of the study findings with Tanzanian development stakeholders by sharing the findings and initial analysis of what constitutes country ownership in Tanzania.

Overall, this qualitative approach allowed me as a researcher to investigate phenomena as well as the personal thoughts of the study participants through interactive conversation around the theme of ownership within the intended context. Since local education stakeholders’ perception of development ownership has been little discussed and understood before, I had few underlying assumptions or theories about how Tanzanian education stakeholders understand and practice ownership of development in reality. A slight expectation I had, however, was that those generations who had grown up right after independence of 1964 might have mindsets valuing self-reliant
development, which was the central philosophy advocated by the first president of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere. In addition, from my work experiences in Tanzania, I was inclined to believe that today’s development process, largely standardized across many low-income countries, and the relationship between the government and its development partners have significantly impacted how Tanzanian education stakeholders perceive their country ownership in development. Without a sturdy conceptual frame, however, I relied on an inductive approach whereby emerging sub-themes and associating elements were derived from the data gathered from study participants, and generated useful descriptions of phenomena from there.

In this chapter, I discuss the methodology of the study in more detail by reflecting on (1) study setting, (2) study design, (3) study participants, (4) data analysis, (5) my positioning as a researcher, and (6) limitations.

**Study Setting**

The main reason behind the selection of Tanzania as a case study stems from my personal experiences. As further described later in this chapter, I have worked and lived in the country. Among the countries in sub-Saharan Africa I worked in, Tanzania has exposed me to the most valuable experiences in engaging with concerted efforts in development and aid. Since Tanzania is highly aid-dependent and donor intervention is accordingly substantial, I believed that it would be beneficial to illustrate the country’s experience in ownership over development discourse. Given the diversity of development conditions in sub-Saharan Africa, however, I had to anticipate that Tanzanian experiences were not going to be representative or applicable to other country contexts in the region.
Nevertheless, I hoped to come up with findings that are unique yet can be translated to positive and practical lessons at the same time.

The World Bank (2009) points out that Tanzania is one of the most favored aid recipients in sub-Saharan Africa because of its political stability and the government’s willingness to work with external donors. Behind these features, the country recognized aid relationships as a key to more effective development discourse and thus has been engaging in the ownership agenda for a relatively longer time than many other sub-Saharan African countries. Indeed, there is a recognition among the international donor community today that Tanzania has taken a stronger lead in development and aid management. Although these experiences are not likely to fit in the diverse context of sub-Saharan Africa, I was motivated to use Tanzania as a country case and illustrate that countries have distinctive conditions of their own in tackling development challenges including ownership of development.
Located in East Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania comprises mainland Tanzania, covering the area of 945,000 square kilometers, and the islands of Zanzibar of 1,658 square kilometers in the Indian Ocean (CIA/US State Department, 2012). The mainland, formerly known as Tanganyika, gained independence from the United Kingdom in 1961 and Zanzibar followed in 1963. Subsequently, the two territories united.
as a republic in 1964. Today, Tanzania has a population of 44.9 million⁹ and is the second most populous country in East Africa after Ethiopia (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 1). The population is composed of approximately 120 ethnic groups, which with regards to religions can be divided into three groups: Christian (63%), Muslim (35%), and others (2%) (CIA/US State Department, 2012). The legislative capital city is Dodoma, located in the central region of the mainland, where the presidential office, the prime minister’s office, and the parliament are situated. On the other hand, Dar es Salaam remains the biggest commercial as well as administrative center and the largest city with 4.36 million people (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 1).

Politically, Tanzania is known as one of the most stable states in sub-Saharan Africa. Following the country’s independence, Julius Nyerere served Tanzania as the first prime minister and then president from 1961 till 1985. During his presidency, Nyerere was determined to build a self-reliant socialist state in line with his Ujamaa philosophy. However, the severe economic conditions in the 1970s made the formation of collective farming communities, Ujamaa villages, even more unpopular. Following Nyerere’s resignation in 1985, Ali Hassan Mwinyi became the country’s second president and ended the one-party rule by the Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM). In 1995, Benjamin Mkapa was elected as the third president in the first multi-party election conducted in Tanzania. Following the two terms fulfilled by Mkapa, Jakaya Kikwete came in and has served two terms as the fourth president since 2005 (World Bank, 2009). In October 2015, John Magufuli was sworn in as the fifth president after having gone through the tightest

⁹ Mainland Tanzania has a population of 43.6 million while Zanzibar has 1.3 million (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 1).
election for the CCM in history against the presidential candidate of the opposition Ukawa coalition.

The 2015 country economic report from the World Bank indicates that the short- and medium-term prospects for Tanzania’s economy remain positive. The country’s annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has been growing at 7 percent on average over the past decade (World Bank, 2015). In 2014, the GDP was US $49.18 billion and the GDP per capita was US $930 (World Bank DataBank, 2015). Agriculture remains the main pillar of the country’s economy; accounting for nearly a quarter of GDP and employing approximately 80% of work force (World Bank, 2009). Meanwhile, poverty declined by 5 percent between 2007 and 2012. However, about one-third of the country’s population still lives under the poverty line of US $1.25 per day (World Bank, 2015). In terms of human development status, Tanzania ranks 159 out of 187 countries on the Human Development Index (HDI)\textsuperscript{10} (UNDP, 2015).

Being autonomous from each other, mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar adopt and undertake separate development policies and strategies, including those in the education sector as well as decentralization and local government reforms. This study exclusively focuses on the mainland, and thus the central ministries and local district governments referred to in this dissertation are the ones in the mainland. As far as the education sector is concerned, different ministries are in charge of sub-sector policies and coordination issues. Primarily, however, two ministries are responsible for the domain of basic education: the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) and the Prime

\textsuperscript{10} HDI provides a composite measure of three basic dimensions of human development: health, education, and income.
Minister’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG). 11

The education context used in this study is that of basic education.

When it comes to implementation, basic education has been decentralized to local governments or so-called Local Government Authorities (LGAs) in mainland Tanzania. Administratively, the mainland is divided into 25 regions (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013). Under the regions, there are over 130 LGAs, the majority of which are rural districts and the rest being town, city, and municipal councils. The total number of LGAs has slightly increased mainly as a result of the rising number of settlements recognized as urban (Tidemand et al., 2008). Each LGA houses a Department of Education that assumes education administration, and comprises a Chief Education Officer, District Education Officers (DEO) or Municipal Education Officers (MEO), Adult Education Officers, and Statistics and Logistical Officers. For administration purposes, there is another administrative level, wards, located between district and village councils. Ward Education Officers (WEO) are held accountable for supervising education activities carried out at the school level and reporting to DEOs or MEOs.

Meanwhile, Ward Development Committees (WDC) are responsible for reviewing and compiling development plans submitted by village councils. Village councils are immediate local authorities to which primary and secondary schools submit their school plans. Every primary school has a School Committee (SC) 12 that is composed of elected community members, a school head teacher, and one other teacher who is responsible for book keeping of public funds disbursed to the SC. The SC is mandated to

11 PMO-RALG is in charge of supervising pre-primary education, primary education, secondary education, special education, adult education, and NFE service delivery in Tanzania.
12 Secondary schools have school boards.
prepare a school improvement plan and also manage school funds mostly replenished by the central government.

The primary education system comprises of seven years: from Standard 1 to Standard 7. The Government of Tanzania abolished primary school fees in 2001. It also made it compulsory to enroll children at the age of 6 for Standard 1. To replenish school fees that used to be collected previously, the government established two direct funding mechanisms to assist activities at the school and community level: the Capitation Grant and the Investment Grant. The former is used for recurrent costs at the school level while the latter is for construction of classrooms, latrines, and teacher housing. Mandated to manage these funds, SCs opened two bank accounts locally. Expanding access to primary education, UPE, was engaged through the PEDP implementation and was heavily funded by a large number of external donors. Alongside the progress of the PEDP, the country has experienced remarkable expansion in primary enrollment since 2001. In 2013, the Net Enrollment Rate (NER) for primary education reached 89.7%, which increased from 59% in 2000 (MoEVT, 2015). Enrollment at the secondary education level has also increased substantially since the mid-2000s. In 2013, the NER for Ordinary Level\textsuperscript{13} was 33.7% and that for the Advanced Level was 1.8% (MoEVT, 2015).

MoEVT and PMO-RALG are the two ministries responsible for basic education, as already mentioned. The former is located in Dar es Salaam while the latter is in Dodoma, the political capital of Tanzania. My field survey mostly took place in Dar es Salaam where semi-structured interviews were conducted with individual participants from the MoEVT, the PMO-RALG, two Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and

\textsuperscript{13} Ordinary Level (O-Level) is the first cycle of secondary education for Form 1 to Form 4 while Advanced Level (A-Level) is the subsequent cycle for Form 5 and Form 6.
three Education Departments of Kinondoni, Ilala, and Temeke Municipalities.\textsuperscript{14} In addition to Dar es Salaam, I visited Dodoma in order to conduct interviews with personnel from the PMO-RALG.

Additional field research was carried out in Morogoro Rural District, Morogoro Region where focus groups were organized to interview education stakeholders at the community level. Additionally, Adult Education Officers from Morogoro Rural District were also interviewed. Morogoro region was selected purposefully to convene focus groups in order to learn about local ownership in education from Tanzanian stakeholders on the ground. On the other hand, the member selection and arrangement for the focus groups were made on my behalf. Fundamentally, the selection of this particular region and the district was not intended to be representational for the entire country.

Morogoro Region is the third largest region in size in Tanzania with a population of 2.2 million (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013). The regional capital, Morogoro Town, is approximately 183 km westward from Dar es Salaam. The region’s economy is traditionally dominated by agriculture. The most well-known products from the region are sisal and sugarcane. According to the 2012 census, around 73\% of the employed labor force is engaged in the agriculture sector (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013). In relation to general economic and social terms, the region is positioned slightly above the national average.

Morogoro Rural District is among the six districts located within Morogoro Region. The district has a population of 286,248, approximately 13\% of the region’s total population, and encompasses 29 wards (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 56). Its

\textsuperscript{14} Kinondoni Municipality has a population of 914,247, Ilala Municipality has 624,683, and Temeke Municipality has 699,825 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 74).
economy is largely agricultural. For the field research, I visited Kiroka Ward and four villages within the same ward in the district. Kiroka has a population of 21,853 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 58).

**Study Design**

Overall, this study was designed to employ qualitative research methods comprising of (1) a literature review, (2) semi-structured individual interviews, (3) focus group interviews, and (4) validation of data and analysis. I detail the first three research methods applied in the study to explore local stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences on development ownership in Tanzania. The fourth method will be discussed in detail in the Data Analysis section.

**Literature Review**

First, I reviewed the predominant understandings and the changes in the definitions of the term ownership that have taken place over the last two decades in the field of international development. Since ownership largely emerged as development rhetoric from the discourse where international donors had to debate their unsuccessful aid to developing countries, especially those in sub-Saharan Africa, in economic growth and poverty reduction, the discourse on aid effectiveness to date was looked at thoroughly. Moreover, reviewing literature on different attempts to better understand ownership led me to discuss how development ownership became a source of development paradoxes. In essence, the ownership agenda goes hand in hand with international aid and aid relationship between recipient governments and their financiers. These reviews were primarily intended to set a rational background for my investigation of country ownership to be carried out.
Then, Tanzania’s national development path to date was reviewed from its historical and political accounts through document reviews. I sensed that Tanzanian socio-political and historically generated conditions provide insight into how Tanzanian stakeholders today may understand and envision national development and its associated ownership. Indeed, during the course of the interviews, some participants hinted at historical connections to the late president Julius Nyerere’s philosophy and development principles, articulated in the Ujamaa policy.

Following the review on socio-political and economic transition, I reflected how international aid has interacted in the development process taking place in the country. Given that this empirical case study is set in the context of education, literature on Tanzanian development and education policies was also consulted to understand the magnitude of significance, which might or not have necessitated the country to execute ownership over education development. Another area reviewed was local governance, more precisely the decentralization policy and its implementation. The current decentralized structure for development undertakings appears to be quite influential in affecting perspectives of Tanzanian stakeholders from different levels where education activities take place. In this regard, the core decentralized governance policy and related reports have been carefully consulted.

**Individual Interviews**

Alongside a familiarization of the country context where Tanzanian education stakeholders are positioned, ownership over development discourse, specifically in the education sector, was framed as a main theme for this study to investigate in depth. Prior to the field research conducted in Tanzania, I drafted a questionnaire, which I initially
planned to distribute to individual study participants at the time of the interviews. Upon my arrival in Tanzania, I consulted a few Tanzanian acquaintances concerning the use and content of the drafted questionnaire. Based on some feedback I received, I reframed the questions. I also decided not to distribute the questionnaires to be completed by study participants, taking into consideration both a need to avoid redundancy and the time constraints of busy education officials. Alternatively, in line with the guiding study questions, I prepared a list of discussion points together with open-ended questions, which guided me in conducting semi-structured interviews and also to extract central ideas and sub-themes from what was expressed by the study participants. The list contained 12 questions, as shown in APPENDIX A, which were mostly detailed and subdivided from the main study questions. As interviews proceeded, however, I revised the order of those questions and also prioritized them while finding out the relative importance of critical points for inquiry and discussions. Depending on how our conversation proceeded, I even omitted one or two lower priority questions.

Before starting an interview, I explained to each study participant the concept of informed consent. In this process, I highlighted the following ethical principles underlying informed consent (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 75): Participants are fully informed about the study purpose and how their opinions are utilized; participants may withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice; and participants’ names will not be disclosed. Although the explanation of informed consent might have been perceived to be very formal, I believe that clarifying their position and rights as a study participant perhaps enhanced a sense of trust between participants and the researcher. Also, it made
us more conscious about each other’s responsibility as part of the study. Thus, I felt ethically obliged to share the outcome of this study to acquire their consent.

Interviews were conducted individually in English for approximately 1.5 hours on average. Before starting an interview, I explained that I would document responses from participants by taking notes with a small laptop. While the participants did not seem to mind my using a laptop, for which I had requested their permission, audio recording was not a preferred option for most. Typing during interviews was not an easy task. During our interaction, however, I tried not to appear to be concentrating on taking notes but rather on our conversation.

Stringer (2007) states that interviews should be characterized as informal conversations. As much as possible, therefore, I attempted to create an informal atmosphere during data collection to enhance open and frank conversations with study participants. Moreover, the mode of interviews was individual with a consideration that study participants would likely feel more discreitional when expressing their opinions without any pressure or group dynamics involved. Given that ownership is an intricate and possibly politically delicate matter, it was crucial for this study to obtain honest and unbiased views around the subject so that unique yet valuable experiences from the stakeholders could be consolidated in the end. In fact, as I discuss in the next chapter, the theme of ownership frustrated a few participants when detailing their ideas during interviews. In the end, however, an interactive approach enabled study participants and the researcher to discuss and explore the notion of ownership together.

Whenever I had difficulty in understanding the nuance of what was said, I questioned the study participant immediately to make sure that there would be no
misunderstanding or misinterpretation. Despite the guiding questions of the research, I tried to give sufficient room for both participants and myself as a researcher to explore ideas and notions of ownership together. In fact, there were two occasions when I had to organize interviews of two and three ministry personnel together due to their time constraints. For both occasions, I mentioned possible group dynamics, yet they confirmed that they would feel comfortable enough to express their individual opinions and experiences with the other colleague(s) present.

**Focus Groups**

Concerning focus groups, my initial thought was that group discussions may not be necessarily favorable in a culture where power distance is considerable, which is often the case in many sub-Saharan African countries. Thus, use of this particular method, involving several education officials at a time, was not predetermined but was only considered for implementation depending on actual proceedings and its relevancy for data collection. In the end, focus groups were not organized for the individual study participants.

On the other hand, I applied focus group discussions when I conducted another field research at the community level. As discussions on ownership proceeded with individual participants, data collection at the community level was revealed as inevitable and rational for the inquiry on development ownership in Tanzania. In fact, some study participants also strongly recommended to me to hear what villagers or local stakeholders at the community level would have to say about their undertakings and ownership over

---

15 Power distance refers to the degree to which the less powerful members of a society accept and expect that power is distributed unequally. East Africa is considered high in this dimension (Hofstede Center, 2016).
education development. As a consequence, I decided to use this research method to gather data from community stakeholders in education.

Despite the justification, I was not certain about the feasibility of conducting a field survey at the grassroots level. But one old colleague of mine from the Ministry of Education was persistent from the initial stage in urging me to go down to the community level for my inquiry. When I was beginning to be persuaded about this need, the ministry colleague further encouraged me with detailed suggestions on where and whom I could meet within Morogoro Region. This was primarily why I was able to pursue focus group discussions with villagers.

Meeting arrangements with education stakeholders at the community level were made on my behalf. This way, however, the composition of the groups was determined beyond my control. Since the primary communication language is Kiswahili at the village level, to assist me in communication, two Adult Education Officers from Morogoro Rural District were designated to accompany me and translate wherever necessary during interviews. These education officers were both familiar with the communities we visited because the villages concerned have been undertaking an adult education program called ICBAE (Integrated Community Based Adult Education), which is promoted by the Ministry of Education. Mandated to supervise, the officers visit the communities on a regular basis.

Among the five communities that I visited, the numbers of participants in the focus groups varied substantially; from two to over 20. As detailed in the following Study Participants section, all the groups were composed of local stakeholders associated with basic education in their locality. Despite the variation in group size and group nature, I
used nine predetermined questions. Those were very simple and designed to verify the previous data collected from individual respondents and construct a notion of country ownership that fits in the Tanzanian local context.

Upon arrival at a meeting venue, I introduced myself and explained the purpose of my visit and discussion with the community participants. All the groups appeared to be unfamiliar with visitors from outside but they were accommodating and cooperative. Considering that the communities are to some extent beneficiaries of externally supported ICBAE, I emphasized that my research had nothing to do with promotional aid or funding and I would appreciate honest perceptions and opinions around the theme of ownership, which the participants seemingly understood and agreed to do. They were familiar with one another, hence, the groups seemed to feel comfortable enough in responding to questions during focus groups.

The group interview lasted for 30 to 45 minutes each. The primary language used was Kiswahili. Due to my limited language proficiency, I had to depend on the translation made by the two district officers who accompanied me to each focus group site. Upon arrival in Morogoro town, I met them in a hotel first to introduce myself and explain to them my study as well as the interview procedure. In our meeting, I also inquired about the Kiswahili translation of ownership and also about villagers’ familiarity with the Kiswahili word and its application in the education context. Their response implied that villagers would understand the notion of ownership in relation to school and education issues. Indeed, except for a few instances, the translation was generally conducted smoothly during the interviews.
Despite the necessary translation, posed questions were probably too straightforward to generate discussion or to draw substantially different opinions among the participants. In general, one participant responded first, and then a few others confirmed the initial response with a little more explanation. One must wonder if the villagers are like-minded people or are fully sensitized about the theme of ownership. In the end, focus groups were organized to verify the data previously collected from individual study participants. As far as the studied communities are concerned, the focus groups served my intention.

