



**AgEcon** SEARCH  
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

# Research Series No. 54

## Socioeconomic Determinants of Primary School Dropout: The Logistic Model Analysis

By

Ibrahim Okumu Mike  
Alex Nakajjo  
Doreen Isoke

February 2008



**Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC)**

51 Pool Road Makerere University Campus, P. O. Box 7841 Kampala, Uganda  
Tel: 256-41-541023, Fax: 256-41-541022, Email: [eprc@eprc.or.ug](mailto:eprc@eprc.or.ug)

---

**See the end of this document for a list of previous papers in the series**

---

# **Socioeconomic Determinants of Primary School Dropout: The Logistic Model Analysis<sup>1</sup>**

**By**

**Ibrahim Okumu Mike  
Department of Economic Policy and Planning  
Faculty of Economics and Management  
Makerere University**

**Alex Nakajjo  
Rand Group Consult**

**And**

**Doreen Isoke  
Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development  
Uganda**

---

<sup>1</sup> This poverty research in Uganda was a tripartite research program involving Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, Economic Policy Research Center and Cornell University under the auspices of the Sustainable Access Growth Analysis (SAGA) project. The opinions expressed in this study are the responsibility of the authors and not of their institutions or even the funding institutions.

Key words: socioeconomic determinants, primary education, and dropout.

## **Abstract**

This paper describes the socioeconomic determinants of primary school dropout in Uganda with the aid of a logistic model analysis using the 2004 National Service Delivery Survey data. The Objectives were to establish the; household socioeconomic factors that influence dropout of pupils given free education and any possible policy alternatives to curb dropout of pupils. Various logistic regressions of primary school dropout were estimated and these took the following dimensions; rural-urban, gender, and age-cohort. After model estimation, marginal effects for each of the models were obtained. The analysis of the various coefficients was done across all models. The results showed the insignificance of distance to school, gender of pupil, gender of household head and total average amount of school dues paid by students in influencing dropout of pupils thus showing the profound impact Universal Primary Education has had on both access to primary education and pupil dropout. Also the results vindicated the importance of parental education, household size and proportion of economically active household members in influencing the chances of pupil dropout. The study finally calls for government to; keep a keen eye on non-school fees payments by parents to schools as these have the potential to increase to unsustainable levels by most households especially in rural areas; roll-out adult education across the entire country; and expand free universal education to secondary and vocational levels as it would allow some of those who can not afford secondary education to continue with schooling. This has the effect of reducing the number of unproductive members in the household.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
1.0 Introduction and Motivation of study.....	1
1.1 Policy relevance .....	2
1.2 Organization of the study .....	2
2.0 Review of Literature .....	3
2.2 Household level factors .....	3
4.0 Research Methodology .....	5
4.1 Conceptualization of the Study.....	5
4.2 Data Source.....	7
4.3 Model Specification .....	7
5.0 Description of the data.....	9
6.0 Presentation and Discussion of Findings .....	11
7.0 Conclusions and Policy Recommendations.....	16
8.0 Bibliography .....	17
9.0 Appendix.....	21
9.1 Logistic Model results for determinants of Primary School Dropout. ....	21
9.2 Marginal effects After Logistic.....	24

## 1.0 Introduction and Motivation of study

Education is a fundamental human right as well as a catalyst for economic growth and human development (World Bank, 1993 and Okidi et al., 2004). In its bid to promote economic growth and human development, the government of Uganda in 1997 implemented the Universal Primary Education (UPE), initially for four pupils per family but later opened to every one of school going age or interested adults. The Ugandan government is committed to UPE, as reflected by the improved budgetary allocations to the education sector<sup>2</sup>. For instance, whereas in 1992/93 education comprised 12% of the total government expenditure, by 1998/99 it had reached 25% and stood at 23.3% in 2004/05<sup>3</sup>.

The introduction of UPE accompanied by government commitment, including political leadership resulted into a surge in primary school enrolment from 2.7 million pupils in 1996 to 5.3 million in 1997 and to 7.1 million in 2005<sup>4</sup>. The ever increasing primary school enrolment has consequently led to improvements in gross enrollment ratio (GER). Whereas GER in the decade preceding 1997<sup>5</sup> had increased by only 39%, by 2004 GER had risen by 104.42% (Bategeka et al., 2004). This suggests that Uganda is on the verge of attaining the UPE Millennium Development Goals (MDG) in as far as access is concerned.

However, much as primary school enrolment has been a success, the concern now is with regard to the internal efficiency<sup>6</sup> of primary education that is the ability to retain pupils until they graduate from primary school. The incidence of pupils dropping out of school is palpable in primary six and primary five which is 34.9 percent and 22.1 percent respectively (NSDS, 2004). The comprehensive evaluation of basic education in Uganda report (2005) asserted that UPE dropout has escalated from 4.7% in 2002 to 6.1% in 2005. It further notes that of the Net Enrollment Ratio (NER) for boys and girls is 93.01%, however 55% of boys and 54.6% of girls reach primary four, while 31.2% of the boys and 27.7% of girls reach primary seven.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Education Sector Investment Plan (ESIP) made it mandatory that not less than 65% of education budget is spent on primary education

<sup>3</sup> See Annual Budget Performance Report (MoFPED), several series.

<sup>4</sup> Education Statistical Abstract, several series

<sup>5</sup> Period 1986 to 1996, enrolment increased from 2,203,824 to 3,068,625 in 1996.

<sup>6</sup> Internal efficiency is measured by both dropout and repetition.

The problem of dropout is thus disquieting to policy makers since it partly reflects the inadequacy of a schooling system in terms of either school quality or quantity. Noteworthy to mention is that school dropouts are usually associated with chronically high unemployment levels, low earnings, and poor healthy outcomes (McNeal 1995; Pallas 1987; Rumberger 1987), and persistent poverty among certain segments of society (Chernichovsky,1985). Taken aggregately, these individual-level consequences of primary school dropouts are perilous to national development by undermining national human capital development efforts.

Given the glaring dropout rate of pupils and ghastly effects of primary school dropout, there is therefore a dire need to establish the socio-economic factors that influence the probability of pupils dropping out of school. The study therefore sought to answer the following questions;

- 1) What key household socioeconomic factors influence dropout of pupils given free education?
- 2) What policy alternatives to curb dropout of pupils can be pursued?

## **1.1 Policy relevance**

The findings of this study contribute to policy discussions; with regard to education sector in general and primary education vis-à-vis UPE in particular. The study explores the influence of household level factors on the probability of a pupil dropping out of primary school<sup>7</sup> and associated policy implications. Although Uganda has almost attained universal primary education, school wastage through dropout undermines efforts to achieve more than basic literacy since it is one thing to achieve universal education and another to keep children enrolled in school.

## **1.2 Organization of the study**

The paper is organized in five sections. The first section is the background and motivation of the study. This is followed by the literature review section that explores research findings of similar studies. Section iii encompasses the methodology adopted while the description of the data is presented in section iv. The findings of the study are presented in section v, and the paper finally draws some conclusions and policy recommendations in section vi.

---

<sup>7</sup> Ensuring enrolment and that children remain in school until the primary cycle of education is complete is one of the broad objectives of UPE program.