**Study Participants**

This section discusses study participants who participated in two different field surveys respectively: one conducted by individual interviews and the other by focus group interviews. In this dissertation, the former is referred to as the primary survey and the latter as the community survey. Table 4 below shows the entire composition of the participants who took part in the interviews. The first four rows indicate individual interview participants while the fifth row points to focus group participants.
Table 4: Composition of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level (no.)</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Main Organizational Functions</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>MoEVT</td>
<td>Policy, Standard setting, Quality assurance, Sector review, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Central Administration</td>
<td>PMO-RALG</td>
<td>Coordination and supervision of LGAs in basic education service delivery, Consolidation of education plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>District (1)/ Municipality (3)</td>
<td>District Government/ Administration</td>
<td>Socio-economic development, Social service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NGO/CSO (2)</td>
<td>TEN/MET, Haki Elimu</td>
<td>Supports in improving and coordinating the area of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community (5)</td>
<td>Primary School Committees, Ward Development Committee (WDC), Primary Schools, Villages, ICBAE</td>
<td>Annual school activity planning, Budgeting, Budget management, Monitoring school activities, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Study Participants**

Study participants were composed of 25 individuals who are actively involved in education development undertakings in Tanzania. The participants included those from central ministries that are in charge of education policy formulation, monitoring and evaluation of policy implementation, and basic education service delivery and coordination; namely the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) and the Prime Minister’s Office – Regional Administration and Local Government (PMO-RALG). For the MoEVT, 11 participants were selected from a range of departments and sections that deal with policy and planning, information management, school construction, primary education, adult and non-formal education (NFE), and vocational training. As for the PMO-RALG, three participants were selected from the Division of Basic Education. Participants’ positions ranged from officers, section heads, assistant directors, and
directors. The years of their services in education at the central government were over 10 years on average.

At the lower government level, the participants were nine municipal and district education officers engaging in basic education\textsuperscript{16} service delivery at LGAs, which are, in this case study, municipal and district governments and administration in mainland Tanzania. I visited three municipalities in Dar es Salaam, namely Ilala, Tema, and Kinondoni, and outside Dar es Salaam I visited Morogoro Rural District. Three municipal education officers (MEO) from Tema and two MEOs and DEOs from each of the others participated in individual interviews. Their positions range from education officers and statistics and logistical officer to chief education officers, which head the education department at the municipal and district level. The duration of years of services at LGAs varies between 3 and 28 years. All of them have previous teaching experience at the basic education level prior to their careers as district officials.

Lastly, although the number was minimal, two participants were selected from local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) actively supporting activities in the education sector in Tanzania. Tanzania Education Network/Mtandao wa Elimu (TEN/MET) is a local network with over 150 national and international organization members engaging in education. It was established in 1999 to influence policies to promote basic quality education for all in Tanzania. The other organization was Haki Elimu, a leading CSO active in education. It was founded in 2001 to empower citizens to bring in changes and govern education. To request an interview for my research, I contacted the two organizations, and one officer was assigned by each organization.

\textsuperscript{16} In mainland Tanzania, pre-primary education, primary education, secondary education, special education, adult education, and NFE service delivery is decentralized to LGAs.
According to arrangements made, I interviewed one personnel in charge of finance and administration and one education program officer.

Involvement of non-state stakeholders was thought to be essential for this study to investigate whether there are diverse and distinctive perceptions around the notion and practices of ownership in accordance with where they are positioned and how they are involved in the Tanzanian education development discourse. Furthermore, multiple opinions extracted from outside the governmental structure not only enrich understandings but also help facilitate a more thorough analysis on the country conditions surrounding ownership issues.

**Focus Group Participants**

As detailed in the Study Setting section, the focus groups were conducted in Morogoro Rural District. According to the arrangements made, I visited Kiroka Ward and four villages within the same ward. The focus groups are referred to as Group 1 to Group 5 in Chapter 5, which presents the findings from the community survey.

Group 1 participants were comprised of six members from Kiroka Ward Development Committee (WDC). The participants’ gender composition was: five males and one female. The committee is mandated to review school improvement plans and consolidate them into an education plan for Kiroka Ward. Once compiled by the committee, the plan is submitted to the district council. In the case of Kiroka, the committee submits development plans to Morogoro Rural District Council. WDC deals with development issues at large including basic education.

Group 2 had only two participants in Bamba Village: a Bamba Primary School assistant head teacher and the chairperson of the Bamba Primary School Committee.
Both were males. Group 3 was composed of three community members from Bondula Village. All of them are, to some extent, associated with the ICBAE program either as a committee member or adult education learners. Two of the three participants have children who attend primary school in the village although none of them belong to a local school committee. Group 4 was made up of six participants from Kungwe Village. The group composition was as follows: a Kungwe Primary School head teacher, Kungwe Village chairperson, an ICBAE facilitator, two female villagers, and one male villager. Lastly, Group 5 was visited at Kikundi Primary School, where an ICBAE class was in session. The group encompassed the following participants: a Kikundi Primary School head teacher, an assistant teacher, an ICBAE facilitator, a carpentry teacher for ICBAE, and 21 ICBAE learners/villagers. The last group in this community survey was the largest, a focus group in Kiroka Ward, Morogoro Rural District.

**Data Analysis**

Tanzanian local stakeholders’ knowledge and perceptions of development ownership are little known to us. There have been some attempts by external development actors and researchers to examine Tanzanian ownership by using definitions and terms set without much consideration of locally generated ideas and practices concerning ownership. Little information was therefore available to attempt constructing a concept of development ownership based on local perspectives and experiences.

Against this background, a socio-political and economic lens became a valuable tool to unpack and better understand issues related to ownership in the context of Tanzanian development when country conditions and the research data were both analyzed. At the central government level, development aid and the aid relationship with
external donors are seemingly considerable elements affecting the development discourse (Harrison et al., 2009) as well as study participants’ understanding of ownership. International aid, particularly ODA, is largely determined by political, strategic, and economic interests held by donors against recipient countries (Riddle, 2007).

By the same token, there must be motivation for the Tanzanian side, which can be often justified with economic and political accounts, in accepting international aid. For these reasons, issues around development and ownership are practically inseparable from the context of international aid and associated economics and politics. Tanzania has been highly dependent on external aid. Hence, it was necessary to understand given country conditions surrounding development aid and aid relationships by utilizing a socio-political and economic lens in order to analyze the state of ownership in the country.

On the other hand, the Tanzanian government has been engaging in the decentralization policy called Decentralization by Devolution (D by D) since the late 1990s. In line with the devolution underway as part of local governance reform efforts, LGAs are expected to play central roles in proceeding with socio-economic development, including basic education development. D by D indeed is expected to enable decentralized institutional arrangements, which embrace planning and budgeting, to respond to local priorities as well as influence people’s attitudes and mindsets across different decentralized levels. Thus, political and economic dimensions need to be carefully taken account of when ownership of development discourse is examined in Tanzania’s decentralized setting.

Following the individual interviews, I reflected on each interview conducted and added comments as additional background information in the notes that I had taken.
during conversation with study participants. I went through the interview notes carefully and multiple times while coding. A summary sheet was also prepared in the course of my field survey, which summarizes collected data according to the guiding questions and lists highlighted concepts and relational phrases. As individual interviews proceeded, I continued to prepare each interview note and added information to the summary sheet as well. From close consultation with the data summary sheet, key words and sub-themes linking with ownership began to emerge to form a broad concept of country ownership. This compiled sheet was an essential source for me to organize and translate data into a more meaningful description on perceptions of ownership held and envisioned by Tanzanian education stakeholders.

To identify and analyze different education contexts where ownership was thought to be practiced, I selected the following seven categories to discuss with individual study participants: (1) policy making, (2) priority setting, (3) strategy development, (4) planning, (5) budgeting, (6) financial management, and (7) monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Based on the compiled responses collected during individual interviews, a matrix was developed to illustrate: (1) What should be owned in the specific context, (2) Who are main actors involved in the contextual activities (e.g., central government, specific ministries and departments, local governments and administrations, DPs, civil society, citizens, etc.), (3) Who should be the owner of identified items under (1), (4) Do study participants recognize their own ownership in relation to the activities, and (5) What are key elements influencing ownership. Creation of this matrix helped me understand the main actors in ownership identified by Tanzanian education stakeholders and also highlight fundamental factors to form a sense of ownership in a practical
education sector work context. The completed matrix, APPENDIX B, provides a useful reference to further analyze how ownership functions in an actual development discourse and to examine a local notion of development ownership.

Subsequent to the initial study analysis that was conducted following my field surveys between 2012 and 2013, I organized consultative discussions with Tanzanian stakeholders in July-August 2015. This was mostly intended to verify the accuracy of my argument before concluding this study. Since the data collected were mostly subjective by nature, I felt a need to find more evidence that supports my analysis and argument with relevant reasoning (Booth et al., 2008). Furthermore, during the course of analysis, I began to question whether the study results were rather isolated cases within Tanzania or somewhat particular to the education sector in the context of development. Having these questions in mind, I attempted to draw more perspectives and opinions on the study findings from Tanzanians, who are situated inside but also those outside of the education sector.

For this final consultative analysis, I spent about a month in Tanzania. As shown in Table 5 below, the last field survey involved 10 individuals: four ministry officials who were interviewed at the initial field survey of 2012, three education experts who were not among the previous interviewees, and three experts who are working in decentralized governance, human resource management, and public relations, and were not involved in the previous survey. These Tanzanians were selected mostly because of their expertise, availability for the inquiry, and willingness to discuss ownership issues while I was in Tanzania. I had the opportunities to work with nine of them at some point when I was based in Tanzania before. As a consequence, I was confident that they were
relevant to the discussion from professional and critical point of views. Each meeting was not framed as a formal interview but framed as an informal consultation to draw unbiased and honest opinions. I took notes during our interaction by using a laptop and also showed them with the laptop some figures as well as consolidated study results from previous field research. One meeting lasted about 1.5 hours on average.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Participant’s Specialized Area</th>
<th>Main Discussion Points</th>
<th>Previous Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Ministry</td>
<td>Adult and NFE</td>
<td>Challenges and remedies for decentralized ownership, Local community ownership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ministry</td>
<td>Adult and NFE</td>
<td>Local community ownership practice in adult education, ICBAE, External aid dependency, Decentralized planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ministry</td>
<td>Information Management</td>
<td>Decentralization of education, Local community ownership cases, Widening gap between local priorities and the center (devolution)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Ministry</td>
<td>Adult and NFE</td>
<td>Decentralization of education, Self-reliance, ICBAE, Resources as a means to drive ownership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local NGO/ Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>Local community ownership cases in education, Ownership factors, Traditional values</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral Donor Agency</td>
<td>Education and Gender</td>
<td>Decentralized structure, Reality of community ownership, Donor support, Self-reliance, Political change</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Education Sector Coordination</td>
<td>DPs’ contradictive aid approach, New education policy, Centralized power, Education as the government priority</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Decentralized governance, Challenges for local ownership, Contradiction of self-reliant education</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Consultant</td>
<td>Local Governance/ Finance</td>
<td>Self-reliance, Decentralized governance, Political transformation</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral Donor Agency</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Ownership cases in villages with good leadership, Tanzania not as a leading country on ownership</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The notes taken were carefully reviewed to reflect the discussions and look for connections and reasoning for the questions that had emerged in relation to the study.
result and analysis put together earlier. The first question was whether the constructed notion of country ownership was agreeable in line with the current Tanzanian development discourse. Then, the next question was intended to gather opinions on what was behind the centrality of community ownership stressed by Tanzanian education stakeholders. Another question was to inquire if the community ownership practices I have gathered from a small sampling might be isolated cases or particular to education. Additionally, we also discussed the current development challenges facing country ownership envisioned by Tanzanian education stakeholders.

The most recent consultation with Tanzanian colleagues was quite useful and valuable to reinforcing the relevance of the translated notion of Tanzanian country ownership, and also capturing the latest situation surrounding development affairs in the country. Based on those discussions and sub-themes that emerged and were reaffirmed during the discussions, I identified additional literature to engage in further analysis. In the end, I gained wider and more profound perspectives to analyze the study findings from the consultative analysis with Tanzanian colleagues.

**My Position as a Researcher**

It has been over 20 years since I started my career in the field of international development. I have found development work fascinating but at the same time extremely challenging and frustrating at times. Development is such a complex and multidimensional field. Moreover, my work has always taken place within the structure of Japan’s ODA. Because ODA is about aid provided by one government to another, the nature of aid-giving adds further complexity to development affairs. In terms of regions,
most of my work has focused on sub-Saharan Africa and taken place in Anglophone countries.

With this background, development and aid in sub-Saharan Africa is the sphere in which I have a profound interest in and desire to reinforce my skills and knowledge professionally and academically. Throughout my work in various countries, however, I constantly had to ask myself the same fundamental question: How I can better serve as an external development partner while respecting and supporting local ownership over development processes? In this way, I have been almost haunted by the same question on ownership for so long, which led me to engage in this study.

Tanzania is among the sub-Saharan African countries I have worked in for the last 15 years. While based in Dar es Salaam, I had most stimulating and enlightening work experiences in relation to development ownership and aid relationship. That was a time when Tanzanian state actors, external development partners, and non-state actors jointly and equally strived for a shared objective: to improve development results and aid coordination. Tanzanian ownership was a fundamental principle in this context. But at the same time, I sometimes observed external partners’ paradoxical attitudes and actions to be in opposition of local ownership. In this way, over the past years I have gained familiarity with and equally developed a concern about the development of ownership in sub-Saharan African countries, many of which are highly aid dependent and struggling with aid relationships to various degrees.

I worked in Tanzania once as an education sector advisor based in Dar es Salaam and a second time as a project team leader in Dodoma. For both occasions, I was posted by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) – the Japanese government’s
development assistance executing agency. In the early 2000s, Japan was one of the largest bilateral donors in ODA provision to Tanzania while education was among the priority sectors for JICA support in the country. During my posting as education sector advisor, however, the Japanese aid and intervention went through dramatic changes alongside the major aid reform efforts underway. The education sector has seen probably the most striking change in aid modality as well as donor coordination. Because the Tanzanian government’s preference was explicit and donor aid was quickly shifting to budgetary support, Japan did not have a comparative advantage and rationale in continuing support in education in Tanzania. In the end, JICA took education out of the prioritized sectors for its support.

Today, JICA no longer carries out projects in the education sector in Tanzania. As a consequence, the agency has substantially diminished its presence in the sector in recent years. Various study participants from the ministries, however, touched upon how JICA’s assistance in the past has brought about positive differences into education in the country. Clearly, for those study participants who have known me from my previous posting, I am a colleague and friend from the Japanese development agency.

During my first posting in Tanzania between 2001 and 2004, I had extensive exposure to education development and aid efforts involving the Ministry of Education and Culture, the PMO-RALG, other donor agencies, and the NGO sector. Attached to the JICA Tanzania as education sector advisor, I was assigned to follow up on and assist the implementation of the Education Sector Development Program (ESDP), in other words, education development undertakings in line with the Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp) that had been adopted and pursued by the Government of Tanzania.
SWAp is an approach to sector-wide development and intends to promote implementation of comprehensive sector development programs with mid-term expenditure plans, which are prepared and implemented under a country’s ownership and leadership as well as donors’ harmonized support in accordance with the sector comprehensive plans (Kamei, 2005). Based on the ESDP, the Primary Education Development Plan (PEDP) was produced in 2001. When the PEDP implementation began in 2002, SWAp initiatives were under full swing. The SWAp process required multiple reform efforts in improving development and aid inputs as a whole. For one, it required education donors to coordinate extensively among themselves.

Back in 2002, 15 bilateral development agencies and international organizations were involved in the education sector coordination in mainland Tanzania. Aid coordination was a high agenda. Education donors met almost biweekly to discuss and coordinate education issues to speak in one voice when meeting with government partners. We also developed a coordination structure in which education donor group members took specific tasks and thus each played a role in coordination and partnership. This was intended to reduce the overall workload of coordination among ourselves and also to alleviate transaction costs for our Tanzanian government counterparts. I personally served as a lead donor (person) in adult and non-formal education to represent the donor group and coordinate necessary undertakings for this specific sub-sector through an Adult and NFE technical working group with the Tanzanian government side.

During the course of this function, the Ministry of Education and Culture developed the second sub-sector development strategy following the PEDP – the Adult and Non-Formal Education Development Strategy. In the process of developing this
strategy and 5-year implementation plan, the colleagues involved went through a very challenging but rewarding quest which not only produced the very first Tanzanian strategy for the particular sub-sector but also generated solid ownership over the development strategy and plan. At that time, the Tanzanian government also started decentralizing implementation of basic education from the Ministry of Education to the PMO-RALG and LGAs. Therefore, these given conditions made the overall coordination and Tanzanian ownership in the education sector even more complex and demanding.

Through the above intensive endeavor with my Tanzanian government colleagues, I have developed an intimate understanding of their ownership context and a trusting relationship with them as well. Most of the study participants from the ministries went through the described period. So, as a researcher, my exposure to and knowledge of their country conditions and past experiences allowed me to facilitate drawing local views and honest opinions around the theme of country ownership in the context of education development. As far as individual study participants and experts are concerned, my positioning was more beneficial than otherwise for data collection.

**Limitations**

**Focus on State Actors**

It cannot be stressed enough that development issues are extremely intricate and multidimensional. First of all, national stakeholders in the development discourse range from central government – state officials – to the country’s civil society – citizens. Ultimately, good governance implies that a government is responsible for creating a climate that enables citizens to enjoy peace and security, according to Olowu and Sako (2002). In this respect, a central government is required to set policies that protect
citizens, ensure their overall welfare and are closely associated with civil society at large. Thus, a country’s development vision and policies should be eventually supported and materialized not only by state actors but with the involvement of non-state actors.

On the other hand, my field survey primarily involved education stakeholders from central and local governments and administrations in exploring Tanzanian perceptions. This focus was because, for one, governments and administrations are core agents to set development policy directions and consolidate development planning as well as implementation processes nationwide. For another, the study required a focus on the central government ministries, which are primarily responsible for overall decision making concerning development and aid, where a serious paradox seemingly exists in terms of ownership agenda. As pointed out by Whitmore et al. (2009), the relationship between state actors, non-state actors, and donor agencies has become increasingly complex in recent years. This complexity is likely to generate diverse or even conflicting views about ownership as well as development aid among state actors and non-state actors. When educational needs are concerned, people are also likely to have distinct opinions. Hence, the focus on the central level might have constrained capturing a comprehensive picture of ownership perceived by Tanzanians.

In Tanzania, for example, it is common for the central government to involve university personnel in formulation of development policies and strategies. Depending on the extent of their roles and involvement, stakeholders from academia may develop a sense of ownership over national policies and strategies concerned, which may be even translated as intellectual ownership. As this example suggests, there is a wide range of potential actors, capacities, and ways concerned to explore country ownership.
Fundamentally, it depends on how ownership is defined and context boundaries are set. The context of this study was concerned not only with development but also with international aid. As a consequence, it became important to prioritize and interact with state actors for this study. The selection of the study participants was purposeful.

It is sensible, therefore, to anticipate that data collected from state actors may not necessarily reflect perceptions of ownership held by broader development stakeholders and civil society at large. Views from actors other than ministry and district officials would further contribute to discussions and analysis of country ownership. In the end, partial involvement of non-state stakeholders is likely to be a considerable limitation for this study. Yet, as an attempt to better understand conditions and thinking around local ownership, which is often discussed in the context of international development and aid, it is deemed reasonable to focus on state actors involved in the development discourse in Tanzania.

**Positioning as a Former Donor Agency Personnel**

Another area of limitation has to do with my positioning. It is not questionable that power relations between low-income countries and their financiers exist in development and aid discourses. During my postings to Tanzania, I was engaged in education development activities with the Ministry of Education and Culture\(^\text{17}\) and the PMO-RALG as my counterpart ministries. In fact, some of the primary study participants were those I had closely worked with in the past. Therefore, I was mindful of my position as an external researcher coming to an aid-recipient country and of my possible effect on study participants at the time of data collection and analysis.

\(^{17}\) Back then, the ministry was named the Ministry of Education and Culture.
To alleviate a potential adverse effect, it was crucial to foster an understanding among study participants that they would not only provide their opinions to the researcher but would be also part of the study process to contemplate and explore ownership in their country context as a mutual inquiry. In recollection, this understanding was built with some of the participants in the primary survey. Despite my undeniable positioning as a former development partner rather than a researcher, as discussed in the previous section, our discussions at large were mostly constructive and honest.

When it comes to the field research conducted at the community level, however, my positioning might have had considerably more influence. To begin with, I was accompanied by two district officials who translated my questions and responses from focus group participants. Those local officials’ presence probably affected the responses I gathered from the community education stakeholders. Furthermore, the community participants might have presented more positive information and perspectives about their ownership performance to a researcher who came from a donor country although it had been explained to them that my research was personal and had nothing to do with aid provision to the involved communities.

**Languages for Data Collection**

Within the same context, I should also discuss the limitation related to languages used for my field research. In Tanzania, Kiswahili is a national language and spoken throughout the country. English, as an official language, is also spoken but mostly in urban areas and the government’s workplaces. In school education, Kiswahili is used as the instructional language at primary schools while it is switched to English at the secondary education level.
For my primary field research, I conducted interviews with education officials in English without a major communication problem. On the other hand, to organize focus groups with education stakeholders, in other words, villagers, in Morogoro Rural District, Kiswahili had to be the main communication language. Due to my limited language ability in Kiswahili, I had to rely on the translation made by the district education officers when conducting focus group interviews.

Both of the officers started their careers as school teachers and have been working at the district level after having served as a head teacher for 8 and 10 years respectively. They were capable of discussing ownership issues with me in English. Yet, my prior experiences with individual study participants proved that the term ownership is somewhat elusive in the context of development. Therefore, when I initially met with those education officers, I explained to them the purpose of my study and the context used for focus groups in order to investigate the state of community ownership.

At the same time, I questioned them if the translation of ownership in Kiswahili would be understood by community stakeholders. They replied that community people should understand the term without problem. The direct Kiswahili translation is *miliki*. During the focus groups, however, terms such as *zetu* (ours) and community’s were apparently used by the participants given that the questions posed to them largely concerned subjects such as schools and school implementation plans – tangible objects. In any case, language issues posed a considerable limitation for the researcher to fully understand subtle nuances and differences which might have occurred at the time of translation.
CHAPTER 5
STUDY FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the main findings of the study carried out through my field survey in Tanzania. They are presented according to the five guiding questions as outlined below:

Q1. How do local stakeholders understand ownership in development?
Q2. Who are the primary constituents of country ownership over education development discourse?
Q3. In what contexts and how is ownership exercised?
Q4. What are the essential elements that influence local ownership?
Q5. How do local stakeholders perceive their own ownership state?

In addition to these study questions, I asked some of the study participants who came up with clearer ideas about country ownership, “What should be looked at when assessing country ownership in the context of development?” Their ideas will be briefly presented in this chapter. Also, one other query concerning external donor support emerged in the course of our discussions on the theme of ownership. As I believe it is a pertinent issue in relation to the ownership agenda in Tanzania, this chapter presents some ideas expressed by individual study participants at the end. The question was “Are developing partners supporting Tanzanian ownership?”

As the previous chapter discussed in more detail, data were primarily derived from semi-structured interviews with 25 individual participants: 23 who are personnel from the central as well as the local government administrations in charge of basic
education and then two personnel from local NGOs actively supporting education activities in Tanzania. Following the individual interviews that took place mostly in Dar es Salaam and Dodoma, additional data were also gathered from focus groups organized at the village level as deemed to be necessary during the course of the field survey. The latter study participants were composed of local stakeholders from one ward and four villages in Morogoro Rural District. These supplementary data became valuable for further analysis and verification of the data and opinions collected from Tanzanian education authorities earlier in the study. Importantly, the main findings and analytical outcome have been shared with some of the study participants in order to have their feedback.

In this chapter, I organize and describe the main findings, according to the guiding questions set for this study. Since those questions were intended for individual education stakeholders and the additional survey at the community level was carried out as a result of the primary survey, I present the community survey results in the next chapter to further examine the findings that are discussed here in this chapter. In Chapter 7, the concluding chapter, then, I articulate the final outcome, a notion of ownership, which has been discussed and clarified with the study participants. Subsequently, I address key recommendations with the intention of generating a better understanding and more awareness of local ownership in the development discourse.

**Main Findings**

One of the most significant findings from this study is that the term ownership is well utilized by the study participants in their familiar context of education development, but at the same time, there is a definite ambiguity around it, especially when addressing
ownership of development in depth. Despite the frequent and casual usage of the term in their work settings, the majority initially experienced a challenge in detailing what ownership means to them and in relating ownership to actual development activities. With evidence of this challenge experienced by Tanzanian participants, I basically confirmed the necessity for the investigation and discussions undertaken on ownership of development: in essence, to better clarify and grasp what ownership means to the local stakeholders, and what it does or can do to development engagement and efforts on the ground.

Another significant finding is that study participants always claimed the centrality of ownership to be in place at the decentralized levels. This particular result implies, as far as education is concerned, that the primary actors in ownership of development are identified to be Tanzanian communities, in other words, villagers, who are the main component of the population in the country. The outcome was rather powerful in the sense that the study participants’ responses were mostly concerned with ownership at the community level on the grounds that development activities are carried out at that level. This rather unique phenomenon makes one wonder why these Tanzanian education stakeholders have such a similar mindset about ownership. To address this question, I attempted to understand and come up with possible reasons, especially from historical and local governance perspectives. The associated analysis will be discussed in Chapter 7.

Even more noteworthy is that the local population, more specifically the study participants at the community level, clearly recognized themselves as the primary agents responsible for education and school improvement while reasoning that they are the owners of local schools. During the interviews and discussions, I observed confidence
expressed and practical experiences shared by the community members, perhaps more than education officials did during ownership inquiries. From their responses and attitudes, it appeared to be unquestionable that they believe communities own local schools. In a legal sense, public schools are properties of the government. Yet, the communities are well sensitized to the notion that local schools belong to them and thus they are responsible for them locally.

As indicated by the individual study participants, the field survey at the community level brought about an assertion that the communities, or at least some villagers, are executing ownership in their practical context of education and development by identifying school issues and priorities, deciding actions to take, and striving for implementation through community contributions and mobilization as much as they can. This reveals promising evidence of ownership practiced in the local education development context in Tanzania, which was attested to by the study participants. In the overall circumstance surrounding ownership of development in the country, however, there are diverse challenges and conditions across local development grounds, and in fact, some Tanzanians were skeptical and questioned if the cases uncovered may be either artificial or examples of rather isolated ownership demonstrated by the communities.

Ownership: Familiar Term but Ambiguous Notion

The first question raised in this study was “How do local stakeholders understand ownership in development?” To start off, I asked the study participants about their familiarity with the term ownership. According to the responses collected from the individual participants – represented by central and district administrations and leading
local NGOs – they were all familiar with the term ownership with two exceptions of no familiarity. Various respondents, both from the central and lower levels, implied that they often use the term in their work settings. Interestingly, some of them further explained that they tend to use it specifically when dealing with their counterparts in lower administration levels to emphasize the importance of ownership at the community and school level. Thus, from the very beginning of the inquiry on ownership, there was a substantial indication that ownership has a lot to do with the decentralized levels in Tanzania.

Despite those claims of familiarity, however, intriguing evidence emerged to suggest that many interviewees understand the term ownership rather literally. They recognize ownership as possession of something tangible, land and property, for example. In the case of education, school property, textbooks, and the like were used as examples by individual study participants. Most of the examples described and familiar to them were situated at the community and school level. “They [people] should possess programs and be part of the implementation,” said one participant. One other ministry official, describing ownership, stated “But to me, it [ownership] is about possession. Politically, Ujamaa policy, socialism entailed the idea that all people have to share – community discusses to come up with their own priorities and communicates issues to districts – in this way people possess something commonly...” In this statement, the respondent implied that ownership traditionally had a connotation of collective or communal possession within the Tanzanian context.

In contrast, the participants from the ministries hardly related ownership to tasks and responsibilities engaged at the center with the exception of policies. Education policy,
described in the singular and a term which respondents probably used to refer to “Education and Training Policy,” seemed to be understood as tangible and ownable. On the other hand, a few participants explicitly expressed their opinions that they cannot own a process or discourse. “Ownership is too ambiguous. It’s not possible to own processes,” declared one ministry official. Thus, for them it is rather inappropriate or impractical to apply the term ownership in the context of a development process or discourse. The same respondents, however, accepted the usage with more ease as we continued to discuss the theme and use the word in more specific education contexts.

Briefly brainstorming about ownership allowed the participants to come up with clearer sub-themes associated with the term ownership. Overall, it turned out to be not so straightforward for most individual participants, even frustrating for a few members, to recapitulate what ownership of education development is. The extent of difficulty observed should have been anticipated because there is no formally established definition of ownership in the context of development; however, it was not quite anticipated, mostly because Tanzania is often considered to be a country leading discussions and practices on country ownership, in particular in relation to development aid coordination and partnerships with external donors. Those study participants from the center were thought to be among the Tanzanian government officials who have been part of this sort of development discourse.

Along with the confirmed initial ambiguity and unsettled concept of ownership, another notable finding is that no one among 25 individual study participants was familiar with the Paris Declaration. Only a few ministry officials indicated that they have heard of it but were not aware of the details at all. This unexpected result somewhat
explains the general difficulty the study participants experienced in defining country ownership and discussing associated issues. Furthermore, it poses a serious concern; what has been discussed concerning country ownership in the international arena is barely known by the local education authorities. This was rather disturbing evidence since one would anticipate that officials in management should have some familiarity with those dialogues eagerly undertaken through aid effectiveness forums for quite some time, where Tanzania is seemingly an active member country. It can be interpreted that the Tanzanian government’s top officials who participate in such meetings and follow up on the Paris Declaration, which emphasizes country ownership as essential to improving aid delivery, do not necessarily advocate discussed aid effectiveness agenda across line ministries and convey key discussions to the Tanzanian people.

Based on what was confirmed by the study participants, it is reasonable to believe that in general the term ownership is well adopted in the local education context even though a clear notion has not been established yet. Thus, interpretations and perceptions vary somewhat among the education stakeholders at the ministry as well as district administration levels. Yet, notably, they do share fundamental elements associated with ownership of development. These elements will be eventually confirmed in the coming sections. Varied understandings and views of ownership are, on the other hand, most likely generated from different backgrounds and experiences held by the study participants in the context of education development.

For the majority of the study participants, it was not easy to describe what ownership of development means to them when questioned at the beginning of our interaction. Some of them indicated that they had never thought about the meaning of the
term before – even when most of them responded that he/she was familiar with it. The respondents certainly know its literal meaning, however. Data gathered also indicate that they often use the term in their general work context. Regardless, the meaning became unclear, especially when the term was applied to a context relating to their conventional tasks and responsibilities and/or the entire education sector process. One respondent clearly pointed out that the meaning of ownership shifts depending on a given context. One other respondent also claimed that the boundary between ownership and obligation is difficult to delineate. This remark suggests that some may feel that they are engaged in certain activities because of their duties or orders coming from their superiors although they may or may not recognize a sense of ownership.

After all, many individual study participants felt that the term ownership was familiar at first but in fact became vague when they had to explain it in more detail. This outcome turned out to be an intriguing and unexpected discovery to the participants themselves. Throughout the entire interaction in the field research, only a few participants could describe what ownership of development meant to them without hesitation. Ownership is an exceptionally profound and intricate subject; it is against this background that one respondent asserted, “No one can define ownership!” Yet, no one denied significance of country ownership over development. In fact, various study participants were eager to clarify the meaning through our inquiry. In the course of this field survey, I became more certain that there was an acute need to address and discuss ownership agenda with the local education and development stakeholders in Tanzania or elsewhere.
Key Words and Phrases

Due to the unexpected unfamiliarity, which made some participants feel surprised and a little awkward, I encouraged individual study participants to talk more freely about ownership. Based on the semi-structured interviews employed in this study, some key terms and subjects clearly began to appear – even before proceeding any further – and they were commonly and repeatedly mentioned by the respondents during our conversations. In the end, it turned out to be quite helpful for the participants to themselves learn what came to their minds when thinking about ownership in the context of education development. This intercession also seemed to have provided some comfort as well as clarity, and raised participants’ confidence level. In this way, each participant had his/her key words associated with ownership better clarified and understood during the course of the dialogue.

Those key words and phrases that emerged and were seemingly closely related to ownership include the following: (identify own) priorities, (own) decision making [authority], fully in control [autonomy], (collective) planning, full participation, (assets in the form of) resources, (sense of) responsibility, and commitment. These are, more or less, the words and phrases that consistently arose from the study participants when they were addressing what country ownership could mean to them in the context of education development. Before moving to my next inquiry during interviews, I summarized to each respondent what I had gathered, and then confirmed with him/her the main themes roughly expressed. Overall, the notions were not concrete at this stage; however, the study participants did have some ideas and personal situations to associate and describe ownership with.
Who Are the Primary Actors in Ownership?

There has been an evolution in the ownership debates alongside the forums on aid effectiveness over the last decade in terms of who are the constituents of country ownership. As Chapter 2 reviewed, ownership used to be, more often than not, understood as ownership of the national governments of aid-recipient countries. Then, only when CSOs began to actively take part in the aid effectiveness discussions, more precisely around the time of the Accra Forum held in 2008, they strongly advocated that ownership over policy and strategy process should involve country citizens together with parliaments. This broadened understanding was collectively adopted by the international community in the Busan Forum in 2011. Despite these international debates and attempts to better define ownership, the perceptions of the local population on ownership have barely been investigated thoroughly.

Against this background, I posed the following study question: Who are the primary constituents of country ownership over education development discourse? To explore this question, when referring to country ownership, I questioned “whose ownership” to clarify the ideas possessed by Tanzanian education stakeholders. The responses gathered from 25 individual study participants were aggregated by their responses and are presented in Figure 2.

---

18 The data was collected without providing the participants with any sample answer. Three participants out of 25 gave more than one constituent as their answers.
Figure 2: Responses to “Who are the primary actors in constituting country ownership?”

The result shows that over 70% of the overall responses concern the Tanzanian people, rather than government, line ministries, parliament, or any other group entity. In more detail, 37% of the entire responses fell under “people at grassroots level or communities.” These terms are interchangeable with “villagers” as the participants described during the interviews. Following “people or communities,” 27% were described as “Tanzanians.” Some respondents meant Tanzanians as people on the ground, who can be also described as villagers. Others meant Tanzanians at all levels, which imply Tanzanians at the bottom as well as those at the top of the government. One participant interestingly emphasized the importance of nationality as Tanzanian. Similarly, 10% of the responses fell under “citizens.” It should be noted that some participants used Tanzanians and citizens interchangeably. In summary, it was convincingly demonstrated by the study participants at large that country ownership is or should be about and led by the Tanzanians, especially by the people on the ground. Again,
it is important to keep in mind that these terms of “who” were interchangeably used in conjunction with villagers by the respondents.

In contrast, only a few participants indicated that country ownership should be held by government entities rather than individuals and/or people in Tanzania. Fascinatingly, even among those respondents, their opinions were clearly divided. Two participants indicated that country ownership should be primarily in the hands of the central government or responsible ministries. Not surprisingly, those respondents were the ones dealing with policy matters at the ministerial level. Moreover, one respondent who thought the ministry should be the agent of ownership clearly meant the Ministry of Education, not any other education-related ministry such as the PMO-RALG. In the education sector in Tanzania, a few ministries, including the PMO-RALG, are in charge of education affairs. However, it was indicated that the Ministry of Education is mandated with overall education policy, and thus ownership should be with this particular ministry as far as education policies are concerned. Other participants who chose government entities basically selected more than one constituent; the other constituents were local governments as well as people/communities. In addition, they mentioned the importance of the government’s involvement of the population in a national development discourse.

Despite the fact that Tanzania has been proceeding with the decentralization policy, neither the regional administration nor the district and village councils drew much attention as entities of ownership. In this regard, it was reasoned by a few participants that the councils at the decentralized levels represent local Tanzanian residents and take up issues to inform the central government of their citizens’ opinions. In this respect,
together with the local population, in their words, villagers, it was implied that the local governments should be part of communities and have ownership over development discourses in general.

Surprisingly or not surprisingly, there was no single respondent who suggested the significant association of parliament with country ownership. When discussing who was involved in policy making, a few study participants mentioned that the parliament or members of parliament (MP) do have a say about policies. In fact, education policies must be approved by the parliament in Tanzania. However, none of the respondents gave voice to the idea that the parliament or MPs should be the primary constituents of country ownership over a development process. In relation to this, one participant pointed out that MPs do not get involved in policy matters notably because they leave policies to responsible line ministries. On the contrary, education is often one sector where MPs are rather eager to chip in and have a say. Some other study participants indeed stated that politicians tend to intervene in education policies, which they have more influence over than responsible ministry officials in reality. Consequently, parliament and politicians are recognized as actors involved in policy making but not as a primary owner of education development in the end.

Insightfully, one respondent articulated that ownership depends on a given context. He further went on to say that even development partners should own part of a development process once it is clarified what and how they are supposed to take roles in the due course, although Tanzanians must be always in charge of the policy and implementation process as a whole. As mutual accountability is increasingly becoming a common norm in the international development discourse, jointly owning a development
process even with external actors appears to be a new way of thinking, which is provocative but may be useful for more discussion and elaboration. Actually, as discussed in the literature review, the Tanzanian ownership experience so far has been associated with external donors’ involvement. Especially when resources are put together to ensure agreed actions, joint ownership somewhat becomes inevitable. Therefore, for Tanzanian development stakeholders, the idea of shared ownership may not be as provocative as we might think in the development context as well.

Lastly, the responses to “whose ownership” were aggregated by the two divisions of the study participants: those from central ministries and the others from district education offices as well as NGOs. In Figure 3 below, the bars in blue indicate the number of respondents from the center while the bars in red indicate the numbers of district and NGO participants. The result clearly shows that government entities were chosen as primary constituents mainly by the respondents from central ministries while the majority of district and NGO respondents opted to choose non-state entities of country ownership.
Figure 3: Responses to “Whose ownership” aggregated by the Center and Others

In What Contexts Is Ownership Recognized?

To explore the next guiding question of this study, “In what contexts and how is ownership exercised?” this section elaborates the findings concerning the contexts. Prior to the field research, seven specific contexts were preselected, which I considered to be the principal areas that local education stakeholders are familiar with and in which they were likely to recognize a connection with ownership or even exercise ownership. These preselected contextual activities are (1) policy making, (2) priority setting, (3) strategy development, (4) planning, (5) budgeting, (6) financial management, and lastly (7) monitoring and evaluation (M&E). They are the components of an education development and management process generally and widely operated in Tanzania. By presenting these subject areas to the study participants, it was intended to facilitate their consciousness of potential areas of exercising ownership, to draw more practical ownership cases, and also compare varied weights of ownership perceived or their recognition across different activities conducted in the education development process.
Policy Making

Overall, the individual participants responded positively to most of the education process undertakings inquired about. The reactions toward policy making, however, were somewhat interesting and complex. Most of the participants felt that they were not in a position to influence policy making or policies in general. Accordingly, they do not believe that they are exercising ownership within this domain. There were a few members of the participants from central ministries involved in the area of education policy, and their responses implied that education policies are mostly determined politically and as a consequence only a limited number of personnel may exercise ownership over policy making. The respondents further explicated that due to having no decision-making power or authority, even those ministry officials engaged in policy development are apparently discouraged by a policy-making discourse in which they have no control. Despite this rather passive perception, the study participants, especially those in the management of the MoEVT as well as the PMO-RALG, strongly expressed that they own Tanzanian education policies.