## **2.0 Review of Literature**

In almost all developing countries, school dropout or low completion rates have been a subject of interest to academics, researchers, and policy makers for a long time. According to the Poverty Status Report (PSR, 2005), the phenomenon of high school dropout rate continues to pose a big challenge to the successful implementation of national policies. Although the findings of various studies differ depending on the peculiar country specific situations, rural- urban divide, gender bias, and distance to school appear to be the most common elements in all the studies. In this section we review the findings of some of the studies pertaining to drop out rates at various grade levels at household levels with greater emphasis on Uganda.

### **2.2 Household level factors**

The study by Holmes (2003) found out that overall; females receive less education than males, and they tend to dropout, or are withdrawn earlier for both economic and social-cultural reasons. The study further argues that the opportunity cost of sending female children to school in rural areas, where girls are married quite early, is high because benefits of their schooling will not accrue to their parental household. Similarly Kasente, (2004), Kakuru, (2003) explain how early marriages influence children's dropping out of school especially as regards the girl child as it is perceived by parents that marrying off the girl child is an escape route from poverty. Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment (UPPAP, 2000) indicates that marrying off girls would benefit her family in terms of attaining bride price.

Odaga and Heneveld (1995), further note that parents worry about wasting money on the education of girls because there are most likely to get pregnant or married before completing their schooling and that once married, girls become part of another family and the parental investment in them is lost this therefore perpetuates parents discouraging the girl child from continuing with school.

Findings with regard to the impact of parent's education on schooling of children show that the children of more educated parents are more likely to be enrolled and more likely to progress further through school. Holmes, (2003) shows that this impact differs by gender, the education of the father increases the expected level of school retention of boys, and that of the mother's enhances the educational attainment of girls. Similarly other studies by Behrman *et al.*, (1999) and Swada and

Lokshin (2001) reported a consistently positive and significant coefficient of father's and mother's education at all levels of education except at secondary school level.

United Nations Children Education Fund (UNICEF, 1999); MOES, (1995); Government of Uganda (GOU, 1999) Horn (1992); all demonstrate that Parental decisions do affect children retention. Students whose parents monitor and regulate their activities, provide emotional support, encourage independent decision making and are generally more involved in their schooling are less likely to dropout of school (Astone and McLanalan, 1991; Rumberge *et al.*, 1990; Rumber 1995; Odaga and Heneveld, 1995; and Russel, 2001). Taking into account of the gender dimension of dropouts, UNICEF, (2005) notes that girls are more likely to dropout of school than boys and that pupils whose mother's have not attained any level of education will most likely dropout of school.

Russel, (2001); Bickel and Pagaiannis, (1988); Clark, (1992); and Rumberger, (1983) demonstrate that communities can influence dropout rates by providing employment opportunities during school. While some researchers have found out that work can contribute to a student dropping out, others have showed that student employment begins to correlate with dropping out when the student regularly works over 14 hours per week (Mann 1986, 1989). Other research place the critical level for employment higher, at 20 hours per week (Winters 1986), with the likelihood of dropping out increasing with the number of hours worked.

In another study by MoES (2001), the rates of drop out<sup>8</sup> in all government-aided schools for girls and boys are almost equal. The total number of male dropouts for 2001 was 164,986 (50.6%), while that of females was 160,932 (49.4%) giving a national total of 325,918. In an account for the gender disparity in primary school drop out, Nyanzi (2001) put forward that marriage, pregnancy and sickness are major causes of drop out among girl children while amongst the boys, they include; jobs, lack of interest dismissal and fees.

The reviewed literature above identifies variables affecting primary school dropout at the household level. Most studies have not been based on large samples and data that is representative of the whole country, and others where conducted a few years into the implementation of UPE. This study

---

<sup>8</sup> 'School drop out is derived as the difference between the number of pupils/students enrolled at the beginning of the year and the number who enrolled at the end of the year' (MGLSD, 2000, 12).

utilizes a national representative sample of all regions of Uganda, data collected in 2004, 7 years after implementation of UPE, as such at a time when the first cohort of UPE completed their primary level.

### **3.0 Research Methodology**


#### **3.1 Conceptualization of the Study**

The dropout of pupils from school over a given period of time reflects the impact of various socioeconomic factors, originating from the community and homes/families of the pupils. The socio-economic variables can broadly be categorized into pre-primary learning of the pupil, the pupil's family background, pupil's personality and community based factors.

Socio-economic variables influence the dropout of pupils directly by influencing the pupil's decision to drop from school, or that of the parent to withdraw the pupil from schooling. The variables also indirectly influence the drop out of pupils by negatively affecting their education achievements in school (attendance, learning and academic performance in examinations), this in turn influences dropout of pupils.

This conceptualization highlights the complexity of factors influencing dropout of pupils; most variables are interrelated and influence each other. Some of the variables influence the dropout directly and indirectly through their impact on the school achievement of the pupils. The diagrammatic exposition is as shown in figure 1.

**Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of the Study**



### 3.2 Data Source

The study utilized data collected by Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) in 2004 for the National Service Delivery survey (NSDS). The household survey questionnaire collected information on social-economic variables of households in relation to service delivery based on four regions of Uganda, namely Northern, Eastern, Central and Western Uganda using stratified sampling. The sample size was 17,681 household, covering all the regions of the country. The central region had 4,533 households, drawn from 13 districts of Kalangala, Kampala, Kiboga, Luwero, Masaka, Mpigi, Mubende, Mukono, Nakasongola, Rakai, Sembabule, Kayunga and Wakiso. The eastern region had 4,699 households, drawn from 13 districts of Bugiri, Busia Iganga, Kamuli, Jinja, Kapchorwa, Katakwi, Kumi Mbale Pallisa Tororo Mayuge and Sironko. The northern region had 3,749 households, drawn from 15 districts of Soroti, Kaberamaido, Adjumani, Apac, Arua, Gulu, Kitgum, Kotido, Lira, Moroto, Moyo, Nebbi, Nakapiripiriti, Pader, Yumbe. The western region had 4,700 households, drawn from 15 districts of Bundibugyo, Bushenyi, Hoima, Kabala, Kabarole, Kasese, Kibaale, Kisoro, Masindi, Mbarara, Ntungamo, Rukungiri, Kamwenge, Kanungu and Kyenjojo.

### 3.3 Model Specification

To examine the determinants of dropout using household level information, we use a dummy variable,  $HD_{ij}$ , which takes one if child  $i$  of household  $j$  dropped out of school and zero otherwise. The logistic model is adopted because of the dichotomous nature of the dependent variable. Generally, we estimate the logistic model as:

$$\text{Prob}(HD_{ij}=1) = f(C_{ij}, H_j, X_j, X_c) \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

Where

$HD_{ij}$  = dropout of a pupil,  $HD_i = 1$  if a child was reported to have dropped out of school before completing primary seven; else  $HD_i = 0$ . This is the dependent variable of the model

$C_{ij}$  is a set of characteristics of child  $i$  of household  $j$

$H_{ij}$  is a set of household head characteristics of child  $i$  of household  $j$ ;

$X_{ij}$  is a set of household characteristics of child  $i$  of household  $j$

$X_c$  is a set of community characteristics/factors where household  $j$  resides

**The child characteristics  $C_{ij}$ , include:**

Age of the child in completed years, which is categorized in three categories namely age1 taking value 1 if age of pupil is between 5 and 8, and zero else where; age2 taking value 1 if age of pupil is between 9 and 12, and zero else where; age3 taking value 1 if age of pupil is between 13 and 17, and zero else where.