According to the data collected, the main actors who are involved in policy making include: the government, responsible ministries, and the parliament. Notably, external donors or development partners (DPs) were also mentioned as another actor in this domain. On the other hand, the ownership of policies was most often identified with the MoEVT and the PMO-RALG at the institutional level; and the Minister of Education and ministry officials at the individual level. Meanwhile, it should be noted that most respondents simultaneously indicated that local stakeholders should own education policies in the end. These remarks ought to be understood as a vision rather than a reality,
however. In this regard, one district respondent described it as follows: “Primarily, it should be government leaders at the national level when we are talking about development of the country. When it comes down to the people, the details should be owned by people on the ground.”

In analyzing policy as a context, ownership concerning policies should be divided into a few distinctive dimensions: (1) policy making involving the government’s top leaders and politicians, (2) policy development that involves technocrats and experts mostly at the center, and (3) policy implementation that concerns a much wider range of education stakeholders across different levels. Each dimension encompasses specific actors while ministry officials are involved in, to varied degrees, different policy stages. Importantly, education officials tended to express their general frustration about having no control over decision making but at the same time a strong sense of owning actual policies themselves.

Concerning education policies, ownership of policy making was not well recognized by the individual study participants although ministry participants, especially those who were involved in policy development, claimed to have a clear sense of ownership over concerned policies. The participants, both from central and local government administrations, assume that policy makers, more often than not, identified as politicians including the education minister, are the ones who should exercise ownership over policy making. Then again, it has been revealed that some respondents themselves claim to have a strong sense of ownership over education policies – the final products of policy making.
Reflecting on the responses from study participants led me to believe that ownership of policy can be cultivated and enhanced consecutively when stakeholders are closely engaged in the process since the time of policy development and also once policy directions are set and implementation is handed over to wider education stakeholders. Obviously, education stakeholders get involved in different stages of a policy process and with different mandates, and as a result, varied magnitudes of ownership are generated. As far as the education officials are concerned, they are in charge of coordination, monitoring, and evaluation of policy implementation and are thoroughly familiar with policies concerned. And indeed, they expressed their strong sense of ownership over them. It was further explained that they feel responsible for sound implementation of education policies and that with this sense of responsibility they reviewed the country’s Education and Training Policy in recent years. The Education and Training Policy, a core education policy originally developed in 1997, was revised and finalized in 2013.

**Priority Setting**

Along with identification of key issues to tackle, priority setting was one context that study participants across different levels identified as important in relation to ownership of education development. Among areas of ownership inquired about, priority setting was described as one of the most critical activities associated with Tanzanian stakeholders’ sense of ownership and execution. Various study respondents implied that development issues must be identified at the village level and then villagers must prioritize what and how they should be able to tackle them. Furthermore, when it comes to priority setting, the majority considers that the level of ownership to be exercised should be at the community, not necessarily at the ministerial or local government level.
Consequently, within the context of priority setting, the individual study participants did not recognize ownership directly in relation to their mandates at work but rather put an emphasis on the education stakeholders on the ground.

On the other hand, the stakeholders who actually set priorities were perceived differently according to the respondents. Primary priority setters were mostly identified as the central government, MPs, and external donors. In adult education, however, communities were indicated as primary actors, as described by one study participant as follows: “Priority setting – good thing about adult education is that the program let them [communities] decide what needs to be done, what resources they can come up with.”

As a practical example, one ministry participant articulated his daily practice of ownership in prioritizing the work of the day. This official said that he tries to operate his mandates according to the priority set and reflects on the result of his work at the end of the day to assess its outcome and consider any improvement needed to his work. This is definitely an exceptional case where the ownership concept is consciously applied and practiced in a daily work setting. Yet, this particular case seems to suggest the practicability of self-initiated ownership as well as significance of prioritization and its connection to a sense of responsibility and accountability.

According to the data collected from individual interviews, priority setting was recognized as one inevitable pursuit that generates ownership and promotes its implementation locally where education issues emerge. It was rated highly in terms of importance in relation to ownership; comparatively higher than other activity categories. However, it was not evident that the study participants themselves have a keen sense of ownership over priority setting although it was accepted generally that they set priorities
wherever they need to do so. Because of the eminent recognition placed upon the community level in relation to development priorities as well as strong recommendations from a few ministry officials, an additional survey was organized at the community level in order to investigate the importance and practices of ownership, including that of priority setting, by communities. Findings from the field survey will be discussed subsequently in connection to what has been discussed here.

**Strategy Development**

Generally speaking, strategy development is considered extremely crucial in a development process. Especially since the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) process initially prescribed by the World Bank became a norm in many sub-Saharan African countries, a national development strategy has been a requirement for low-income countries to acquire development funding from the international community. Despite widespread recognition of its importance, it can be concluded that the study participants as a whole did not clearly capture and respond to strategy development. This result may not be exceptionally surprising but to some degree expected due to the fact that development of strategies for policy implementation is often handled rather exclusively at the ministry level and mostly by technical experts.

Similarly, the study participants from the districts as well as the NGO sector did not recognize ownership over strategy development. This result emerged despite the fact that there is usually a consultation organized to involve a wide range of stakeholders across different levels at the time of consolidation or revision of strategies. Regardless, the study participants largely agreed that ownership must be exercised over strategy
development as well. Those who should own concerned strategies were said to be responsible ministries and departments.

Some respondents from the ministries indicated that the government prepares overall strategies while local governments subsequently prepare development strategies for policy implementation at the decentralized level. In this respect, the observation was also made by a district official that strategy development normally involves only a limited number of technical people, or experts. Thus, a similar situation for strategy development exists at both levels, and it implicitly suggests that a sense of ownership is not to be generated as generally and widely as, say in the case of planning that engages a much wider range of stakeholders at every level.

In conclusion, development of education strategies was identified as a little obscure in explaining ownership given that most of the respondents were not substantially involved in strategy designing. As a consequence, even when some participants, particularly at the center, are very familiar with the contents of education strategies, they did not claim that they have ownership or exercise ownership over those strategies. One obvious exception was that those ministry officials, who have prepared a specific education strategy, expressed their strong ownership over the strategy concerned. This is the case of the Adult and Non-Formal Education (NFE) Development Strategy, which was developed in 2003 by a responsible unit of the Ministry of Education as the first development strategy for adult education and NFE in Tanzania. This particular case appears to be worth investigating for a more concrete understanding of ownership practices over strategy development.
Behind the strong sense of ownership expressed was the strategy development process in which the responsible unit members had led undertakings and actually written the strategy while an international consultant, who was contracted for this particular exercise, mostly facilitated the overall process to ensure the timely and constructive development of the strategy in coordination with various stakeholders. In retrospect, one ministry official who has been involved in developing the strategy recalled, “When [consultant’s name] came as a consultant, he didn’t bring in anything but we put our ideas together [facilitated by him]. He was a good facilitator and respected our ideas.”

**Planning**

This study identified planning as another context where stronger ownership is likely to exist and be exercised by education stakeholders across all levels. In the education sector in Tanzania, the concept of bottom-up planning was introduced shortly after the Local Government Reform Program (LGRP) implementation became active in 2000. Basic education is one sector where the bottom-up planning has been applied and carried out for some time. Fundamentally, education planning takes place at all levels; starting at the school and community level. Once developed, school plans are required to be submitted to and approved by village councils. Then, approved plans need to be forwarded to district councils via WDC, and finally to the PMO-RALG. At every level, submitted plans from a lower level are reviewed and compiled into a plan. PMO-RALG is the central ministry responsible for consolidating district education plans into a comprehensive national plan.

Since the decentralized structure in Tanzania requires this bottom-up planning in education, the study participants from the center clearly assumed that ownership exists at
every level in which planning takes place, especially at the lower levels where planning initially starts. Indeed, the participants from the local governments as well as communities expressed their strong feelings about their own education plans. They claim ownership because they are the ones who put the plans together. In the case of the school and community level, a school activity plan is called a “school improvement plan,” and a school committee has a mandate to prepare such a plan annually and submit it to a village council.

When addressing planning at the community level, one ministry official stated, “When we come together and discuss, everyone contributes ideas, then, he/she feels that the plan is his/hers. Engagement from planning stage is a key.” As echoed by other respondents, planning is one distinctive context where a stronger ownership was expressed commonly during individual interviews. Given that planning is a solid mandate for every level of the decentralized governance, education stakeholders across varied levels described their involvement in planning as a crucial education undertaking. These responses suggest another way that education stakeholders somewhat assume their ownership: Stakeholders accept responsibility to prepare an education plan for implementation. Needless to say, planning is directly linked with policy and strategy implementation, therefore, a weak implementation could be attributed partially to inappropriate planning. As a consequence, education stakeholders tend to take planning seriously as their own responsibility, which may generate a sense that the plans belong to them as an outcome of their collective efforts. In this respect, it is extremely critical who is involved in planning and makes associated decisions.
From a different angle, one ministry participant explained his daily planning exercise when he described what ownership means as follows:

*For me, starting from individual level, individuals have everyday plans…On daily basis I check the status of my plan but to implement it I need resources. And resources have to come from me. I will check if I have resources and who does what, and monitor the status of activities. To fulfill the objectives, I will have discussions with others. But in the end, the plan is mine. For me, ownership is how the plan is developed and also implemented primarily using my own resources.*

The attitude described above was largely evident at the community level as well. All the focus groups from the studied communities presented a similar explanation that the school committee is responsible for plan preparation and that their school plan belongs to the community. Importantly, the community is responsible for identifying and mobilizing resources (e.g., labor, materials, and financial contribution) needed for school improvement as much as possible. Overall, the focus groups expressed even stronger ownership over education planning as compared with the education authorities. Along with priority setting, local stakeholders apparently cultivate ownership by being engaged in the planning process, which further generates a sense of responsibility for prioritized actions, resource mobilization and implementation. A combination of identification of priorities and planning how to cope with them is considered to be a most vital process associated with a sense of ownership.

**Budgeting**

There is no doubt that budgeting is a pertinent subject in considering ownership over education development activities as well as the whole development process. One ministry participant explicitly indicated that a critical role in education budgeting should be placed at the LGAs, given that the local government is where most of the education
budget is put together based on consolidated education plans originating from local schools. Along with this decentralized arrangement for planning and budgeting, most respondents from the ministry as well as the district level appeared to feel that they do not possess a sense of ownership over education budgeting. According to the discussions held with the individual study participants, it was revealed that ownership is hardly generated due to the fact that budgeting is beyond their control; in the end, the Ministry of Finance is authorized to determine budget allocation, not the Ministry of Education and the PMO-RALG nor local governments. In addition, an increase in external donor intervention makes this domain more complex and difficult to own.

Significantly, on the other hand, the participants in focus groups at the village level addressed their responsibility for implementation of their school plans and thus ensuring they have the required resources. They well recognize that the government’s financing is limited and therefore it is their obligation to come up with additional resources, of any kind, to fill up existing financial gaps for their plans. All this evidence points to the fact that community members, or villagers, at large are likely to have some sense of ownership, or a sense of responsibility, over education budgeting and resource allocation for their school plans. This is particularly true of those community members who attended my field survey and are members of school committees. Priority setting, education planning, and resource allocation are intermingled to determine effective implementation of their priories, in other words, development plans.

In this sense, budgeting is considered one important domain in which stakeholders ideally should have a sense of ownership across different levels. This is rather a distinctive finding, and it may be worthwhile exploring ownership practice in more depth,
for example, across more communities, including those less empowered, in Tanzania or even in comparison with other country cases in order to better understand what motivates some stakeholders to act on ownership despite prevailing financial difficulties. In the case of Tanzania, this strong sense of ownership at the community level could be uniquely associated with socio-political factors such as a long-standing philosophy of self-reliance, traditional values rooted in many rural communities, in-place decentralization arrangement and associated sensitization. Again, these aspects could be further explored.

In summary, education budgeting was scarcely recognized as owned by the interviewees from central ministries and district administration. Even for those who head departments at the ministry and are responsible for a budget, budgeting was described as beyond their control, and thus, they have no authority to determine it. A general claim was that the top management at the ministry level and ultimately the Ministry of Finance are responsible for decision making concerning the education budget. Hence, they should execute ownership in this domain. In discussing and analyzing this particular context, decision-making power and control emerged as two forefront notions expressed by the participants just as when they discussed policy making. Contrastingly, at the community level, the focus group participants appeared to be in more control of securing resources for their plan implementation. This evidence may suggest that some communities have a sense of ownership and assume ownership in relation to education financing.

In addition, the findings from this context raise a fundamental question concerning ownership and aid practice, more specifically donors’ budgetary support. Since budget support has become a significant aid modality in development engagements, donors accordingly mind fiscal budget and budget allocation in their recipient countries.
As implied by some study participants, if it is vital for country stakeholders to make decisions and have full control as regards budgeting, then, would it be possible for budget-recipient countries to exercise ownership? This is a critical question because budget support arguably allows aid-recipient countries to pursue policy implementation according to their priorities. Given that GBS is the aid modality preferred by the Government of Tanzania, it is deemed necessary to be cautious of a likely connection between donors’ aid practice and Tanzania’s ownership practice.

**Financial Management**

Financial management appeared to be a domain whose importance cannot be denied but in which ownership was recognized the least by the study respondents as a whole. Those who are responsible for departments at the ministry as well as local administration levels explicitly agreed that ownership over financial management is critical. Yet, they also implied that ownership, in other words, primary responsibility, should be assumed by the government at large or the finance department specifically. Other participants basically indicated that they were not directly involved in financial management and thus did not necessarily have a sense of ownership over the subject area. Again, because of the decentralized planning and budgeting structure set for basic education, some respondents, both from the center and local administration, suggested that ownership should be in place at decentralized levels: school committees and district governments in particular on the grounds that that is where education finance is mostly executed.

Meanwhile, when it comes to the school and community level, it may be possible to interpret the observed attitudes and demonstrated views during the field survey that
community members who are involved in resource mobilization and budgeting have a sense of ownership and feel responsible to manage allocated resources properly and accountable to the community members even though financial management was not inquired about and discussed at the time of focus groups. Findings from the village level will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

In conclusion, ownership in relation to financial management was not well recognized by the individual study participants in order to verify its significance and how it is executed in reality. There was a clear tendency, however, for the participants to point out the appropriate location of ownership within either central government or local governments, more specifically the department of finance. Even though the study participants did not recognize ownership at an individual level, they recognized the importance of financial management as a context of ownership execution regardless of the levels of education activities carried out. They are fully aware that PFM is a serious concern for donors as well. In the end, however, there is some room for further discussion regarding ownership concerning financial management to clarify what it implies in practice.

**Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**

Periodic monitoring and reviewing of policy implementation, mostly of intended education activities, is an integral part of the education sector management undertaken at all levels. Hence, study participants are familiar with this context and recognized the importance of ownership over education monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in general. Nevertheless, the respondents as a whole did not express a sense of ownership over this
particular context at the individual level. Some appeared to feel that they are involved in certain aspects of M&E as part of their duties without a sense of ownership.

On the other hand, M&E is uniquely positioned in the development process in the sense that associated activities can be rationally planned and implemented together with external development partners, either formally or informally. Tanzania is a forerunner in organizing joint education sector reviews, which have been conducted in collaboration and coordination with DPs in the country for over a decade. There has been a clear trend in many aid-recipient countries in recent years that a country’s development policy implementation is jointly reviewed and assessed with a wide range of stakeholders. The education sector in Tanzania is not an exception but possesses rather advanced experiences in that regard.

Against this background, one ministry participant suggested that development partners could have ownership as well when concerned with M&E. The implication of this statement may be that if the process is jointly organized and carried out, external partners also should have a sense of ownership and be accountable for the outcome even though to a larger extent ownership must be held by the Tanzanian side, more precisely by responsible ministries that are in charge of overall sector reviews. As far as the individual study participants are concerned, however, a sense of ownership was not notably expressed. Not surprisingly, some clarifications were made by those who are in the management, both from the ministries and districts, that monitoring should take place at lower administration levels while assessment should be handled at higher levels. Possibly reflecting this division of labor, district participants expressed somewhat stronger ownership elements than their counterparts at the center when it comes to
monitoring. Moreover, when adult education is concerned, monitoring is also conducted by local communities. Accordingly, there were implications that ownership should exist at the community level in addition to local administration levels.

Regardless, study participants as a whole did not quite perceive ownership in relation to the subject domain despite the fact that most of them are involved in M&E activities to varied degrees. The reason for this could be that the majority was not in charge of M&E while department heads fairly expressed their sense of ownership on the other hand. In the end, from the conversation with individual education stakeholders, practical examples of exercising ownership did not come forward in the context of M&E.

**Summary**

Previous sections discussed and analyzed how the study participants recognized ownership associated with specific education contexts as well as where to place such ownership across different levels of the governance structure. In principle, those education undertakings are carried out as an integral part of the education sector development process in Tanzania. Each individual participant is or was in charge of or involved in certain aspects and/or activities inquired about depending on his/her position and duties. Thus, familiarity with and responsibility for each subject area held among the participants varied considerably. These varied individual experiences made it difficult to refine an overall picture of ownership existing and exercised in the education sector. Regardless, by incorporating as much as possible of the views and understandings expressed during interviews, a matrix was developed to depict the assessed ownership structure and is presented in APPENDIX B.
During the course of inquiry, the individual participants did not respond well to rating the importance of ownership across the discussed contexts. It should be noted, however, that the respondents at large appeared to feel more weight to be in place for two particular contexts: priority setting and planning. As for the former, the local community was identified as a primary owner of priorities determined locally for education development. On the other hand, planning was said to be owned by stakeholders at every level in which education planning takes place. Also, of all the subject areas, ownership over planning was recognized with more clarity. This must be because the respondents are most familiar with planning as a domain that they engage with regularly in their work settings.

All in all, priority setting and planning have emerged as two development contexts that appear to be crucial for education stakeholders to be fully engaged in so as to generate a sense of ownership, which further makes them feel responsible as well as committed for implementation of their priorities and plans in development. Along with these two domains, budgeting and securing resources seem to be another important ingredient, possibly generating a stronger sense of ownership. However, many individual study participants denied their ownership due to their lack of authority as well as lack of control in this domain.

On the contrary, stakeholders at the community level recognized their responsibility to mobilize needed resources to realize their prioritized activities and contribute to resource allocation within their capacity. In this sense, securing resources, in other words contributing to resourcing, plays a pertinent role in forming ownership, which can be translated into a way of locally practiced ownership of development.
Fundamentally, development undertakings cannot be implemented without needed resources, especially financing. In this perspective, control of financial resources is one inevitable key to ownership of development at all levels.

Lastly, it should be noted that one ministry participant suggested that goal setting is another domain to be owned by local stakeholders. This is indeed a rationally agreeable point. Probably, as with priorities and objectives, when development stakeholders discuss and determine their own goals to strive for, this process should facilitate a sense of owning those goals. In Tanzania’s neighbor, Rwanda, the central government, more precisely the Ministry of Education, came up with its own country education goal in addition to six EFA goals that have been adopted globally across developing countries. At the time of reviewing the EFA implementation in 2014, the Rwandan Ministry of Education expressed a strong sense of ownership over the efforts taken for attaining the EFA goals, signifying the fact that they had initiated the additional goal internally and voluntarily.

**How is Ownership Exercised?**

This section continues to analyze and articulate how Tanzanian education stakeholders exercise ownership while engaging in the course of development. When discussing the issue of ownership in relation to policy making, one study participant implied that involvement in the process alone does not necessarily ensure ownership. While technical personnel, as largely represented by the study participants from central ministries, consolidate policies, policy directions always come from politicians, including their own ministers, as pointed out by some respondents. The respondents clearly indicated that they do not have control as far as policies are concerned. However, one
participant, a senior officer from a ministry, insightfully described his thinking regarding ownership in relation to policy making as follows:

Ownership is cultivated when you are part of coordination of the process. I cannot influence much the process of these undertakings overall. I cannot claim that I have full ownership. Ownership can be said in that we belong to a subsection and own certain associated tasks and then we can influence the process. I cannot influence the process of policy making, for example. But politicians are not the ones who actually translate, draft, and come to the details of the policies. The one who owns the policy is the minister or may be decision makers as well but the ones who really have a sense of owning may be those who interpret and write the policy at the ministry level.

The above description of ownership provides some insights. First, one can generate ownership by being part of the entire process with some specific mandates. Even without full participation, one might be able to somehow influence undertakings in the process. Participation in a process through technical contribution is implied as a way of cultivation and realization of ownership in the above description. In fact, one technical officer from a ministry described that she exercises ownership by making technical inputs into the process based on her technical expertise. Furthermore, the ownership described raises another point: having a sense of ownership and owning something are two different matters. Considering the reality that ownership over a development process or certain activities is more about a “sense” rather than an actual ownership, it is indeed more understandable to describe ownership as a “sense” in some contexts of development.

Then, how does a sense of ownership become a reality or visible? Given that examining ownership according to the preselected education contexts had a limitation in clarifying how ownership is exercised, I encouraged the study participants to describe how ownership may be exercised in a context more familiar to them individually. The following Table 6 shows the ideas revealed by the respondents.
Table 6: Descriptions of Exercising Ownership

**Descriptions of Central Ministry Participants:**

- **By being accountable for undertakings** from technical aspects [even when authority is limited]
- **By participating** and **contributing** to development activities through hard work; critical particularly during the planning process
- **By developing plans** with our own ideas, **implementing them with our own resources**, and **being responsible** for the outcomes
- **By being fully in control** of what and how to implement, which has been decided internally
- **By planning** what to do based on our knowledge and skills [locally available knowledge and skills] and **contributing** to the policy process
- **By acting on their own decisions** when community members (villagers) decide what is and how they cope with their collective agenda
- **By influencing the process and detailing** the course of engagements in a coordination process [in which various stakeholders are involved in]
- **By making decisions** and **planning**, and **utilizing own resources** as well as own **capacity** to implement development programs
- **By utilizing own [human and financial] resources** and by **committing** to development engagements through **participation** in the process
- **By participation, taking responsibility**, and **contributing** to the development implementation process

**Descriptions of District Participants:**

- **By taking responsibility** for own decisions and plans
- **By using** limited yet available **resources** to act on changing lives [through development and education engagements]
- **By taking responsibilities, collectively making efforts**, and **committing** to development engagements
- **By engaging** and **being committed** to implementing the policy through different undertakings
- **By being fully engaged** in and **in control** over development activities in a **planning** process
- **By taking responsibility** and **contributing** through efforts (resource, time, labor, etc.) to accomplish engagements
- **By making decisions** [to directly own] or **being mandated** to do activities/tasks in development [to indirectly own]
- **By deciding** what and how to go about in development and **implementing** their own decisions for realization

**Descriptions of NGO Participants:**

- **By being accountable** and **transparent** for tasks where partners **work together**
- **By participating** and **having a say** in the development process

Although my inquiry of practicing ownership did not offer any specifics, the above responses do present some similar premises and ideas that are associated with ownership. Individual study participants were not confident in describing ownership at
the beginning of our interaction. Yet, having discussed issues during interviews, they became more certain of what ownership was about. Based on the views revealed and consolidated, I would infer that the following areas may well represent how the local stakeholders feel that they are exercising ownership in the education sector development discourse.

First, a fundamental entry point to exercising ownership is to initiate ideas together to realize as implementers. Second is to make decisions about what and how to implement. Third is to be accountable for implementation of policy, strategy, plans, decisions, specific tasks, etc. Lastly, it is to commit oneself to implementation and engagement through making efforts and contributions in various forms. If considered in relation to a development process, the first two aspects are mostly about decision making for priority setting and planning. Then, the third and fourth are concerned with policy implementation and participation in it, which clarifies responsibility and requires accountability for outcomes. All these elements and stages interact to a different degree but make stakeholders feel that they are acting on ownership.

One fresh thought expressed and hinted at by a few study participants is that having mandates for specific tasks may generate indirect ownership of development even without involvement in the preceding decision-making process. Thus, having certain mandates or obligations is another distinctive element of generating a sense of ownership. However, considering the significance of emphasized planning and decision making, ownership is likely to suffer from a weakness or shortage of key ingredients, notably accountability, for example. That said, this shortage might be compensated for by a
strong commitment for implementation at the individual level. In this sense, fulfilling mandates to account for results may be another form of exercising ownership.

**What Elements Are Essential to Influencing Ownership?**

The previous section discussed those features thought to be essential for local stakeholders to feel that they are exercising ownership. At an engagement level, collectively identifying priorities and deciding on actions to take are vital for forming country ownership while responsibility and accountability are associating elements that further strengthen a sense of ownership. In the course of the interviews, I also questioned the study participants about main factors that support and discourage their ownership. By the time this particular question was raised, the respondents were engaged in our conversation and eager to give their thoughts. Their responses were aggregated respectively, and the results are presented in the below graphs (Figure 4 and Figure 5).

**What Supports Ownership?**

As Figure 4 depicts, various factors were identified by 25 study participants as elements supporting their ownership. Seventeen responses were about decision making and control [authority and autonomy]. Different participants are of the opinion that decision making and a control [over specifics] are necessary in order to make ownership solid. Discussing what country ownership means, one district officer’s description well captured those elements as follows:

*To me, country ownership means that the country should own every dimension of development, including economic, social, even cultural aspects. In other words, a country should be able to control its economy, social services, and everything. So you cannot say you own something unless you are in full control. Being in full control, I mean, you are a decision maker.*
Next, 14 respondents out of 25 were concerned with commitment, responsibility, and accountability as essential elements for ownership. Eleven responses were about participation of the people on the ground. Five were on resources and enabling means for implementation. Then, four responses concerned capacity and empowerment, followed by three responses for bottom-up planning. These aspects make up about 73% of all the responses revealed to support local ownership. The rest, based on responses by two study participants each, includes the following aspects: inner initiatives, shared interests/objectives, professionalism/mandates, recognition [of what has been achieved], analysis and assessment [to identify problems and priorities], confidence, and awareness.

![Figure 4: Factors Supporting Ownership](image)

**What Constrains Ownership?**

Views on factors constraining ownership were consolidated and are presented in Figure 5. Twelve respondents, nearly half of all the study participants, chose limited resources and finance as a major factor constraining ownership. This is a strong
indication that Tanzanian development stakeholders are likely to feel that they are unable to fully practice ownership or be in control when facing a shortage of resources. This indication is further supported by the fact that 11 responses revealed dependency on external aid as an obstacle to ownership, in other words, autonomy. Then, nine responses were similarly concerned with limited authority or controlling power. Another seven responses indicated a lack of commitment, responsibility, and accountability, followed by six responses that pointed to a lack of understanding and/or awareness [of ownership issues]. Then, four responses addressed poor participation [in the process concerned]. Another three were about mistrust and negative attitudes [towards development undertakings]. There were two responses each for capacity constraints and for Development Partners’ (DP) intervention. Lastly, the government’s dominance and inability to use knowledge and skills were revealed by one respondent each.

Figure 5: Factors Constraining Ownership
Summary

The responses described by the study participants can be summarized as follows. First, local stakeholders ought to make decisions, which is likely to enable them to be more in charge or control of associated undertakings as implementers. Second, ownership is also likely to be enhanced when stakeholders feel responsible and accountable for the decisions made and/or development undertakings. Third, ownership is thought to be strengthened when the local population actively participates in the education development process.

On the negative side, limited resources and financing definitely constrain local stakeholders’ execution of ownership because development undertakings always require resources, most often in the form of funds. Almost equally, high dependency on external aid is claimed to weaken local ownership. Then, when stakeholders are not committed enough to feel responsible and accountable for development undertakings, the lack of these elements adversely affects ownership. In addition, a lack of understanding and awareness of development issues is another obstacle to generating local ownership. Significantly, there are clear consistencies that can be found between the identified factors on the positive side and those on the negative side.

How Do Local Stakeholders Perceive Their Own Ownership?

After some discussion on ownership and before closing our conversation, the study participants were posed the question of “How they perceive overall country ownership state in a development context in Tanzania.” Although this was rather a subjective query, at that point of our interaction the majority already seemed to feel comfortable enough and have a clearer mind for contemplating the question. The
respondents were asked to rate the degree of country ownership of overall development at three levels – high, fair, and poor. The outcome is depicted in the following graph, Figure 6.

Figure 6: Perceptions of Country Ownership

Significantly, 11 out of 20 study participants, depicted in the blue bars in Figure 6, rated the current state of country ownership poor. The result may suggest that many Tanzanian local stakeholders perceive the country’s state of ownership in practice as unsatisfactory or challenged by various reasons. One ministry participant described, “When speaking of economic ownership, we are not sufficient and depend on external finance. We cannot decide development investments on our own. We have a little contribution to decision making, ownership.” Another participant specified the two main reasons: exclusion of implementers from planning and dependency on external aid.

It is often the case that Tanzania is seen as a model country engaging in aid coordination and harmonization. Indeed the country has been striving for many years to improve efficiency and effectiveness of development endeavor and the aid relationship.
In this perspective, development partners in general perceive the Tanzanian effort, often described as ownership, positively. This gap of perceptions between local actors and external partners probably suggests there is a fundamental difference in their understanding of what constitutes country ownership.

Meanwhile, there were five respondents, out of 25, who gave their ratings for country ownership specifically in their familiar education context. This was mostly because they felt more confident in responding in the context of education, rather than overall development. Their perceptions were depicted in the red bars in Figure 6. According to those responses, although they were not intentionally collected from every participant, country ownership of education development was perceived significantly more positively. These positive ratings need to be further investigated for precise reasons, yet, speculated explanations include education being one sector highly prioritized by the government, thus relatively better financed, perhaps with more commitment, and responsible ministries guiding and coordinating external aid; in other words, Tanzanians are in more control. Most likely, positive perceptions were also supported by their understanding of participation by local population in basic education activities on the ground.

Next, the study participants were asked to rate ownership at a personal level in relation to education undertakings. Although this question was also subjective, there was quite an interesting finding in the results shown in Figure 7.
Figure 7: Perceptions of Education Ownership at a Personal Level

The collected responses are depicted by two bars: blue bars indicate the numbers of responses from the central ministry participants; and red bars show those from district and NGO participants. In our conversations, it became evident, and a contrast, that ministry personnel revealed more confidence in rating their individual ownership while there was a clear tendency for district personnel to indicate their ownership as being strangled by a lack of authority and a shortage of resources, in particular funding for education activities. Thus, the result revealed that stakeholders had quite different feelings and perceptions about ownership execution in their education undertakings between the center and lower levels.

In analysis, the overall perception of country ownership in Tanzania turned out to be rather negative based on the collected responses. This outcome is reasonably understood when reflecting on the major factors described by the study participants as supporting and constraining ownership. When it comes to the education context, on the
other hand, there is a distinct tendency that the stakeholders perceive ownership practices on a more positive side.

Above all, there is a significant perception gap between the center and local government levels. It can be sensibly explained that this difference in ownership perception stems from the power distance in authority or control between the center and the local governments despite the decentralization structure in place and pursued through the implementation of the D by D policy. On the other hand, the majority of the study participants believe that country ownership should be with the Tanzanians at the community level or so-called villagers. How does this centrality of ownership account for the overall unsatisfactory status of country ownership perceived? Are the reasons for weak country ownership driven more by negative forces described during interviews than the country’s strong community ownership claimed by various study participants? Or are villagers more active in education as compared with development activities in other sectors? These questions will be discussed in the following chapters.

**What Aspects Should Be Assessed for Tanzanian Country Ownership?**

Tanzanian study participants extended their ideas concerning what should be looked at when country ownership needs to be assessed. Since the majority was not aware of the Paris Declaration initiatives, they had no idea that the international development community assessed Tanzanian country ownership using some indicators that were unfamiliar to them. I did not raise this particular query to every participant; I asked those whose ownership ideas had been clearly articulated by the end of our conversation.
Overall, the responses were mostly concerned with engagement in and the level of commitment to policy implementation by the Tanzanian people, which essentially need to be guided and supported by their government. The majority of the study respondents suggested that it is the Tanzanian people’s participation in the process; engagement in and contribution to the implementation; and benefits gained as an outcome that should be investigated when assessing country ownership. At the same time, the government’s political will, in other words, conducive leadership, was also indicated as one potential measure by looking at its budget allocation according to the policy contents prioritized and supported by the population. In addition, direct budget release – discretionary funds – from the Ministry of Finance to local governments, and then to the village and community level would also indicate a national effort to support local development priorities and execution of local ownership.

Are External Partners Supporting Ownership?

As mentioned earlier, Tanzania is often referred to as a model country in aid coordination and relationship with donors. However, during the course of the inquiry on ownership, it quickly became apparent that external intervention in the form of development aid is not necessarily considered positive but rather threatening by the education stakeholders with respect to their ownership over development. To better understand the reasons behind their negative perceptions, the individual study participants were questioned, whenever suitable, if external partners, mostly meant to be donor countries and development agencies actively involved in the development discourse in Tanzania, are supporting Tanzanian country ownership or not and why.
Respondents explicated the reasons of their negative perceptions as follows:

“Donors tell Tanzanians what to do,” “They bring in their own ideas,” “They control development undertakings,” “They give us orders,” and “They manage projects/programs on their own way.” Some of the same features identified earlier as factors impeding ownership are clearly captured in the above reasoning as well. Those essential terms include own (determined) ideas as well as control, in other words, autonomy. The respondents’ general claim was that Tanzania, as an aid-dependent country, lacks authority and autonomy to determine its own development priorities and implement them on its own way partly due to external donor intervention. A few respondents further pointed out that donors tend to think that they are entitled to intervene as they are largely funding development activities in the country. To come to the point, financiers make decisions.

While recognizing discouraging effects, a few other respondents also exemplified positive aspects of donor intervention as follows: “Donors have consistently addressed EFA and MDGs for Tanzania to set right priorities in education,” “They insist on ownership that have made us more aware of its importance,” “They participate actively in development dialogues with Tanzanians,” and “Their provision of funding supports boosting Tanzanian self-help development efforts.”

Based on the views both from negative and positive sides, those observations are intuitive. Yet, they also provide similar features of ownership clarified earlier by the study participants: the importance of determining own agenda and priorities, participation and dialogues, and undeniable need of resources, in this case, mostly financing. These are some of the essential elements associated with and appearing in the study participants’
thinking of ownership so far. Moreover, not frequently mentioned during the interviews with the study participants, yet quite a significant element is a notion of self-help or self-reliance. For those generations who grew up around or right after independence in Tanzania, self-reliant development is a familiar notion that was imparted as a national development principle during President Nyerere’s governance. Here is a remark made by one ministry official: “The late Nyerere said Tanzania needs self-development, self-determination. External aid just comes in to boost our self-development.”
CHAPTER 6
COMMUNITY AND FOLLOW-UP RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

Chapter 5 presented and discussed the main findings of how country ownership is perceived, articulated, and exemplified by 25 individual Tanzanians who are engaged in education development within different capacities. And, this primary survey was mainly guided by five study questions. One outstanding outcome revealed by the investigation was the centrality of country ownership expressed by the majority of those education stakeholders. There was an undeniable view shared among them that communities, often also referred to as villagers, are central to Tanzanian country ownership. Once uncovered, this perspective was thought to be quite unique and necessitated further exploration.

In this context, additional research at the community level was carried out in Morogoro Rural District subsequent to the individual interviews. As exemplified in detail in Chapter 4, five communities were visited in the district to organize focus group interviews. For this study, the community survey became indispensable to obtaining more evidence that supports the data collected from the individual education stakeholders. Stimulated by the earlier findings, I was eager to discover more practical cases of ownership at the community level in education development. The findings are presented according to nine questions posed to the communities in this chapter.

Subsequent to the two field surveys conducted in 2012, I visited Tanzania once again in 2015 to organize consultative discussions on the study findings and the overall result. Given that considerable time had passed since the data collection, I needed to validate the relevancy of the consolidated notion of country ownership based on the
previously gathered data. At the same time, I attempted to draw more perspectives and opinions on the study findings from Tanzanians, who are situated inside but also those outside of the education sector. Some of them took part in my previous study interviews and the others did not. The last batch of discussions in Tanzania enabled me to analyze the earlier findings in more depth and perhaps strengthened the credibility of my argument. I will elaborate the latest discussion points and analysis after presenting the result from the community survey on ownership in the context of education development.

**Community Ownership in the Context of Education**

To investigate the state of ownership at the community level, a field survey was carried out in collaboration with two Adult Education Officers from Morogoro Rural District. The field visit to Morogoro Region was initially proposed by one official from the Ministry of Education whom I was closely communicating with at the time of my field research in Tanzania. The Ministry of Education has been promoting a program called the Integrated Community Based Adult Education (ICBAE) for nearly two decades. Morogoro Rural District is among those districts implementing the program. With this background, necessary arrangements and contacts to local education stakeholders were made through the ministry personnel for me to realize field research at the community level.

**Field Survey at the Community Level**

Morogoro Rural District, with a population of 286,248, is situated in Morogoro Region (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013, p. 36). According to the arrangements made, I visited Kiroka Ward and four villages within the same ward in the district with assigned education officers. Kiroka has a population of 21,853 (National Bureau of Statistics, 2013,
At the center of Kiroka Ward, the first meeting – a focus group – was organized at the local office of SACCO.\textsuperscript{19} Participants were comprised of six members from Kiroka WDC. The committee has a mandate to review school improvement plans and consolidate them into an education plan for Kiroka Ward. Once compiled by the committee, the plan is submitted to the district council. In the case of Kiroka, the committee submits development plans to Morogoro Rural District Council. WDC deals with local development issues in general including basic education.

The second group I visited was at Bamba Primary School in Bamba Village. I met an assistant head teacher and the chairperson of the Bamba Primary School Committee. During the meeting, the school committee (SC) chair responded to most of the questions although the assistant head teacher was encouraged to chip in. The SC chairperson also serves as the ICBAE facilitator in the village.

The third group was composed of three community members from Bondula Village. All of them are, to some extent, associated with the ICBAE program either as a committee member or adult education learners. Two of the three participants have children who attend primary school in the village although none of them belong to the school committee. I met with them within the compound of the ICBAE facility.