Orphanage of a child as a result of death of a mother and father; orp\_father being orphanage due to death of a father and takes a value of 1 if father of a child died, otherwise zero is assigned; orp\_mother being orphanage due to death of a mother and takes a value of 1 if mother of a child died, otherwise zero is assigned.

A dummy variable for gender of a child; G\_pupil takes a value of 1 if pupil is male and zero for female.

**The household head characteristics,  $H_j$ , include:**

Age of household head; Age\_hh being age of household head in completed year

A dummy variable for the gender of the household head, g\_hh=1 if male and zero for female

Education level of father and mother; Accfather being number of years of schooling for father while Accmother being number of years of schooling for mother

Marital status of household head is captured by three variables; hh\_maried=1 if household head is married and zero otherwise; hh\_dev=1 if household head is divorced and zero otherwise; hh\_wid=1 if household head is widowed and zero otherwise.

**The household characteristics,  $X_j$ , include:**

Household size; hhsiz= number of persons in the household

Proportion of economically active members of household; eco\_act= number of persons between 18 and 64 years of age in a household divided by total number of persons in the household.

Amount of money paid to the school annually for child I, measured by the average amount paid per pupil per enumeration area.

**Community characteristics/factors where household j resides  $X_c$ , includes:**

Distance to school, measured by the average distance in kilometers to the nearest primary school per enumeration area

A dummy variable for rural or urban; ruralu=1 for rural households and takes value 0 for urban households.

We estimate equation (1) above for children aged 5 to 17, as the general model. We also estimate separate models for boys and girls separately to capture the gender dimension. We further estimate separate models for the rural households and urban households. While estimating the models, only pupils in the age bracket of 5 and 17 years were considered in the analysis, to cater for even those who started school late or repeated some classes. We go further to capture the age dimension by estimating three different models, one for the age bracket 5-8 years, 9-12 years and 13-17 years. For each of these categories, a separate model, one for boys and the other for girls are estimated.

#### 4.0 Description of the data

We summarize the data description by obtaining frequencies for categorical variables and means for continuous variables in the data set, which are presented below

##### Frequency of Categorical variables

Factor	Categories	Frequency	Percent
Rural/urban divide	Urban	21,058	22.87
	Rural	71,000	77.13
Gender of household head	Male	73,806	80.58
	Female	17,787	19.42
Gender of pupil	Male	45,454	51.11
	Female	43,477	48.89
Marital Status	Married	73,954	80.33
	Widowed	8,920	9.69
	Divorced	3,610	3.92
	Single	3,907	4.26
	others	1,354	1.48
Orphanage of Pupil	Mother died	4,586	6.71
	Father died	8,943	13.21

### Averages of continuous variables

Variable	Mean
Age of household	42.4850
Age of pupil	10.4280
Academic attainment of father	4.8744
Academic attainment of mother	4.7357
Distance to school (km)	2.1028
Total amount per child paid to school per year	11689.41
Household size	6.6204
Proportion of economically active persons in household	0.4252

Further more, we test the equality of means on variables in the estimated models between pupils who were reported to have dropped out of schools and those that were still schooling at the time of the survey and the findings are summarized in the table below. From the table, all variables except gender of pupil, orphanage due to death of a mother and distance to school are significant.

Variables		Observations	Mean	t statistic
Rural-Urban	Non-dropout	44127	0.770435	4.7006
	dropout	26587	0.754955	
Gender household Head	Non-dropout	43905	0.786163	-14.5804
	dropout	26497	0.831188	
Gender of pupil	Non-dropout	44068	0.512322	-0.2085
	dropout	26500	0.513132	
Age household Head	Non-dropout	43859	44.26936	16.6182
	dropout	26417	42.55438	
Orphanage due to death of mother	Non-dropout	42842	0.06685	-0.2793
	dropout	25548	0.067403	
Orphanage due to death of father	Non-dropout	42442	0.138848	6.7553
	dropout	25273	0.120682	
Age of pupil	Non-dropout	44127	10.47635	4.5943



	dropout	26587	10.34761	
Academic attainment of Father	Non-dropout	26368	4.796875	12.3456
	dropout	16524	4.383745	
Distance to school	Non-dropout	44062	2.044541	0.3129
	dropout	26351	2.039626	
Total amount of dues paid to school per pupil	Non-dropout	44127	11543.67	-3.739
	dropout	26454	12235.93	
Household size	Non-dropout	44127	7.577356	29.3821
	dropout	26587	6.983488	
Proportion of economically active persons	Non-dropout	43367	0.356005	-37.8509
	dropout	26398	0.397452	

## 5.0 Presentation and Discussion of Findings

This section presents the findings and discussion of the regression analysis of household level factors influencing the probability of pupils dropping out of school. During the discussions, reference is made to the tables of regression results and marginal effects in appendix 1 and 2. To investigate the influence of household level factors on primary school dropout, we considered the gender dimension, location dimension and the age-cohorts of the primary school children, as detailed in Appendix 1. Similarly, appendix 2 presents the marginal effects for the estimated models. The definitions of the models in the table are as below:

- Model 1: Household Model for all pupils in the sample
- Model 2: Household Model for only pupils from rural households
- Model 3: Household Model for only girls in rural households
- Model 4: Household Model for only the boy child in rural households
- Model 5: Household Model for only pupils from urban households
- Model 6: Household Model for only the girl child in urban settings
- Model 7: Household Model for only the boy child in urban settings
- Model 8: Household Model for only children in the age cohort 5 to 8
- Model 9: Household Model for only the girl child of age-cohort 5 to 8
- Model 10: Household Model for only the boy child of age-cohort 5 to 8
- Model 11: Household Model for only children in the age cohort 9 to 12

- Model 12: Household Model for only the girl child of age-cohort 9 to 12  
Model 13: Household Model for only the boy child of age-cohort 9 to 12  
Model 14: Household Model for only children in the age cohort 13 to 17  
Model 15: Household Model for only the girl child of age-cohort 13 to 17  
Model 16: Household Model for only the boy child of age-cohort 13 to 17

Below is the discussion of findings with respect to the various variables.

### **Rural-Urban divide**

Results of the general model for all pupils in the sample indicate that the probability of a child dropping out from primary school reduces as one moves from rural to urban areas, which is statistically significant at 5%. This could perhaps be attributed to the fact that it is easier to access schools in urban areas as compared to rural areas. Across all the models, the odds ratios are negative, which is consistent with theory. However, results of age-cohort models reveal statistical significance of the rural-urban dummy variable, the significance drops as a child grows older. This implies that at older ages, the influence of locality to the probability of a child dropping out of school reduces, as also attested by the decreasing marginal effects. Considering the gender of pupil in the rural-urban dimension, the odds ratios for the rural-urban dimension are insignificant for girls except for the 13-17 age cohorts. We associate this to the high chances of girls to marry, get pregnant or be married off by parents as they grow older in rural areas as compared to urban areas. Noteworthy however is that the marginal effects associated with the rural-urban dummy variable are insignificant across all dimensions of analysis. The largest effect is with boys in the age cohort 5-8 years, where the probability of dropping out increases by 6% as the dummy variable changes from urban to rural setting.