The fourth group was made up of six participants from Kungwe Village, and the composition was as follows: a primary school head teacher, the village chairperson, an ICBAE facilitator, two female villagers, and one male villager. The focus group discussion was organized at the head teacher’s office of Kungwe Primary School.

\textsuperscript{19} SACCO is a local financial cooperative found nationwide in Tanzania.
The last group was visited at Kikundi Primary School, where an ICBAE class was in session. The group encompassed the following participants: a primary school head teacher, an assistant teacher, an ICBAE facilitator, a carpentry teacher for ICBAE, and 21 ICBAE leaners/villagers.

Community Ownership over Education and Schools

A set of nine questions were posed to each group. Those questions discussed with and responded to by the participants are all outlined in this section while the responses collectively agreed upon among the participating members are also spelled out in the tables below following each question. The questions were formed, based on the key elements extracted from the individual study participants’ perceptions of ownership, mostly to verify what is actually happening with local ownership at a community level and to deepen our understanding of ownership affairs in the local context of education development in Tanzania.

Q1: Who identifies issues/problems regarding the school, and decides priorities and what to do?

These distinctive actions earlier emerged as key features associated with and/or needed to build a foundation of ownership. For this reason, it became inevitable to examine the elements in more depth. Although the data collected were not investigated for accuracy and validity, responses from the participants indicate that the key undertakings in a planning process are primarily led by the SC, villagers, and school teachers. The responses derived from the five groups, referred to as Group 1 to Group 5, are consistent across as shown in Table 7. According to more detailed explanations given by Group 2 and Group 5, school teachers play central roles in identification and assume
their roles in collaboration with SCs. Then, villagers come in to endorse proposals. Where issues arise, SCs often consult with village development committees as well. Group 3 also mentioned that villagers are involved in identifying priorities through village meetings.

Table 7: Answers to “Who identifies issues/problems regarding the school, and decides priorities and what to do?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Teachers, school committee, and villagers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Teachers, school committee, and villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Teachers, WEC, school committee, and villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>School committee, villagers, village council, and school head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>School committee, villagers, school teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2: Who prepares the school improvement plan?**

Concerning who actually prepares a school improvement plan, there is a slight variation with respect to who and probably to what extent the concerned actors take part in the plan preparation process. The responses may reflect the actual practices that are possibly and slightly different from village to village despite the guideline placed on how to prepare a school improvement plan. Primarily, however, SCs and school teachers are apparently in the core of plan preparation, which is required to be approved at the village level. In responding to this question, Group 1 explained, “It starts from school among teachers, then, their proposal is introduced to school committee for comments. Then, they forward it to village level. Villagers are conversant about school plans. For instance, school meal is in the school plan and villagers are involved in providing food materials.”
Table 8: Answers to “Who prepares the school improvement plans?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1:</th>
<th>It starts from school teachers, then involves school committee and villagers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 2:</td>
<td>School committee in collaboration with school teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3:</td>
<td>School head teacher, staff, and ward councilors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4:</td>
<td>School committee starts but villagers give final approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5:</td>
<td>Whole village and school teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3: Who implements the school plan?**

Who implements the education policy was a pertinent question during the earlier interviews with individual study participants. And, many of them are of the opinion that policy should be owned locally because local communities at the village level are implementers of the policy. School improvement plans are translated as part of education policy implementation at the school level. Indeed, the responses concentrated on community or villagers as the primary implementing agents of a school improvement plan as indicated in Table 9.

It should be noted that Group 4 described external supporters as implementers as well. Group 1 similarly pointed out that partners other than the community may also join implementation. It could be possible that activities intended for school improvement and supported by external partners, such as ICBAE, are integrated into a school plan, thus the villagers regard outside supporters as plan implementers as well. Group 4 also mentioned the district as another supporter involved in implementation.
Table 9: Answers to “Who implements the school plan?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Community, in particular parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>School head teacher, school staff, WEC, and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Community (villagers) and other supporters from outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Community stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4: Who is the owner of the school plan?

This question was posed straightforwardly, and impressively, the study participants responded with one single answer and with confidence: the community, in other words, village or villagers. Group 1 said, “In terms of finance, school committee is in charge. But in the end, villagers must approve the plan. So, it belongs to the villagers.”

Table 10: Answers to “Who is the owner of the school plan?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Villagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>School plan belongs to the whole community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5: Who is the owner of the school?

While posted to Tanzania for work, I had various occasions to visit primary and secondary schools in the country and talk to surrounding community members. It was always inspiring to observe a community’s involvement in school improvement activities and strong sense of ownership over local schools. With this past experience, the following responses to the question were more or less anticipated, and the participants
indeed came back with the same response without any hesitation: the community or villagers.

Table 11: Answers to “Who is the owner of the school?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is the property of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Whole community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Villagers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This centrality of community in the context of education development is very unique and possibly particular to Tanzania. It is easy and tempting for outsiders to doubt if these statements are real; communities are simply trying to impress outsiders with good answers in hopes of receiving more external aid. In reality, however, many Tanzanians appear to believe in local empowerment and self-reliance. These traits may be rooted in their traditional cultural values and/or traced back to the notion of self-reliant development, a concept sensitized widely during President Nyerere’s time.
**Q6: What makes a community feel that the school belongs to the villagers?**

According to the responses gathered from the focus groups, feelings of school ownership were largely associated with and can be summarized as the community’s participation in collective dialogues, such as priority/problem identification, decision making, and a sense of responsibility for (contribution to) the betterment of local education. It is important to note that Group 2 indicated roles played by the school head teacher to mobilize community members in collective and important tasks concerning local schools.

Table 12: Answers to “What makes a community feel that the school belongs to the villagers?”

| Group 1: We make decisions ourselves about school. |
| Group 2: Head teacher involves community in decision making concerning the school. |
| Group 3: Community members all participate in discussions about school issues. |
| Group 4: School is our responsibility, and we benefit from our engagements. |
| Group 5: We contribute because the school and its assets are within our village. |

**Q7: What makes community ownership a challenge?**

Even though overall responses collected from the participants appear to be rather positive and revealed few problems, each community has challenges as well. Among them, it was commonly mentioned that community participation is not necessarily equal or consistent; meaning that some villagers are not very active and that generally speaking their participation tends to be low when the economy is not good. Without a doubt, there
is some struggle to motivate villagers as a whole to be responsible for actions needed for their school.

Table 13: Answers to “What makes community ownership a challenge?”

| Group 1: | There are some decisions made outside the community (by the government). |
| Group 2: | Obstacles could be less [non-active] people’s involvement in decision making and less [impeding] transparency. |
| Group 3: | During difficult times, mobilization of cooperation and contribution has some challenging elements. Yet, there is no obstacle. |
| Group 4: | Weak economy makes some members feel that they are not responsible. |
| Group 5: | No obstacle. |

Q8: What makes community ownership strong?

Then, what supports the respondents in having a sense of ownership? Their responses were again consistent with other responses concerning ownership of school plans as well as those for challenging factors. Core elements extracted are collective decision making over school issues as well as responsibility for and commitment to implementation of the decisions made for local schools. A Group 4 participant clearly indicated, “Even without involvement of ICBAE or school committee, we know school is our responsibility as a community member.”
Table 14: Answers to “What makes community ownership strong?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>Decision making and contribution to the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Village meetings to discuss how to implement engagements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Decision making and full participation in the implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>We all know school is our responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Decisions and contribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9: How is the current state of community ownership viewed?

Lastly, the community participants were asked to describe the current state of ownership in the education context in their own village. As a whole, the participants’ perceptions over community ownership are positive as shown in Table 15. It should be acknowledged, however, that the focus group environment might have affected some participants’ responses.

Table 15: Answers to “How is the current state of community ownership viewed?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>We feel very comfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>Very comfortable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>Community members as a whole are satisfied with the current status of ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Findings from the Communities

The five communities, namely Kiroka Ward and four villages located within Kiroka, represented by designated education stakeholders, well described ownership in
their familiar context of education and schools. As claimed by the individual study participants prior to the field survey in Morogoro Rural District, there is a strong sense of ownership over school issues held by the communities, at least indicated and demonstrated so by their representatives across the villages.

From the views and responses gathered about their practical undertakings, key elements of community ownership emerged, including: dialogues and decision making, a collective sense of responsibility, and the villagers’ participation and contribution to the implementation process. These features are consistent with those addressed as pertinent for ownership at the time of the earlier discussions with individual study participants. In addition to those core elements, at the village level, the school head teachers’ role seems to be another element, along with village leaders, which can encourage and motivate a community’s initiatives and engagements in education, and thus influence members’ sense and execution of ownership at the community level.

Overall, in terms of development ownership, the awareness of education stakeholders at a community level is seemingly high. More significantly, they are not only aware of its importance but also recognize that ownership is a lot about responsibility; as they understand it, ownership is meant to be held accountable for their local education and schools. This recognition and practice of ownership at the community level, in the case of those five studied communities, could be largely influenced and resulted from the sensitization through ICBAE, which targeted youth and adults in those villages. If this is the reason behind the observed practices and perceptions of their ownership of education efforts, caution is required when making an interpretation to a more general development context in Tanzania.
Behind the Evidence of Community Ownership

In the 1990s, the Ministry of Education promoted adult literacy in Tanzania, which became a high agenda as one of the EFA goals. According to a ministry official, the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) used to finance approximately 90% of adult education programs in Tanzania but abruptly stopped its financing in 1992 due to the economic difficulty experienced by its home country. The Government of Tanzania could not even replace 10% of what Sida used to fund. As a result, the unit responsible for adult education began to consider more self-reliant ways to promote adult education and established the Integrated Community Based Adult Education (ICBAE) in 1996 and set up four regional ICBAE centers in Morogoro, Tanga, Moshi, and Mwanza. The communities studied in my field survey are located in Morogoro Region.

In more recent years, ICBAE has been carried out with principles called EPOS: Empowerment, Participation, Ownership, and Sustainability. Adult education trainers are trained on EPOS principles to work at the community level. When explaining EPOS, the Assistant Director of the Adult and NFE Department, MoEVT emphasized that communities can decide their own priorities, work together, and ensure sustainability when they are empowered. She further noted that villagers can materialize tasks once they realize that they own something. Built on the evidence and experiences acquired over the past years, adult education programs are largely designed to be responsive to the needs identified by communities themselves, and they are operated almost nationwide today. The latest adult literacy rate of Tanzania is reported to be 73.2% (2010), which increased from 69.4% (2002). It is above the average rate of 68.6% (2012) in Sub-
Saharan Africa but slightly lower than that of 77.2% (2012) in East Africa (UNESCO, 2015).

The Director of the Adult and NFE Department, who has been engaging in adult education in mainland Tanzania over the last two decades, also explained that Kiroka had substantially changed in terms of people’s mindsets and attitudes. According to the Director, the community members are well aware that they have to be self-reliant and should not depend on external resources for development undertakings although they still receive limited technical assistance from the MoEVT and/or a local university. Since the ICBAE method links literacy and micro credits, with some supports from a micro finance scheme, the communities have been working on small scale businesses, such as fish ponds, coffee production, and charcoal making, to earn cash income. In this way, they have also succeeded in improving local schools with their own initiatives and efforts.

When I raised the question of whether these were cases where communities were practicing ownership, the Director responded positively but also implied that Kiroka might be a particularly good case of local ownership demonstrated by the communities. The implication is that the perceptions and practices of ownership I have gathered from the community members may not necessarily represent an average picture of country cases of ownership in Tanzania. Yet, those communities possibly present worthy lessons and experiences as well as an aptitude to initiate and own development engagements locally, which should be further investigated, documented, and shared with others wherever possible.
Follow-up Research and Analysis

Through this study, key elements that are closely linked with ownership generated and envisioned by Tanzanian education stakeholders have been identified. Those elements can be summarized as: decision-making autonomy, planning that reflects priorities identified by implementers, and resources, especially funding, mobilization and allocation at the implementation level. When Tanzanian stakeholders take an initiative and engage in a process where these elements are pursued, it increases the chances to generate a stronger sense of ownership for people to feel responsible and committed to engaging with their own decisions concerning local development issues and priorities. Ideally, commitment should be strong enough to sustain local initiatives and their ownership practice when the government’s complementary support is limited or even after external support is completed in the end.

Following the initial survey analysis that was conducted in 2012-2013, I attempted to draw more perspectives and opinions on the study result from Tanzanians situated inside and outside of the education sector. For one thing, this study identified the fundamental aspects associated with ownership by using the education development context, and those aspects appear to be vital to ensuring locally grown ownership regardless of areas of development. For another, during the course of analysis, I increasingly questioned whether the compiled study results were isolated cases or somewhat particular to the education setting in Tanzania. Accordingly, I longed to raise these issues and also to resume discussions on the ownership agenda with Tanzanian development stakeholders again. But this time, I was inclined to seek input from Tanzanian development experts conducive to more in-depth analysis.
Education is perceived as essential for life improvement by many. Today, Tanzanians are well aware that education is a primary means to bring in positive changes to their lives, and thus, it tends to be prioritized above all. This is largely reflected over the Tanzanian government’s policy priorities and implementation as well. Given the nature of ownership questions, less biased opinions from outside the education circuit were sought for the first time in order to balance the local views but equally enrich insights, and then finally to conclude this study. Furthermore, I wished to share the key findings of Tanzanian country ownership once again with my Tanzanian colleagues in education to stimulate their awareness of pertinent ownership agenda.

As detailed in Chapter 4, the Methodology chapter, I engaged with 10 Tanzanian individuals for consultative discussions. The member composition was: four ministry officials who were interviewed in the initial field survey, three education experts who were not previously interviewed, and finally three experts who are working in areas other than education and were not involved in the previous survey. These Tanzanians were selected mostly because of their expertise as well as availability and willingness to discuss country ownership with me. Meetings with them were framed as informal consultations where I shared the study findings, and then we discussed ownership issues in the latest Tanzanian development context and in an unstructured way.

Isolated Cases or Particular to Education?

As a whole, the Tanzanian colleagues I consulted and interacted with had positive reactions to the country ownership notion expressed and constructed by the previous study participants, the education stakeholders in the case of this study. No one made any disagreement against the prescribed notion. I observed some of them seemed even
relieved to confirm that the compiled notion was nothing confrontational but rather naturally acceptable as generated by fellow Tanzanians. The graph in Figure 2 indicating who constitutes country ownership was of particular interest to some. The revealed focus on the community or village level did not appear to be surprising to them, either. I will present the notion of country ownership envisioned by the education stakeholders in Chapter 7, the final chapter.

However, concerning one major outcome from the community survey – the strong local ownership practiced in the communities – the Tanzanian colleagues had different opinions. A few of them expressed their skepticism over the communities’ ownership over school and education activities. They claimed that generally speaking local communities tend to be relatively passive and wait for help coming from outside rather than initiate their actions on their own. While expressing a grave concern over the current country conditions, one education expert said, “So, I am not sure if communities are really committed to school issues. The majority is not. You need money to make contribution. Despite free [basic] education, education is not really free in reality.” A strong argument was further made that the government has failed the population in empowering them to effectively exercise local ownership.

As an example in basic education, some critically pointed to the fact that the Tanzanian government has been even unable to fulfill capitation grant disbursement according to the guideline; US $10 per child a year. According to them, the amount disbursed is usually much lower than US $10 and rarely disbursed in a timely manner. One other non-education expert explained the reasoning of weak local ownership by stating, “For me, I would willingly contribute if I decide how to go about schools,
dispensary, roads, irrigation, etc. In reality, though, central government decides what priorities to work on.” Another person also pointed out that revenue collection at the village level is so limited that village councils cannot be fully committed and accountable for local priorities. Due largely to the inability of and a lack of commitment by the central government, the effort to empower the decentralized levels by devolution has not been progressing. Thus, the local ownership cases I had collected from Morogoro Rural District were thought to be a little doubtful or isolated cases in the development context of Tanzania by a few experts.

On the other hand, the rest of the Tanzanian colleagues implied that communities, if not all, indeed exercise ownership for local development. One education personnel responded to my question as follows: “Concerning ownership observed at community level, it is true. People are working towards their ideas and vision. So, within that sense, they are practicing ownership.” They understood the cases of community ownership, which I had presented to them, as unexceptional. During the course of our conversation, I learned that they have been familiar in person with different practical cases of local ownership in education while a few were familiar with cases in other development areas. Having evidence of local ownership, the Tanzanian colleagues as a whole were not doubtful that communities can take initiatives and assume ownership although they equally admitted that there were varied challenges in that respect.

If those ownership cases from Morogoro Rural District are actual ownership practices, then, I questioned, was the strong ownership expressed by the community stakeholders somewhat particular to basic education? This query, though, was not clearly answered. This might have been because education experts are most familiar with local
undertakings in education and not necessarily confident enough about a broader context of community development. Having said that, however, they opted to suppose that communities may be more committed to education and school issues relative to other areas in local development. One non-education expert gave the opinion that the social sector, such as education and public health, is likely to receive more attention and effort at the community level. The same informant further commented that education is more closely linked with the population even compared with public health. A similar view was also articulated by one education expert as follows:

Indeed, education is a priority for the government. Thus, education does get attention and more active activities on the ground. Education is everyone’s issue. And, there are ownership practices engaged by various communities. Yet, there is not much difference across various activities. For example, health sector shares lots of similarities with education. Yet, education is concerned by everyone. In that sense, education is different.

Ownership and Local Governance

In addition to verification of the above, a few critical issues emerged out of the discussions held with Tanzanian colleagues. Those issues commonly raised were largely concerned with decentralized governance in Tanzania. In relation to the state of country ownership, various experts I interacted with had to raise a serious concern about the current national government’s leadership as well as the decentralized governance in the country. As already implied, the Tanzanian ownership agenda has a lot to do with the decentralized governance reform that is intended to make local governments more autonomous, and to improve the quality of public services and ultimately the population’s lives. Despite the intention and struggles over the last 15 years, however, a number of experts explicitly indicated that the current decentralizing system is problematic; it is not devolving powers but simply delegating administrative tasks to LGAs. Tanzanian
colleagues at large made a strong argument that the central government still makes decisions and largely controls core financing and staffing, in other words, resource allocation and management at the decentralized levels.

This last point was claimed to be a severe constraint for decentralized ownership during the discussions with the Tanzanian colleagues. In essence, even though the decentralized institutional arrangement, including bottom-up budgeting and planning, gives a general impression that LGAs are enabled to make primary decisions for development initiatives; in reality, their autonomy is still limited and they have serious constraints preventing them from acting on locally identified priorities. LGAs continue to rely on decisions made by the central government, therefore, they are largely held accountable upwards, not to their citizens. These stated conditions somewhat prove that Tanzanian D by D policy exists on paper but has not been much implemented to empower LGAs and Tanzanian citizens. There is a prevailing resistance for devolution of powers at the center, which was claimed at different times by my discussion counterparts in Tanzania. What makes matters worse is that LGAs are also holding onto their limited power, particularly budgetary, commented one non-education expert. Some are not necessarily eager to address or support priorities identified by the local population, either.