### **Gender of Household Head and of Pupil**

The gender of household was found to be insignificant across all the models except for age cohort 5-8 and age cohort 9-12 years for girls only. This finding is contrary to the general belief that female headed households are more likely to experience school dropout. This could be attributed to the fact that primary school education is largely free, as such even female headed households with limited finances can also afford to sustain their children in school. The marginal effects for the gender of a household dummy variable are insignificant except for children in the 5-8 age bracket (with the

probability of dropping out increases by 7% as the dummy variable changes from female to male) and girl child of 9-12 age cohort (with the probability of dropping out decreases by 9% as the dummy variable changes from female to male).

Similarly, the odds ratios and marginal effects of gender of pupil were found to be insignificant across all models. This is in agreement with findings by MoES (2001) and comprehensive evaluation of basic education in Uganda report (2005), with findings that the dropout rate of both girls and boys is almost the same. This is also contrary to theory that the girl child is more likely to drop out of schools than the boys, as argued by Holmes(2003), Odaga & Heneveld (1995). This could be attributed to UPE, which has reduced the opportunity cost to parents of sustaining both boys and girls in schools.

### **Age of the household head**

The odds ratio for age of household head is generally negative except for models 5, 7 and 14. This suggests that as the household head age increases, the probability of a child dropping out of school reduces. The relationship is statistically significant in the general model and in rural areas except for boys. Equally, the marginal effects are significant although very small. These findings point to the role of parental decisions in influencing children remaining in schools. Aged parents often appreciate the importance of education and influence their children to stay at school especially young ones. But as children grow, they begin to take on their own decisions and the influence of parents tends to reduce.

### **Household Size**

Across all models, it is clearly evident that children in larger households are less likely to dropout of school than children living in smaller households and the relationships are statistically significant. Equally, the marginal effects are large and significant, with the probability of dropping out reducing by up to 27% for girls in the 13-17 age brackets. Though this finding is contrary to the general belief, Chernichovsky (1985) and Gomes (1984) too agree with our finding. These interesting findings could perhaps be attributed to the fact that other household members either substitute for child labor so that the children could take advantage of UPE or contribute part of their earnings to

educating younger members of the household. On the other hand in smaller households, children are more likely to be diverted to offer family labor or stand-in in case of family shocks like sickness. Secondly, it could be that UPE has lessened the school fees burden, which could have been a major contributor to pupil dropout for larger family sizes.

### **Academic achievement of mother and father**

High academic attainment of a mother and father significantly reduce chances of primary school dropout for both girls and boys in rural and urban areas. Equally, the marginal effects are significant across all dimensions of analysis. For a mother, this phenomenon could perhaps be attributed to the fact that: educated mothers reduce the time spent doing household chores while increasing the time spent with their children than their uneducated counterparts; also, educated mothers are more effective in helping their children in academic work in doing so, they are also able to monitor and supervise their children's academic progress<sup>9</sup>. While for fathers it's attributed to the fact that educated fathers are also interested in the academic progress of their children thus they would be willing to spend more time helping their children in academic problems. Also, as suggested by Leclercq (2001), educated parents are more aware of the possible returns to their children's education and they are more likely to have access to information and social networks necessary for their children to engage into relatively human capital intensive activities yielding high returns to education. In conclusion, the academic attainment of parents enhances positive attitudinal change towards children's education.

### **Distance to school**

The odds that a pupil will dropout of primary school increases with increase in the distance a pupil moves to school<sup>10</sup>. Pupils traveling long distances to school are more likely to dropout of school. Whereas distance was found to be insignificant in influencing dropout for urban households, it is generally significant in rural areas except for girls. This phenomenon could be attributed to the easier access to schools in urban areas as compared to rural areas. The influence of distance to school on

---

<sup>9</sup> See Suet-Ling Pong (1996)

<sup>10</sup> It is in agreement with the finding by UPPA (2000)

the chances of dropout is more pronounced among the younger boys in the 5-8 and 9-12 age brackets, with probabilities of 1.2 percent and 0.7 percent respectively.

### **School fees payment**

The effect of fees payments across all model specifications is positive though insignificant except for girls in rural areas and 9-12 age bracket. This positiveness and insignificance of school fees could largely be attributed to the presence of UPE which in away reduces the school fees burden.

### **Economically active members**

Across all dimensions of analysis, it is evident that as the proportion of economically active<sup>11</sup> household members increases, the odds that a pupil will dropout of school increase. The relationship is positive and statistically significant across all the models. Looking at the marginal effects, with an increment in the economically active household members in a particular household the probability that a child will dropout of school is 39 percent and 41 percent in rural areas for girls and boys respectively. For urban areas, it is 37 percent and 42 percent for girls and boys respectively. With reference to age-cohorts, the likelihood of dropout is 59 percent, 45 percent and 31 percent for age-sets 5-8, 9-12, and 13-17 respectively. This finding suggests that a large percentage of the economically active are economically unproductive<sup>12</sup> thereby vindicating households' dependence burden. This squeezes out the households resources resulting into pupils in the family dropping out of school. This finding is also a reflection of the current unemployment situation, especially amongst the youth in Uganda.

---

<sup>11</sup> Proportion of economically active members was measured by the ratio of household members between 18-64 years to the total number of household members.

<sup>12</sup> These in the end become dependants thereby further constraining the household expenditure, including education expenditure which exacerbates school dropout of school children of the particular household..

## **7.0 Conclusions and Policy Recommendations**

The study findings indicate that UPE has had a profound impact on access to primary education and dropout of pupils from school. This is confirmed by the insignificance of distance to school and total average amount of school dues paid by students in influencing dropout of pupils. However, it is important for the government to maintain a close watch on non-school fees payments by parents to schools as these have the potential to increase to unsustainable levels by most households especially in rural areas.

Academic attainment of parents is a key factor that influences the chances of a child dropping out of school in both rural and urban areas, and across all age cohorts. We therefore recommend the policy and programmes of adult education by government to be rolled out in all parts of the country. The importance of adult education is envisaged to aide in enhancing attitudinal change among illiterate and ignorant parents in favor of child education.

As the number of the economically active members of household increases, the likelihood of primary school dropout increases other factors held unchanged. This implies that a good number of the economically active people are actually unproductive. This finding points to the need to expand employment opportunities, especially for the youth. Policies and programmes aimed at enhancing productive capacities at household levels could go a long way in curtailing this problem. This also suggests that expanding free universal education to secondary and vocational levels is important, as it would allow some of those who can not afford secondary education to continue with schooling. This has the effect of reducing the number of unproductive members in the household.

## 7.0 Bibliography

- Astone, N.M., & McClanahan, S.S. (1991). Family structure, parental practices, and high school completion. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 309-320.
- Balihuta M. Arsene and Ssemogerere G., (1995). *Education & Poverty in Uganda*. Department of Economics, Makerere University.
- Bategeka L., Ayok M., & Mukungu A., (2004). *Financing Primary Education for All: Uganda*. Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex.
- Begi J., Moraa (2000). *Determinants of enrollment of Girls in Secondary Schools in Kenya*. MA Economic Policy and Management Dissertation, Makerere University.
- Behrman, Jere, Andrew Foster, Mark Rosenzweig, and Prem Vashishtha. (1999). "Women's Schooling, Home Teaching, and Economic Growth." *Journal of Political Economy* 107 (4).
- Bergensen T. and Heuschel M., 2003. *Helping students finish school: Why students dropout and how to help them graduate*. The office of superintendents of public instruction, Olympia Washington.
- Bickel, R. & Papagiannis, G. (1988). Post-high school prospects and district-level dropout rates. *Youth & Society*, 20, 123-147.
- Bjorg C., 2004. *Education and Ethnic Minorities in Denmark*. PhD Dissertation, Aalborg University.
- Bowditch, C. (1993). Getting of troublemakers: High school discipline procedures and the production of dropout. *Social Problems*, 40, 493-509.
- Chernichovsky Dov, (1985) *Socioeconomic and Demographic Aspects of School Enrollment and Attendance in Rural Botswana*, by Economic Development and Cultural Change. The Chicago University Press.
- Durdhawale V. (2004). *Scenario of Primary School Attendance: A Study Less Development States in India*. Seminar Paper Submitted for the Partial fulfillment of the Master in Population Studies. International institute for Population Sciences, Deemed University.
- FAWE, 2000. *Regional Ministerial Consultation on Closing the Gender Gap in Education: Curbing Dropout*. Kampala, Uganda.
- Filmer, D. and Pritchett, L. (1999). The effects of Household Wealth on Educational Attainment: Evidence from 35 countries. *Population and Development*, Vol. 25.

- Foster, E. M., and S. McLanahan (1996): "An Illustration of the Use of Instrumental Variables: Do Neighborhood Conditions Affect a Young Person's Chance of Finishing High School?" *Psychological Methods*, 1(3), 249–260.
- Fergany, N. (1994). Survey of access to primary education and acquisition of basic literacy skills in three Governorates in Egypt. Cairo: UNICEF.
- Fuller, Bruce and Xiaoyan Liang, (1999). "Which girls stay in school? The influence of family economy, social demands, and ethnicity in South Africa." In *Critical Perspectives on Schooling and Fertility in the Developing World*. Eds. Caroline H. Bledsoe, John B. Casterline, Jennifer A. Johnson-Kuhn, and John G. Haaga. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Gomes, N. (1984). "Family Size and Educational attainment in Kenya." *Population and Development Review*, Vol. 10(4): 647-660.
- Haddad D., 1979. Educational and Economic Effects of Promotion and Repetition Practices. International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / World Bank, Washington DC.
- Hess, R.S. & D'Amato, R.C. (1996) High school completion among Mexican American children: Individual and familial risk factors. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 11, 353-368.
- Holmes, J. (2003), "Measuring the Determinants of School Completion in Pakistan: Analysis of Censoring and Selection Bias". *Economics of Education Review* 22.
- Horn, L., (1992). A Profile of Parents of Eighth Graders: National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. Statistical Analysis Report. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics, Office of Education Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, July 1992
- International Labour Organization, (2003). Investing in every child: An economic study of costs and benefits of eliminating child labour. International Programme on Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC), Geneva.
- Kakande M., & Nakwadda R., (1993). A report on A Study of Factors Influencing Access to & Attendance of Primary Education. Ministry of Finance & Economic Planning, Kampala, Uganda.
- Kakuru D. Muhwezi (2003). Gender Sensitive Educational Policy and Practice: Uganda Case study. International Bureau of Education
- Kasente D. (2003). Gender and Education in Uganda: A Case Study for Monitoring Report. Makerere University.



- Leclercq, F. (2001). "Patterns and Determinants of Elementary School Enrolment in Rural North India", Working paper, TEAM-CNRS, Universite de Paris 1, Paris, France.
- Lloyd C. B., Sahar El Tawila, Clark H W., & Mensch S. B., (2001). Determinants of Educational Attainment Among Adolescents in Egypt: Does School Quality Make a Difference? No. 150
- Lloyd C. B. and Mensch B., (2006). Early Marriage & Pregnancy as factors in School Dropout: An Analysis of DHS Data from Sub-Saharan Africa.
- Mafatle H., Tebello (2000). Determinants of Women Enrollment at University level in Uganda. MA Economic Policy and Management. Dissertation, Makerere University.
- Mann, D. (1989)"Effective Schools as a Dropout Prevention Strategy." NAASP Bulletin 73/518 (1989):77-83.
- Mann, D. (1986) "Can We Help Dropouts? Thinking About the Undoable." In School Dropouts: Patterns and Policies, edited by G. Natriello. New York: Teachers College Press, 1986, 15.
- Mingat A., Jee-PengTan, and Sosale S., (2003). Tools for Education Policy Analysis: The World Bank. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Ministry of Education and Sports (2005). A Comprehensive Analysis of Basic Education in Uganda. Education Planning Department, Kampala: MoES.
- Ministry of Education and Sports, (1999). Implementing Universal Primary Education. Effects on Schools, Communities, and Pupils. Education Planning Department, Kampala: MoES.
- Ministry of Education and Sports, (2003). Technical Note on Primary Repetition, Survival, and Completion Rates before and after Universal Primary Education (UPE) in Uganda. Kampala, Uganda.
- Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, (1995-2005): Annual Budget Performance. Several Series.
- Nishimura, M., Yamano, T. and Sasaoka, Y. (2005). Impacts of the Universal Primary Education Policy on Education attainment and Private Costs in Rural Uganda.
- Nyanzi L (2002). Gendering Education Policy: The Uganda Case. Women's Worlds 2002. Conference Paper.
- Odaga O. and Heneveld W., (1995). Girls and schools in Sub-Saharan African from Analysis to Action. The International Bank for Reconstruction / World Bank, Washington DC.

- OERI Urban Superintendents Network (1987). Dealing with dropouts: The urban superintendents call to action. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education
- Pallas, A. M. (1987). School dropouts in the United States Washington, DC: Center for educationStatistics. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service N. ED. 283 119).
- Rumberger W. R., 2001. Who Drops Out of School and Why? Paper prepared for the National Research Council, Committee on Educational Excellence and Testing Equity Workshop. Washington DC.
- SARPN, (2005). Letting them fail: Government neglect and the right to education for children affected by AIDS. Human Rights Watch. Volume 17 No. 13(A)
- Swada Y., and Lokshin M., (2001). "Household Schooling Decisions in Rural Pakistan". Policy Research Working paper series no.2541. The World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics, (2004). Uganda National Service Delivery Survey Report, 2004 UBOS, Entebbe.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics, (2002/03). Uganda National Household Survey: A report on the socioeconomic survey. UBOS, Entebbe.
- Uganda Participatory Poverty Assessment Report, (2000). Learning from the Poor. Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, Kampala Uganda.
- Vo Tri Thanh and Trinh Quang Long, (2005). Can Vietnam achieve one of its Millennium Development Goals? An analysis of schooling dropouts of children. William Davidson Institute Working Paper Number 776.
- World Bank, (2005). World Development Report: Investment, Climate, Growth, and Poverty. World Bank Publications, Page 68.