Furthermore, according to the information obtained concerning the evaluation conducted on the bottom-up planning method called “Opportunities and Obstacles in Development” (O&OD), many communities had been misled by some O&OD facilitators who had indicated to them that the government’s funds would come in once communities identified development priorities and projects locally. This resulted in a reverse effect in terms of dependency for the responsible ministry, namely the PMO-RALG, which had
adopted and promoted the methodology nationwide since 2002 (IDCJ, 2009). This planning method intends to facilitate effective participation of communities in planning and reduce their dependency (PMO-RALG, 2007). As a consequence, taking the O&OD evaluation result seriously, the PMO-RALG is now considering amending the approach to bottom-up planning after a decade of dissemination and upscaling efforts, according to one informant. This case perhaps further exemplifies that dependency on aid from the central government and external partners may be still considerable and financial vulnerability is prevailing at the community level. It also supports the view, expressed by various Tanzanians, that the country’s decentralized system is not functioning and there is still a long way for the government to materialize devolution.

After all, as far as decentralized governance is concerned, the country’s policy implementation seems to be rather questionable. While there are some practical cases of local ownership, there is apparently a huge gap between policy objectives and implementation. Many study participants agreed that the government must empower the local population so that they can identify their own priorities, mobilize resources, and implement the priorities locally. To this end, however, financial devolution has to be accelerated so that the government’s funds can supplement local efforts. The significance of financial decentralization cannot be overemphasized as asserted by Mbogela and Mollel (2014), “It makes no sense to transfer power to the lower level structure without finance to execute own decisions.” (p. 58).

Equally, empowerment of the LGAs is inevitable but remains hugely challenging; perhaps even more of a grave challenge and an immediate concern than empowering the people on the ground. To realize the country ownership envisioned by the stakeholders,
local governments have a lot to do with and must play vital roles in bringing about desired changes in development locally. Decentralized governance is exceptionally demanding because the nature of the challenge is more political than technical. Moreover, the power-balance issue is multiple layered and thus extremely complicated. Is a decentralized structure realistically empowering local governments and the local population? This question must be continuously raised in the context of local ownership with the view to draw more attention internally and accelerate more decisive actions nationally.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

This study has explored perceptions and experiences on ownership of development discourse as described by local stakeholders in their context of education development in Tanzania. The study sought to grasp what constitutes country ownership and construct a central notion of ownership based on local stakeholders’ perspectives. It was largely driven by the prevailing paradox in international development where the widely emphasized country ownership has been progressing at a painfully slow pace in sub-Saharan Africa. Behind the sluggish advancement is an undisputable reality; development aid providers often dominate the development discourse rather than sub-Saharan African nations. This is despite the fact that the concept of ownership would suggest the reverse. In fact, the study result revealed that many stakeholders perceive aid dependency as a serious obstacle to Tanzanian ownership. In essence, the term ownership is a contemporary rhetoric for the donor community while it has not been conceptually owned by aid-recipient countries.

To cope with this persistent dilemma in international development, the study adopted a qualitative approach and methods with the intention of exploring Tanzanian people’s inner thoughts and discovering core elements forming country ownership in the local development context. Ideally, Tanzanians at all levels should be more conscious of what ownership means to them, and then have more confidence and lead their own development discourse. The current condition in the country, however, still requires honest dialogues and concerted efforts, involving both domestic and external
development actors, in creating more awareness of local ownership as well as a more conducive environment for Tanzanian development stakeholders, especially at the decentralized levels, to feel that they are in charge and capable of realizing desired changes in their locality.

In this study, I chose to look into the context of education development because my profession has been concerned with education development in sub-Saharan Africa, and thus, I had the urge to deal with education stakeholders in the region. Furthermore, I chose to use education as a context because the Tanzanian people in general value and give weight to education, which I thought would enable this study to extract more personal as well as practical experiences and perspectives. Equally, education is among the sectors highly prioritized under the Tanzanian national development – NSGPR – framework. Thus, education is high on the development agenda and priority list at individual as well as national levels. Nevertheless, the study results about ownership in the context of education may shed light and be applicable to a wider context of development in Tanzania.

This final chapter conveys the results of the field research carried out in mainland Tanzania. Field surveys involved development stakeholders from different levels: one level in which stakeholders mostly engage in the coordination and technical issues of education policies; and the others in which stakeholders cope with decentralized implementation of education policies. As the field research progressed, it became apparent that the investigation should be extended to the community level although that had not been planned initially. During interviews, the majority of individual study participants were inclined to locate the centrality of country ownership with education
stakeholders on the ground – communities or villagers, as often described by the participants themselves. As a result, observation and inquiry at the community level was undertaken to collect evidence supporting the data gathered from the primary survey. Furthermore, to contrast the perceptions and practices expressed by the study respondents, which were rather subjective, field survey results were shared with a limited number of Tanzanian experts working in development and local governance in order to hear their opinions as well. These consultative discussions generated critical points and issues that had not clearly emerged from previous interviews with study participants and thus added more depth to my inquiry.

In the following sections, I will first describe the country ownership articulated and envisioned by Tanzanian education stakeholders as an outcome of this study. Then, I discuss some of the major issues and challenges possibly facing the envisioned country ownership in the current condition surrounding the development ground in Tanzania. Lastly, a few essential recommendations will be also addressed in order to encourage continued efforts in raising awareness and legitimate understandings around country ownership as well as in creating an environment conducive to local ownership.

**Envisioned Country Ownership**

The Tanzanian country context of development has often been examined and discussed internally and externally. Despite the attention and efforts made in this context, however, little is known in terms of how local development stakeholders understand the notion of country ownership and what perceptions and experiences they have around the issues of ownership. As discussed in Chapter 5, even when the term is occasionally used, Tanzanian study participants at large were not very clear about the definition of
development ownership and/or aware of the concept. Nevertheless, there is a solid belief shared among them that the Tanzanian people are primary constituents of country ownership over development undertakings in the country. Notably, this vision appears to be embedded in the Tanzanians across varied levels: from grassroots to local and central governments. Although a clear conception has not been established yet, at least consciously, the importance of local ownership or self-reliance, as opposed to external aid, is generally well grasped and valued.

Based on the study findings, the notion of country ownership described and envisioned by Tanzanian education stakeholders is summarized here. It is characterized with the following elements and conditions, which were articulated by the study participants. According to the data collected and analyzed, country ownership should be:

- By Tanzanian people
- Practiced at different levels, but
- Development priorities and ideas must originate from the community level; and
- In that respect, the government is responsible for empowering people and allocating as much resources and means as possible for implementation of their development priorities; because
- Tanzanians must be accountable for and fully in charge (control) of development engagements and a whole process responsive to their local needs and country context.

From the inquiry about country ownership, the essential elements required by the education stakeholders to assume ownership are clarified as: priorities locally determined; decision making at legitimate levels; control of own priorities, decisions, and resources, particularly finance; and commitment and accountability for determined undertakings and results. The prescribed notion encompasses these key features
envisioned by the Tanzanian stakeholders. As the study result indicates, however, the study participants at large were discontent with the current state of development ownership in the country. Hence, the notion described above largely reflects what has not been fully realized yet and should be strived for in reality.

This prescribed notion is distinctive in that Tanzanians on the ground are so central to country ownership that one may even feel as if the definition of ownership under the Paris Declaration framework – the national government’s ability to lead and coordinate policy and strategy process – is unfitting here. Though the importance of leadership, commitment, capacity, and roles to be played by the central government cannot be denied and are encompassed in the essential elements above, Tanzania has a vision that calls for particular development conditions of its own.

From a socio-political and economic point of view, the late president, Julius Nyerere, saw Tanzanian villages as a core of his philosophy of a self-reliant socialist nation. To him, self-reliant development was the only way for the new republic to be politically free, escape from poverty, and promote equality among Tanzanians (Ibhawoh & Dibua, 2003). The Arusha Declaration of 1967, therefore, emphasized that Tanzania could no longer depend on external aid. Some participants in the latest study discussions perceived that the younger generations do not necessarily have this perspective any longer while those in earlier generations, who had been taught self-reliant education and development, somewhat believe in self-reliance. Nevertheless, it is too intricate and subtle to assert that Nyerere’s ideology has remained in people’s minds strongly enough to lead them into decisive actions for local development.
Today, according to Green (2014), development in Tanzania is still primarily understood as a rural problem, and thus, the government’s role is to advocate the rural population to be responsible for engagements to facilitate national development locally. In this regard, the results of this study infer that the Ministry of Education, in collaboration with LGAs and perhaps other partners as well, might have been successful in sensitizing some villagers that education is a vital means for local development and is a communal responsibility – similar to the philosophy of self-reliance. The rural population’s understanding of the significance of ownership is a feature unique to Tanzania where it has been probably generated or somehow remained over time through the government’s advocacy and furthered by the continued efforts of multiple actors. This feature can be seen as a strength and an advantage for Tanzania especially because the idea of self-help development was initiated internally by Mwalimu Nyerere, rather than by former colonialists and external donors. Hence, even though it is not the entire population, many Tanzanians are inclined to feel that the idea of self-reliant development is not anything new but has been embedded in their national values.

Together with the uniquely characterized development belief, this study notably revealed fundamental gaps between what has been discussed at the international level and what has been actually happening at the implementation level. Serious disparities became apparent especially with regard to: how country ownership is understood and perceived; and how the ownership agenda is confronted. In the end, country ownership is an aspirational rhetoric for the donor community at large. But at the same time, the global development community has made it measurable due to donors’ keen desire to monitor and assess ownership performance across aid-recipient countries. As a consequence, the
contemporary definition of country ownership inevitably became technical although its nature is contrary. In this sense, country ownership is a product generated by both aid-recipients and aid-providers.

Interestingly, the case study of Tanzania has shown that aspirational aspects weaken and become reality as the concept moves towards a lower implementation level. Even without an established definition of country ownership, local development stakeholders are practicing ownership with their own interpretations. The constructed notion of Tanzanian ownership demonstrates that the people are the foundation of changes desired and to be realized with their own efforts. And, those changes and how to cope with them are essentially influenced and determined by autonomy and resources available, as well as locally generated cultural values and socio-political ideology. Lastly, local ownership has been most vividly revealed in the ownership cases in which study participants at the community level proudly declared that the schools belong to them. In this context, one district education officer made a statement that well describes how villagers practice ownership with respect to school issues:

...Communities contribute although there is a limit. They feel that they are the owner of schools of their children. Although they know the school is of government, they understand that the government is doing its job in bringing teachers, books, and so on and communities have to support teachers and respect government’s inputs. It is community’s responsibility to deal with teacher housing issues. They need to take care of their teachers because they want to keep them in their communities. Sometimes teachers do not want to be posted to remote areas. But after a few years they do not want to leave the location since they become part of the communities. They are dealt as community members. People feel that they are the owner of schools.
Challenges for the Envisioned Tanzanian Ownership

**Trustable Systems and Capacity**

Despite the envisioned ownership and some promising features revealed in the course of this study, like many other low-income countries, Tanzania may continue facing various obstacles that undermine the potential of enhanced ownership across different stakeholder levels. Most notably, the country’s high dependency on external aid persists even though the country has been experiencing remarkable economic growth for the last decade. In fact, the proportion of ODA to Gross National Income (GNI) has been fluctuating over the years but declined in most recent years as depicted in Figure 8 (World Bank DataBank, 2015). Tanzania’s average net ODA ratio between 2001 and 2013 was 10.54% while the regional average of sub-Saharan Africa was 4.37% during the same period.
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Figure 8: ODA Proportion to Tanzania’s GNI (2001-2013)

From the study result, it is obvious that aid dependency is perceived as exceptionally problematic for Tanzanian ownership. It is problematic not only from an
ideological perspective but also because the country’s aid dependency has caused transaction costs in coordination and alignment of development activities. Although prominent attempts have been made to alleviate such costs, to this end, reduction of aid dependency still requires the central government’s commitment and accountability in further strengthening country systems. However, reliable country systems can be attained only through a long-term process, which necessitates continuous struggles in placing legitimate frameworks and arrangements as well as engaging in capacity building.

Ironically, this anticipated process is likely to involve external partners’ continued intervention through periodic dialogues, funding, technical assistance provision, and jointly coordinated M&E. Donors and financers are, however, increasingly questioning commitment and accountability for policy and reform implementation of the Tanzanian government. Indeed, there is a grave concern that the government has not been accountable for effective funds allocation, which external donors claim to be one major reason why improvements in development are limited. DPs are apparently losing confidence in Tanzania and some have discontinued or reduced GBS that is released directly into the government’s fiscal budget. In this context, a few discussion partners expressed a considerable fear that donors’ project support is becoming a major aid modality once again to provide development assistance directly to the population. Given this recent adverse trend, coordination and alignment are more and more recognized as challenging, as pointed out by government officials as well as Tanzanian experts in 2015. As a consequence, in view of development, aid coordination and relationship, there is a sense shared by Tanzanian development stakeholders that challenges are not diminishing but rather slightly increasing again for the national government.
Under this rather alarming condition, as revealed in this study, many Tanzanians feel that they do not fully own the national development process, which limits their decision making and control over policy formation and the whole policy process. It is also important to note that the long-time aid-dependent status has probably created room for Tanzanian authorities to blame external partners’ intervention and roles in impacting the country’s performance on ownership. Now that the aid relationship is somewhat troubling both Tanzania and its external donors, both strengthening country systems and institutional capacity, as well as regaining trust from donors, remain equally a challenge for the Tanzanian government to patiently and continuously strive for.

**Decentralized Governance**

Another emerging challenge concerns decentralized governance. Although considerable improvements have been reported in terms of capacity of district administration as well as service delivery over the years, the evaluation of the LGRP indicates that LGAs have not been empowered significantly since 2000 due mostly to their lack of autonomy. This evaluation finding supports the concern expressed by various development stakeholders in Tanzania that staff and budget allocation is still largely centralized. Based on the study result, it is also evident that the lack of authority, autonomy and finance is a major bottleneck in generating a sense of ownership across different levels.

In the context of basic education, school teachers are exempted from decentralized recruitment and are still deployed by the center, more specifically by the Teacher Service Commission (Tidemand et al., 2008). Once deployed, all LGA employees are overseen by council directors who are central appointees. It is significant
to notice that the majority of LGA employees are, in fact, public school teachers as well (Tidemand & Msami, 2010). This way, LGAs are not practically autonomous in regard to human resource deployment and management, which affects the basic education service delivery tremendously. Moreover, LGAs cannot even decide school construction sites within their respective jurisdiction, as indicated by one informant. In the same line, a few Tanzanian colleagues specifically addressed that bottom-up planning was also constrained with instructions coming from the central government as well as uncertainty about fiscal funds allocation. All in all, there are convincing claims that the current decentralized governance structure is not effectively empowering the LGAs. And, this is mostly due to the efforts taken so far, which are based on deconcentration and not on devolution, merely delegating administrative tasks without autonomy and needed resources to lower levels.

A number of Tanzanian stakeholders, both from the center and lower, expressed their grave concern that the central government and line ministries were still controlling core issues. In reality, therefore, LGAs most often have to depend on decisions made by the center and follow instructions coming from the upper stream. And, this condition severely restrains local autonomy and maintains their accountability directed upwards, not downwards to the citizens. As critically revealed during consultative discussions, a decentralized governance structure without autonomy is seen as a major impediment in promoting local ownership.

Overall education undertakings and management are apparently handled better at the community and school level. Based on the study outcome, it is also assumed that depending on the capacity and commitment levels of communities concerned, it may be
technically viable that some villages could be relatively self-directed in relation to planning, financing, and implementation as long as they can mobilize community members and initiate self-help efforts to implement their development initiatives, as strongly advocated by President Nyerere. Having said that, however, in reality, it is considerably demanding for rural communities to be autonomous or self-reliant when financial capacity is often restricted.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the Study Findings chapter, the lack of decision making and autonomy without sufficient resources appears to be a distinctive reason why education officials at the district level were not confident with the state of their ownership practices. Considering where they are positioned in terms of education policy implementation, it is not surprising that many administrators at the decentralized levels have substantial pressure and responsibility in ensuring the execution of policy-related activities on the ground. During interviews, I observed that many felt frustrated against central ministries as policy decision makers and also against local communities as primary implementers of education activities. Development actors at lower government levels are in need of more autonomy, enabling means, and more confidence in their functions as well as trust in the local population at the grassroots level.

Needless to say, given the decentralized structure for planning and implementation in basic education, local governments are positioned to play vital roles in local development and accordingly should be empowered in a more solid way. Autonomy, more precisely, in such areas as decentralized revenue collection and human as well as financial deployment and management would facilitate them to be more responsive to citizens’ needs and be held accountable to them as well. Devolution remains a serious
and enormous challenge for the Government of Tanzania to promote country ownership envisioned by its people.

**Leadership**

Lastly, leadership, another pertinent issue and challenge for country ownership, must be touched upon. Leadership was not much addressed by individual study participants as well as community people during interviews. This must be because education officials were not comfortable in addressing leadership issues, and probably neither were the participants at the community level. Contrastingly, leadership issues emerged more significantly during informal discussions with Tanzanian colleagues when discussing the study findings and obstacles to country ownership. In a way, the very fact that leadership did not appear as a significant element for country ownership somewhat proved the anticipated limitation of the field research. And, this is why the study analysis required more diverse angles and opinions. As the Arusha Declaration of 1967 identified political leadership as one necessary element to achieve self-reliant development in the country, leadership cannot be neglected in relation to local ownership and community mobilization.

In October 2015, parliamentary as well as presidential elections took place in Tanzania. Prior to the elections, a considerable number of village chairpersons were dismissed by their villagers on the grounds that those chairpersons had not done their jobs for the betterment of their communities. This notable movement is a strong indication that leadership matters for local development and ownership. The foreseen challenges discussed above – strengthening country systems and advancing devolution – are discussed above – strengthening country systems and advancing devolution – are

---

20 Village chairpersons are elected by village residents while Village Executive Officers are appointed centrally in Tanzania.
essentially determined by leadership and commitment of the central government. These elements are certainly embraced as expected roles of the government in the notion of country ownership articulated by the Tanzanian education stakeholders. Nevertheless, according to the study result, the general perception over the current state of country ownership can be interpreted as dissatisfaction of leaders’ performance as well. One education expert even declared, “We must have a very strong leadership, even much stronger than Nyerere.” to confront the development challenges Tanzanians have today.

To advance towards the envisioned country ownership, Tanzania needs strong and competent leaders at every level who can engage with and inspire the people in their development discourse, especially when the country apparently lacks credible leadership at the national as well as local levels. Various Tanzanians addressed unaccountable leadership as a grave concern and a challenge during the latest study discussions. The leadership issue has been lingering on since the time of independence. Indeed, it is a central challenge in the Tanzanian context of country ownership.

**Recommendations**

**Defining Country Ownership at the Country Level**

The framework for the Paris Declaration defines country ownership as effective [national] leadership over countries’ development policies and strategies, and coordination of development actions (OECD, 2008b). In 2010, the OECD and the World Bank assessed country ownership of various developing countries by using specific indicators agreed upon under the aid effectiveness forum. Tanzania was also assessed and received the highest score for ownership on a 5-point scale. It was reasoned that
“Tanzania has a strongly unified strategic framework with prioritization of targets and clear links to the budget” (OECD, 2012, p. 3).

As discussed through this dissertation, in the case of Tanzania, country ownership of development is critically concerned with the local population. It is about the Tanzanian people’s ability to manage their local development rather than the central government’s ability to manage the development and aid process. When the government is concerned, its commitment and engagement to empower its population is the fundamental issue. In accordance to the notion of country ownership described by the Tanzanian education stakeholders, the real question should be: whether the prioritized targets and resource allocation are linked with locally identified needs and priorities; who initiates and determines the policy contents and implementation plan; if the local population recognize the policies concerned as their own; and whether they are willing to strive for implementation. When there are increasing claims from Tanzanian development stakeholders that local priorities are rarely addressed and taken up by the government and that local authorities have no autonomy on budget allocation and staff deployment responsive to local needs, it would be difficult for many to agree that Tanzania, more correctly the national government, is rated ‘A’ in the performance of country ownership.