## 8.0 Appendix

### 8.1 Logistic Model results for determinants of Primary School Dropout.

Logistic regression	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Number of observations	29944	22265	10606	11721	7679	3931	3766	10269
LR chi	(17) 1327.11	(16) 924.09	(15) 499.92	(14) 490.78	(16) 426.88	(15) 254.08	(15) 217.44	(15) 592.48
Prob > chi2	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Pseudo R2	0.0335	0.0315	0.0358	0.0317	0.0418	0.0487	0.431	0.0433
Log likelihood	-19129.875	-14219	-6736.676	-7506	-4897.013	-2480.05	-2411.24	-6545.95
	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>
ruralu	0.879 (4.29)**							0.838 (3.38)**
g_hh	1.029 (0.36)	1.156 (1.42)	1.283 (1.69)	1.074 (0.50)	0.863 (1.18)	1.006 (0.03)	0.778 (1.41)	1.359 (2.00)*
G_pupil	1.027 (1.10)	1.022 (0.77)			1.038 (0.77)			1.010 (0.24)
age_hh	0.997 (2.73)**	0.996 (3.04)**	0.994 (3.40)**	0.998 (1.45)	1.001 (0.29)	0.994 (1.83)	1.007 (1.99)*	0.992 (4.11)**
hh_maried	1.524 (4.19)**	1.395 (2.91)**	2.133 (4.11)**	1.008 (0.05)	2.119 (3.50)**	1.870 (2.18)*	2.111 (2.46)*	1.255 (1.43)
hh_dev	1.163 (0.38)	1.077 (0.15)	1.950 (0.87)	0.374 (1.64)	1.207 (0.27)	1.006 (0.00)	1.298 (0.30)	1.282 (0.36)
hh_wid	0.548 (1.30)	0.167 (1.71)	1.255 (0.19)		1.139 (0.23)	5.560 (1.95)	0.459 (0.94)	0.868 (0.17)
orp_mother	1.128 (1.82)	1.212 (2.45)*	1.407 (2.88)**	1.054 (0.50)	0.963 (0.30)	0.851 (0.87)	1.090 (0.51)	1.284 (1.82)
orp_father	1.047 (0.75)	1.086 (1.13)	0.905 (0.90)	1.304 (2.74)**	0.990 (0.09)	0.975 (0.16)	1.054 (0.35)	0.955 (0.35)
age1	0.954 (1.52)				0.928 (1.21)	0.798 (2.64)**	1.061 (0.67)	
age2	0.937 (2.12)*	0.987 (0.37)	0.956 (0.90)	1.032 (0.65)	0.902 (1.72)	0.796 (2.65)**	0.989 (0.13)	
accfather	0.941 (15.32)**	0.944 (11.68)**	0.936 (9.24)**	0.950 (7.39)**	0.936 (9.97)**	0.925 (8.23)**	0.946 (5.97)**	0.921 (12.29)**

<b>accmother</b>	0.988 (9.56)**	0.986 (8.62)**	0.989 (4.46)**	0.983 (7.67)**	0.991 (4.21)**	0.988 (3.99)**	0.993 (2.30)*	0.979 (8.79)**
<b>dis</b>	1.014 (2.27)*	1.020 (2.64)**	1.002 (0.17)	1.037 (3.54)**	1.001 (0.05)	0.984 (0.86)	1.011 (0.72)	1.022 (1.82)
<b>sch_fees</b>	1.000 (1.39)	1.000 (1.31)	1.000 (2.33)*	1.000 (0.38)	1.000 (0.78)	1.000 (0.82)	1.000 (0.78)	1.000 (0.66)
<b>Loghsize</b>	0.457 (18.81)**	0.486 (14.50)**	0.458 (10.81)**	0.501 (10.22)**	0.394 (11.76)**	0.428 (7.57)**	0.349 (9.44)**	0.599 (6.77)**
<b>eco_act</b>	5.430 (16.90)**	5.745 (14.75)**	5.491 (9.63)**	5.895 (11.07)**	4.785 (8.30)**	6.273 (6.75)**	4.006 (5.24)**	12.267 (12.50)**
<b>age3</b>		1.038 (1.03)	1.036 (0.67)	1.054 (1.06)				

Logistic regression	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<b>Number of observations</b>	5141	5146	9806	4787	5026	9852	4599	5301
<b>LR chi</b>	(13) 346.87	(14) 286.07	(15) 373.43	(13) 245.47	(13) 176.08	(14) 469.06	(13) 263.50	(12) 273.17
<b>Prob &gt; chi2</b>	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
<b>Pseudo R2</b>	0.0507	0.0417	0.0000	0.0392	0.0265	0.0361	0.0434	0.0389
<b>Log likelihood</b>	-3250.34	-3289.73	-6258.72	-3005.57	-3236.50	-6259.50	-2900.58	-3371.44
	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>	<b>dpout</b>
<b>ruralu</b>	0.921 (1.13)	0.773 (3.43)**	0.893 (2.18)*	0.924 (1.04)	0.876 (1.82)	0.895 (2.11)*	0.836 (2.36)*	0.943 (0.80)
<b>g_hh</b>	2.526 (3.73)**	0.870 (0.67)	0.966 (0.26)	0.661 (2.12)*	1.344 (1.54)	0.897 (0.85)	1.083 (0.45)	0.767 (1.45)
<b>age_hh</b>	0.987 (4.44)**	0.996 (1.52)	0.997 (1.62)	0.996 (1.28)	0.998 (0.95)	1.001 (0.68)	0.998 (0.82)	1.003 (1.03)
<b>hh_maried</b>	1.212 (0.90)	1.320 (1.17)	1.677 (2.69)**	4.176 (3.71)**	1.039 (0.16)	1.792 (3.24)**	3.163 (3.77)**	1.153 (0.64)
<b>hh_dev</b>	0.938 (0.05)	0.447 (1.06)	2.038 (1.05)	9.633 (1.54)	1.126 (0.16)	0.613 (0.62)	2.877 (1.20)	
<b>orp_mother</b>	1.089 (0.40)	1.420 (1.92)	1.179 (1.38)	1.284 (1.42)	1.042 (0.25)	1.040 (0.39)	1.177 (1.07)	0.922 (0.61)
<b>orp_father</b>	0.997 (0.02)	0.941 (0.35)	0.735 (2.75)**	0.541 (3.58)**	0.985 (0.10)	1.361 (3.47)**	1.167 (1.15)	1.591 (3.92)**
<b>accfather</b>	0.920 (8.77)**	0.922 (8.64)**	0.934 (9.40)**	0.910 (9.03)**	0.955 (4.61)**	0.964 (5.26)**	0.957 (4.34)**	0.972 (3.02)**
<b>accmother</b>	0.976	0.981	0.990	0.996	0.984	0.991	0.992	0.990

	(6.90)**	(5.62)**	(4.39)**	(1.32)	(4.99)**	(4.31)**	(2.58)**	(3.51)**
<b>dis</b>	0.981	1.055	1.018	1.004	1.033	1.003	0.997	1.007
	(1.09)	(3.27)**	(1.77)	(0.28)	(2.36)*	(0.28)	(0.15)	(0.53)
<b>sch_fees</b>	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	(1.26)	(0.82)	(1.54)	(2.41)*	(0.24)	(0.08)	(0.21)	(0.15)
<b>loghsize</b>	0.654	0.566	0.506	0.490	0.516	0.348	0.310	0.349
	(3.95)**	(5.35)**	(9.33)**	(6.64)**	(6.58)**	(14.85)**	(11.38)**	(11.11)**
<b>eco_act</b>	18.854	8.517	4.526	3.577	5.405	3.788	3.681	3.758
	(10.00)**	(7.74)**	(8.20)**	(4.76)**	(6.58)**	(8.84)**	(5.72)**	(6.57)**
<b>hh_wid</b>		1.168	5.130					
		(0.17)	(2.06)*					
<b>G_pupil</b>			1.072			1.011		
			(1.63)			(0.26)		

**Note.**

Absolute value of z statistics in parentheses

Significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

## 8.2 Marginal effects After Logistic

Logistic regression	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx
<b>ruralu</b>	-.0301246 (-1.01)							-.0418286 -0.80
<b>g_hh</b>	.0066315 0.36	.033592 1.42	.0576887 1.69	.0165469 0.50	-.0350431 -0.28	.0013752 0.01	-.0608755 -0.34	.0721747 2.00
<b>G_pupil</b>	.0062784 0.26	.0050925 0.18			.0087094 0.18			.0023963 0.06
<b>age_hh</b>	-.0006898 -2.73	-.0008672 -3.04	-.0014267 -3.40	-.0005693 -1.45	.0001625 0.29	-.0014621 -1.83	.0015362 1.99	-.0019102 -4.12
<b>hh_maried</b>	.0919362 0.91	.073358 0.64	.1532038 0.83	.0018937 0.01	.1556713 0.73	.1315683 0.46	.1572891 0.52	.0517409 0.33
<b>hh_dev</b>	.0358148 0.09	.0173125 0.04	.1633842 0.21	-.1896994 -0.32	.0451046 0.07	.0013069 0.00	.0632042 0.07	.0599574 0.09
<b>hh_wid</b>	-.1263428 -0.27	-.2781219 -0.27	.0540679 0.05		.0309742 0.05	.3957265 0.45	-.1619014 -0.20	-.0325591 -0.04
<b>orp_mother</b>	.0284881 0.43	.0455253 0.58	.0818303 0.69	.012319 0.12	-.008803 -0.07	-.0369626 -0.20	.0204949 0.12	.0601919 0.44
<b>orp_father</b>	.0106504 0.18	.0193716 0.27	-.0227936 -0.21	.06342 0.66	-.0023409 -0.02	-.0058459 -0.04	.0124188 0.08	-.0107405 -0.08
<b>age1</b>	-.0109906 -0.35				-.0174096 -0.28	-.0519236 -0.61	.0141376 0.16	
<b>age2</b>	-.0150984 -0.49	-.0029435 -0.08	-.0103931 -0.21	.0072819 0.15	-.024188 -0.40	-.052445 -0.61	-.0026531 -0.03	
<b>Age3</b>		.0086689 0.24	.0082433 0.16	.0121815 0.25				
<b>accfather</b>	-.0140996 -15.34	-.0134605 -11.70	-.0153922 -9.26	-.0118437 -7.39	-.0155149 -9.99	-.0181802 -8.26	-.0131405 -5.97	-.0192628 -12.32
<b>accmother</b>	-.0028961 -9.57	-.0033186 -8.63	-.0024929 -4.47	-.0040943 -7.68	-.0021156 -4.21	-.0028563 -3.99	-.0016381 -2.30	-.004985 -8.80
<b>dis</b>	.0033325 2.27	.0046873 2.64	.000452 0.17	.0084217 3.54	.0001435 0.05	-.0037787 -0.86	.002534 0.72	.0050454 1.82
<b>sch_fees</b>	1.74e-07 1.39	2.67e-07 1.31	6.72e-07 2.33	-1.12e-07 -0.38	1.25e-07 0.78	1.74e-07 0.82	1.75e-07 0.78	1.40e-07 0.66
<b>Loghhsiz</b>	-.1823697 -18.83	-.1672639 -14.51	-.1806534 -10.82	-.161003 -10.23	-.2187696 -11.78	-.1977973 -7.58	-.2491343 -9.46	-.1202619 -6.77
<b>eco_act</b>	.3937482 16.92	.4054988 14.76	.3941101 9.64	.4133071 11.08	.3675145 8.30	.427958 6.76	.3285833 5.24	.5891658 12.52

Logistic regression	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx	dy/dx
<b>ruralu</b>	-.0193203	-.0615254	-.0263952	-.0180368	-.0310456	-.0258059	-.0418338	-.0137212
	-0.27	-0.82	-0.51	-0.24	-0.43	-0.49	-0.55	-0.19
<b>g_hh</b>	.1846509	-.0327703	-.0079587	-.0945799	.069024	-.0254831	.0181736	-.063643
	0.74	-0.67	-0.26	-2.12	1.54	-0.20	0.10	-0.35
<b>age_hh</b>	-.0029728	-.0009864	-.0007192	-.0008408	-.0005791	.0002903	-.0005172	.0006097
	-4.44	-1.52	-1.62	-1.28	-0.95	0.68	-0.82	1.03
<b>hh_maried</b>	.044007	.0630512	.1095502	.2392788	.0089074	.1226502	.2128879	.0324886
	0.20	0.26	0.57	0.62	0.04	0.68	0.70	0.15
<b>hh_dev</b>	-.0149136	-.1650792	.1742067	.4876137	.0281144	-.1045952	.2581298	
	-0.01	-0.22	0.26	0.33	0.04	-0.13	0.29	
<b>hh_wid</b>		.0372889	.3823665					
		0.04	0.48					
<b>orp_mother</b>	.0202136	.0852495	.0388121	.0586602	.0095702	.0091462	.0383296	-.0187685
	0.09	0.47	0.32	0.33	0.06	0.09	0.25	-0.14
<b>orp_father</b>	-.0008137	-.0143407	-.0681206	-.1267368	-.0035246	.0735938	.0363797	.1123767
	-0.00	-0.08	-0.61	-0.74	-0.02	0.83	0.27	0.95
<b>accfather</b>	-.0195355	-.0191148	-.0156951	-.0216355	-.0108256	-.0083854	-.0101246	-.0066623
	-8.79	-8.66	-9.42	-9.07	-4.61	-5.26	-4.34	-3.02
<b>accmother</b>	-.0056748	-.0044336	-.0023483	-.0010078	-.003784	-.002116	-.0018472	-.0023845
	-6.91	-5.63	-4.39	-1.32	-5.00	-4.31	-2.58	-3.51
<b>dis</b>	-.0045293	.0125259	.0041867	.0009672	.0076167	.0007091	-.0006102	.001703
	-1.09	3.27	1.77	0.28	2.36	0.28	-0.15	0.53
<b>sch_fees</b>	3.48e-07	2.28e-07	3.08e-07	6.93e-07	-6.60e-08	-2.03e-08	-7.19e-08	-5.91e-08
	1.26	0.82	1.54	2.41	-0.24	-0.08	-0.21	-0.15
<b>loghsize</b>	-.0995955	-.1341373	-.1572427	-.1625411	-.1543069	-.2449003	-.2709266	-.2453416
	-3.95	-5.35	-9.34	-6.65	-6.59	-14.88	-11.40	-11.13
<b>eco_act</b>	.6884588	.5046117	.3486427	.2907521	.3935571	.3086411	.3016902	.3086171
	10.03	7.75	8.20	4.77	6.59	8.85	5.72	6.57
<b>G_pupil</b>			.0160589			.0026293		
			0.38			0.06		