This ownership assessment gap is an inevitable consequence of essentially diverse definitions and perceptions of what constitutes country ownership. Behind the OECD-led definition, there is a popular view that aid is most effective when donors’ aid programs support development approach owned by the country [national government] (OECD, 2012). Under the aid effectiveness framework, the level for assessing country ownership is, therefore, the extent to which an aid-recipient country government integrates policy
objectives and needed implementation costs together with predicted external supports into its strategic development and budget framework. This has to do with not only central government’s performance but also external partners’ usage of their aid recipient’s country systems and implementation arrangements. Fundamentally, though, this definition of country ownership does not match that expressed by the Tanzanian study participants. While efforts to consolidate one comprehensive strategic plan, align with and also strengthen country systems are crucial in a development process, central government’s ability to reflect local needs and priorities and ensure local empowerment is equally essential and should be considered as an integral part of country ownership assessment.

Even though it is not likely to be an easy task to challenge the definition adopted by the international framework, the definition of country ownership should be reviewed so that aid recipient countries’ opinions and experiences over ownership could be further explored and acknowledged by the international donor community. To move forward, then, developing country governments should first recognize and advocate the importance of country ownership and define the term with national stakeholders domestically. In the end, the need for raising and discussing ownership imperatives has to come from developing countries so that the global community can be better informed of existing perceptions and definition gaps. Tanzania is in a suitable position to lead these actions.

Now that the MDG and the EFA initiatives are officially ending in 2015, it is a high time to revisit the agenda of country ownership for a more mutual appreciation to be generated alongside the post-2015 agenda for sustainable development. Reflected by the
past lessons, it is proposed that the Global Partnership allow developing country members to discuss at the county level and come up with their own interpretations of country ownership and clarify what requires their ownership notion to be realized in each country’s context. While countries should be encouraged by the international development community, ideally, their ownership agenda, actions, and monitoring progress should be handled by themselves in principle.

**Gradual but Sound Devolution**

As far as Tanzania is concerned, central and local government authorities should initiate efforts in advocating the importance of country ownership defined locally as well as of communities’ initiatives and contribution to Tanzanian policy implementation. This study has revealed that priority setting and planning are two distinctive domains that likely cultivate a strong sense of ownership for implementation. To facilitate steps taken forward, the central government is required to devolve more decision-making authority concerning financial and human resources deployment and management to LGAs as well as increased discretionary budget to them, especially the village level, so that communities can determine development priorities and be in charge of planning and implementing their prioritized activities according to the plans they collectively own locally. Decisive actions are critical to empower local communities and villagers by providing them with more conducive means to execute their own decisions and promote self-help development.

To further strengthen the proposed actions, communities and local authorities should work more closely. One way to do this probably requires local authorities’ increased understanding of local needs, initiatives, and conditions in development. They
should regularly visit and communicate with communities in their jurisdiction so that local mobilization and undertakings would be observed, encouraged, and better informed to the LGAs, especially districts. Complimentary support to communities could be strengthened and increased in various ways.

At the same time, local authorities also need continued capacity strengthening, including resources, in a medium and long term. As far as education is concerned, the LGAs should be in control of basic education school issues locally, including school teacher recruitment, hiring, and management. This way, district and village authorities should be better informed of local issues and needs, and reduce distance in the work relationship with their communities and citizens with a view to be more responsive to the local needs and ownership practices.

Most critically, financial devolution is vital for the envisioned ownership to be realized. As argued by Mbogela and Mollel (2014), local governments can be barely empowered without sufficient financial resources to be delegated in order to execute their responsibilities and be accountable for locally determined needs and development priorities. In reality, LGAs are still largely dependent on the fiscal budget allocated by the central government, more than 80% of total budget, which may not change substantially for years to come. Regardless, D by D cannot be complete unless financial devolution is further confronted and promoted.

The study on decentralized financial management conducted by Mbogela and Mollel (2014) suggests that there have been slow but steady improvements in that regard along with the implementation of the LGRP. Financial decentralization, however, requires continuous capacity strengthening and enabling institutional arrangements that
should be supported legally. Therefore, despite the obvious limitation of the
government’s fiscal resource, Tanzania needs to engage in fiscal devolution in a tangible
and sustainable manner in view of empowering LGAs and local population.

**Locally Determined Way Forward**

Considering the current adverse situation surrounding external aid and
relationships with donors, Tanzanians ought to be better informed that there are other
national governments which have demonstrated strong leadership, often understood as
effective ownership, despite external aid and donor intervention (Whitfield, 2009).
Tanzania should be able to act on ownership more firmly even with the current aid
dependency rate, and it might be meaningful and inspiring for Tanzanian authorities to
look at other country cases in the region with strong ownership of development policy
engagements demonstrated at a national level. This endeavor has to be initiated by the
central government, and then authorities should analyze what is needed for stronger
ownership in the Tanzanian context so as to determine further actions to pursue.

To ensure local ownership is encouraged, the dissemination of practical
information and data concerning education policy implementation status, such as public
finance, a summary of the annual Education Management Information System (EMIS)
data and regional progress digest, and practical cases of ownership efforts, would
encourage local ownership and initiatives at the lower levels. Information and data need
to be translated in a user-friendly and inspiring manner. On the other hand, villagers in
general are not aware of the fact that they are implementing national development
policies; they are primary implementers of education policies and associated activities.
And, this is the backbone of the claim made by the study participants that country ownership should primarily concern the Tanzanian people.

For the community level, therefore, sensitization as well as an official recognition of community ownership should facilitate encouragement for school committees and communities at large. It might be equally strategic to further sensitize the adult and youth population about essential development and ownership issues through various means, including radio broadcasting, adult education programs like ICBAE, and dissemination of other communities’ ownership practices through village meetings, for instance. It should be cautioned that it is pertinent to avoid generating an expectation that community projects will be funded by the government. This misinterpretation has repeatedly failed and discouraged the communities in various development initiatives and programs. In the end, empowerment of the population is a key to an enhanced sense, creative ideas, and execution of country ownership in Tanzania at large. The way forward must be determined locally by implementers and then facilitated by the local governments as well as central government for constructive implementation.

**A Trusting Relationship for Development Efforts**

Aid effectiveness has been vigorously debated by the donor community since the 1990s. Today, debates and actions concerning effective aid involve not only donor members but the entire development community as illustrated by the discussions held through the forums on aid effectiveness. The five principles of aid effectiveness under the Paris Declaration suggest that to ensure the underlying principles it may well require greater collaboration and constructive partnerships between developing country governments and donor partners. Ownership, for instance, can hardly be ensured without
countries’ solid will to lead their own development processes and be accountable for the outcomes. But in addition, it requires donors’ long-term commitment and collaboration to support capacity and system building for countries to manage such processes. Fundamentally, without trust between developing country governments and their external partners, development efforts are not likely to generate effective and sustainable results.

When considering aid relationships, it does seem to be necessary to associate with trust and to explore what trust means to both aid recipients and providers. For the side of the donors, there is a growing tendency that they allocate ODA to those governments that are perceived as more capable and accountable for policy implementation and financial management. In this sense, trust relates to governments’ adherence to policy implementation, which may be translated as adherence to policy conditions associated with aid, capability of reliable execution of the budget, and financial accountability. The G8 similarly stresses that the member nations will assist African countries that are taking credible actions against corruption and increasing transparency and accountability (G8 Summit, 2007). After all, donor agencies are held accountable for the aid budget and outcomes to their home governments, parliaments, and tax payers. Therefore, the donors naturally opt to disburse funds to recipient governments more trustworthy in managing aid finance as well as policy implementation.

On the side of recipient countries, on the other hand, the governments inevitably prefer working with those donors who respect their ownership, act upon what has been agreed to but ideally without much imposed conditionality, and disburse development funds as scheduled. These donors are considered as predictable in aid provision, in other words, more reliable development partners. Now that donor funds are a more integral part
of fiscal budgets in many sub-Saharan African countries, aid provision has to be more predictable and reliable than ever before. This dimension is also adopted as an indicator for ownership under the aid effectiveness framework. Whether a recipient country government trusts its development partners or not is a sensitive question. African governments, including that of Tanzania, tend to be implicit about how they perceive their donor partners because that may affect the relations with their financiers. Yet, trust is one vital element for both aid-recipient countries and donors, particularly for the latter, to be more mindful of.

In relation to trust and country ownership, there are two interacting domains: governance and country capacity. Trust between the two parties is interconnected with development and aid practices. Therefore, it also interacts with progresses in governance and country capacity. With strengthened capacity in the context of governance, countries should be able to increase their influence and control over policy choices and associated undertakings. Hence, these domains serve interests, not only for donors, but also for sub-Saharan African countries themselves.

In view of country ownership, however, a real critical question is whether sub-Saharan African countries would choose governance voluntarily as their own agenda to strive for. Furthermore, another real challenge for many African governments is to develop their own practical strategies and mobilize domestic resources necessary to strengthen institutional capacities and governance if the countries recognize such efforts as crucial. The past experiences in these domains were undoubtedly donor-driven and put the local governments in rather passive positions. The Tanzanian government has strengthened ownership in certain aspects and also increased the trust level towards its
donor partners in the course of development undertakings over time. Likewise, the donor community increased its confidence and trust on the government’s lead in the overall development process (Harrison & Mulley, 2007). As exemplified in the previous chapter, however, both parties are somewhat losing confidence and trust in mutual development efforts recently. Maintaining trust and confidence in aid relationships requires a substantial time investment and the acknowledgment that they can be very vulnerable at the same time.

Development and aid history in sub-Saharan Africa proves that aid relationships and development business are extremely complicated and considerably affected by domestic and aid politics. And, development practitioners have learned, by and large, that a profound understanding of local conditions and a trusting relationship with counterparts in developing countries fundamentally matter to the results of collective efforts in development. Challenges we face on the ground are often so immense that we drive the necessary discourse on our own terms. Under this circumstance, we are the one to be accountable for end results. Under this circumstance, we are not likely to foster trusting relationships with our partners on the ground, either.

As clearly asserted by Tanzanian education stakeholders, country ownership requires autonomy. Desired autonomy is the one that allows the countries to decide on development priorities and control resources, especially finance, needed for numerous development undertakings. Autonomy, though, appears to be facilitated, not solely by legal measures but also by trust in relationships among development actors. We, external partners, ought to be conscious about influence we may have over our partners’ autonomy. Sub-Saharan African nations, including Tanzania, should be willing to strive
for self-reliance and earn more confidence. The donor community should be willing to strive to become trustable partners in this endeavor while respecting and supporting local ownership in their development discourses.

Broad-Based Discussion of Ownership

Lastly, there is a dire need to draw more perspectives and practical experiences of local ownership from a wider range of development stakeholders in their country context of development. As discussed in the Limitations section of Chapter 4, this study explored local perceptions mostly from Tanzanian education stakeholders who are categorized as state actors. At the country level, education stakeholders encompass those from central and local governments, schools, training institutions, academics, teachers’ unions, NGOs/CSOs/Religion-Based Organizations (RBO), the private sector, communities, parents, and education donor group, if the main constituents are listed. This diversity inevitably generates varied opinions and expectations concerning country ownership but equally generates more creative ideas and solutions in moving forward. The idea of joint ownership with external development partners can be also debated for its relevancy and practicability. Thus, in the same line with defining ownership at the country level, broad-based discussions on ownership agenda should be sought after in order to put locally generated ideas together to construct credible solutions to be collectively committed and owned in each country context.

Final Statement

I have received absolutely positive and supportive reactions to this study from the study participants as well as the Tanzanian experts when I presented the key findings and the notion of country ownership built upon the perspectives of the Tanzanians. Many
commented on the significance of the inquiry and associated discussions on ownership of
development discourse. Behind those positive reactions to my study, there is a reality as
discussed in this dissertation that many Tanzanians are frustrated with the static
conditions surrounding their development landscape and are beginning to lose confidence
in the government’s leadership as well as how it tackles development challenges. This is
despite the exceptionally positive experiences the country had in development discourse
and aid relationships earlier.

In this respect, ownership discussions through this study extended Tanzanian
education stakeholders a chance to contemplate what ownership means to them, what
challenges Tanzania is currently facing in that regard, and what should be done to cope
with the ownership agenda. Ideally, Tanzanian stakeholders will continue dialogues on
country ownership so that they can further scrutinize Tanzanian ownership in
development and determine next steps themselves to move forward to realize their
envisioned country ownership. Even if not collectively, I wish each of them to be more
mindful of and act on ownership at a personal level. As the founder of the nation,
Mwalimu Nyerere, asserted, it is only the determination and diligent work of the people
that will change the country in a meaningful and desired manner.

Although the Paris Declaration and subsequent action agreements promoted much
attention to aid effectiveness, these debates hardly allowed the global development
community to adopt a more genuine and subtle concept of ownership in a collective way.
From the perspective of challenging the paradoxically donor-driven approach, a more
legitimate understanding of country ownership should be debated. The notion needs to go
beyond the technical one, and it should concern autonomy and sovereignty over national
and local development. Otherwise, counterproductive practices in aid and development may continue undermining local ownership and damage relationships between developing nations and their external partners, which will affect development efforts negatively in the end.

This study proposes that what country ownership fundamentally means and requires should be discussed and determined at the country level. By the Tanzanian definition, country ownership concerns the government’s ability to engage with its citizens and to be accountable to them for attaining development objectives and priorities that originated locally but were determined nationally. In essence, though, there are diverse definitions and points of concern. Therefore, again it has to be emphasized that an ownership agenda can be determined and tackled most effectively at the country level. I believe that Tanzania is in an advantageous position to initiate this endeavor and cultivate a real sense of ownership for its own development discourse. I truly respect their understanding of development ownership and remain supportive of their journey to realize the envisioned country ownership on their own terms.
APPENDIX A

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS ON OWNERSHIP

Date: | Time: | Meeting venue:
---|---|---
Name:
Affiliation: | Position:
Years of services in education (or civil/public service):
Phone: | Email:

Q1. Are you familiar with the term ‘ownership’? Do you hear/use the term in your work setting?

Q2. Do you know in recent years there have been discussions taking place about ownership under the Paris Declaration framework (which defines ownership as the country’s ability to design and implement national policies and strategies)?

Q3. Regardless of the definition of ownership, the international donor community emphasizes the importance of country ownership for generating more tangible results in development and aid. **What does country ownership primarily mean to you? What is country ownership about?**

Q4. Also, **whose ownership is this?**

Q5. By your understanding of ownership, then, **how do you see Tanzanian country ownership** over development?

Q6. When it comes to the education sector and education activities, **who are involved and who should own?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Who are involved?</th>
<th>Whose ownership?</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment/review/evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Can you tell me one [empirical] example of a case of your ownership? [Something you feel you owned, how you exercised ownership, what is a proof of your ownership?]

Q8. Can you express the degree of country ownership (ownership at national level) as well as your own ownership (ownership at personal level)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Degree of ownership (V)</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10. What are major factors which support your ownership? What makes exercising ownership difficult?

Q11. In your view, are development partners supporting Tanzanian ownership? What are the reasons of your answer?

Q12. How and what would you monitor to assess ‘ownership’ if you were in charge?
## APPENDIX B

### OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE DESCRIBED BY TANZANIAN EDUCATION STAKEHOLDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>What is owned?</th>
<th>Who are involved?</th>
<th>Who owns?</th>
<th>Recognition of ownership</th>
<th>What influence?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Making</strong></td>
<td>• Process&lt;br&gt;• Policies</td>
<td>• Government&lt;br&gt;• Politicians (MPs)&lt;br&gt;• Responsible Ministries&lt;br&gt;• DPs</td>
<td>Institutional level: MoEVT, PMO-RALG&lt;br&gt;Individual level: Ministers&lt;br&gt;In vision: Population</td>
<td>• Responsible Ministry Officials: Strongly recognized&lt;br&gt;• Other Officials: Weakly recognized&lt;br&gt;• MPs/Minister: Not investigated&lt;br&gt;• Community level: Not recognized</td>
<td>• Political directions&lt;br&gt;• Authority&lt;br&gt;• Autonomy&lt;br&gt;• DPs' policy conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Setting</strong></td>
<td>• Process&lt;br&gt;• Priorities</td>
<td>• Government&lt;br&gt;• Politicians (MPs)&lt;br&gt;• DPs&lt;br&gt;• Stakeholders at implementation level (Communities)</td>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>• Ministerial level: Poorly recognized&lt;br&gt;• District level: Poorly recognized&lt;br&gt;• Community level: Well recognized</td>
<td>• Political priority&lt;br&gt;• Autonomy&lt;br&gt;• Collective dialogue&lt;br&gt;• Active participation&lt;br&gt;• Resource availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Development</strong></td>
<td>• Process&lt;br&gt;• Strategies</td>
<td>• Responsible Ministries/Departments&lt;br&gt;• DPs&lt;br&gt;• Technical experts&lt;br&gt;• Communities (in Adult Education)</td>
<td>Responsible Ministries/Departments</td>
<td>Poorly recognized overall</td>
<td>• Political commitment&lt;br&gt;• Technical expertise&lt;br&gt;• DPs' intervention&lt;br&gt;• Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>• Process&lt;br&gt;• Plans</td>
<td>• Ministries/Departments&lt;br&gt;• Regional Administration&lt;br&gt;• LGAs&lt;br&gt;• School Committees</td>
<td>Stakeholders at every level</td>
<td>• Ministerial level: Fairly recognized&lt;br&gt;• District level: Well recognized&lt;br&gt;• Communities: Strongly recognized</td>
<td>• Dialogue&lt;br&gt;• Participation of implementers&lt;br&gt;• Leadership&lt;br&gt;• Responsibility&lt;br&gt;• Accountability&lt;br&gt;• Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Budgeting (Resource allocation)** | **Ministry of Finance** | **Ministerial level:** Poorly recognized  
**Community:** Feeling responsible for resource mobilization | **Authority**  
**Autonomy**  
**DPs**  
**Resource availability** |
|---|---|---|---|
| • Mandates  
• Resources  
• Resource Mobilization | Personnel in charge of budgeting  
Management in allocation/decision making  
Parliament in approval  
Communities in resource contribution | Local Communities | |
| **Financial Management** | Responsible Ministries/Departments  
LGAs  
Schools/School Committees | Central Government  
Local Government Finance Department  
School Committee | Importance recognized  
Ownership poorly recognized across study participants | **Authority**  
**Transparency**  
**Accountability**  
**DPs** |
| • Mandates  
• Reports | | | | |
| **Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)** | Ministries  
LGAs  
DPs  
Other Stakeholders  
Communities (in Adult Education) | MoEVT/PMO-RALG  
LGAs/Responsible Departments  
School Committee/Local Communities | Importance recognized  
Ownership poorly recognized across study participants  
Management level: Fairly recognized | **Authority**  
**Transparency**  
**Accountability**  
**DPs** |
| • Process  
• Mandates  
• M&E results | | | | |
| **Policy Implementation** | Ministries  
LGAs  
DPs  
Other Stakeholders  
Communities | MoEVT/PMO-RALG  
LGAs  
Local Communities | Ministerial level: Well recognized  
District level: Not well recognized  
Communities: Not directly inquired | **Resources**  
**Commitment**  
**Accountability**  
Community mobilization  
Community contribution |
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