(\*) dy/dx is for discrete change of dummy variable from 0 to 1

**Note.**

Figures immediately below dy/dx are values of z statistics

## ECONOMIC POLICY RESEARCH CENTRE

### Research Series

<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>AUTHOR(S)</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
53	Akankunda Bwesigye Denis	An assessment of the causal relationship between Poverty and HIV/AIDS in Uganda	February 2008
52	Rudaheranwa N., Guloba M. & W. Nabiddo	Costs of Overcoming Market Entry Constraints to Uganda's Export-Led Growth Strategy	August 2007
51	Ibrahim Kasirye	Vulnerability and Poverty Dynamics in Uganda, 1992-1999	August 2007
50	Sebaggala Richard	Wage determination and wage Discrimination In Uganda	May 2007
49	J. Herbert Ainembabazi	Landlessness within the vicious cycle of poverty in Ugandan rural farm households: Why and how is it born?	May 2007
48	Marios Obwona & Sarah N. Ssewanyana	Development impact of higher education in Africa: <i>The case of Uganda</i>	January 2007
47	Charles A. Abuka, Kenneth A. Egesa, Imelda Atai & Marios Obwona	Firm Level Investment: Trends, determinants and constraints	March 2006
46	John Okidi, Sarah Ssewanyana, Lawrence Bategeka & Fred Muhumuza	Distributional and Poverty Impacts of Uganda's Growth: 1992 to 2003	December 2005
45	John Okidi, Sarah Ssewanyana, Lawrence Bategeka & Fred Muhumuza	Growth Strategies and Conditions for Pro-poor Growth: Uganda;s Experience	December 2005
44	Marios Obwona, Francis Wasswa and Victoria Nabwaayo	Taxation of the tobacco industry in Uganda:The Case for excise duty on cigarettes	November 2005
43	Marios Obwona & Stephen Ndhaye	Do the HIPC debt initiatives really achieve the debt sustainability objective? Uganda's experience	August 2005
42	Nichodemus Rudaheranwa	Trade costs relating to transport barriers on Uganda's trade	May 2004
41	Okurut Francis Nathan Banga Margaret & Mukungu Ashie	Microfinance and poverty reduction in Uganda: Achievements and challenges	April 2004
40	Ssewanyana Sarah, Nabyonga Orem Juliet, Kasirye Ibrahim, David Lawson	Demand for health care services in Uganda implications for poverty reduction	March 2004
39	Ssewanyana N.S., Okidi A.J., Angemi D., & Barungi V.	Understanding the determinants of income inequality in Uganda	March 2004
38	John A. Okidi	Trends in Ugandan household assets during the 1990s	March 2004
37	Nichodemus Rudaheranwa, Lawrence Bategeka and Margaret Banga	Beneficiaries of water service delivery in Uganda	October 2003
36	Nichodemus Rudaheranwa, Lawrence Bategeka, Margaret Banga & Ashie Mukungu	Supply Response of Selected Export Commodities in Uganda	October 2003



<b><u>NUMBER</u></b>	<b><u>AUTHOR(S)</u></b>	<b><u>TITLE</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>
35	Godfrey Bahiigwa, Frank Ellis, Odd-Helge Fjeldstad & Vegard Iversen	Rural Taxation in Uganda: Implications for Growth, Income Distribution, Local Government Revenue and Poverty Reduction	January 2004
34	David Lawson, Andy McKay & John Okidi	Poverty Persistence and Transitions in Uganda: A Combined Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis	December 2003
33	Michael Atingi Ego & Rachel Kagwa Sebudde	Measuring Efficiency of a Market in Transition: The Ugandan Foreign Exchange Market	September 2003
32	John A. Okidi & Andrew McKay	Poverty Dynamics in Uganda: 1992 to 2000	May 2003
31	Rosetti Nabbumba & Godfrey Bahiigwa	Agricultural Productivity Constraints in Uganda: Implications for Investment	May 2003
30	M.D. Sajjabi	Capital Account Liberalization in Uganda: An assessment of the early warning indicators and policy response	July 2003
29	Klaus Deininger, Gloria Kempaka, & Anja Crommelynck	Long-term welfare and investment impact of AIDS-related changes in family composition: Evidence from Uganda	December 2002
28	Klaus Deininger & John Okidi	Growth and Poverty reduction in Uganda, 1992-2000: panel data evidence	March 2002
27	Marios Obwona & Adam Mugume	Credit Accessibility and Investment Decisions in Uganda's Manufacturing Sector: An empirical investigation	June 2001
26	Charles A. Abuka & Augustine Wandera	Determinants of Price Level Dynamics in Uganda: Some Stylized Facts and Empirical Evidence	June 2001
25	Godfrey B.A. Bahiigwa	Household Food Security in Uganda: An Empirical Analysis	December 1999
24	Bruno R.M. Ocaya	The Economic Performance of Highly Indebted African Countries	October 1999
23	Torgny Holmgren, Louis Kasekende Michael Atingi-Ego & Daniel Ddamulira	Aid and Reform in Uganda – Country Case Study	September 1999
22	Paul Okiira Okwi	Poverty in Uganda: A Multivariate Analysis	October 1999
21	Godfrey Bahiigwa	The Impact of Trade and Investment Policies on the Environment: The Case of the Fisheries Industry in Uganda	September 1999
20	Peter Mijumbi	Estimation of Regional Staple Food Demand Elasticities using 1993-4 Uganda National Survey Data	September 1999
19	John Alphonse Okidi	The Degree of Socially Sub-optimal Individual Behaviour in Collective Resource Management	September 1999

<b><u>NUMBER</u></b>	<b><u>AUTHOR(S)</u></b>	<b><u>TITLE</u></b>	<b><u>DATE</u></b>
18	John Alphonse Okidi	The Potential for Community-based Management of Forest Resources in Uganda	September 1999
17	John Alphonse Okidi	Regional Growth Disparities and Household Economic Performance in Uganda	September 1999
16	Gloria Kempaka	Exchange Rate Movements and Their Effect on Industrial Production in Uganda	September 1999
15	Marios Obwona	Foreign Direct Investment: Leader of Follower	September 1999
14	Marilyn Kamanyire	External Financing and Economic Performance: The Case of Uganda	September 1999
13	Darlison Kaija	Community and Economic Impact of Export Diversification: The Cut-Flower Industry in Uganda	September 1999
12	Klaus Deininger & John Okidi	Capital Market Access, Factor Demand, and Agricultural Development in Rural Areas of Developing Countries: The case of Uganda	June 1999
11	Fred Kakongoro Muhumuza	How Responsive is Tax Revenue to Growth in Uganda	June 1999
10	Charles A. Abuka & David M. Saggiabi	The Importance of Domestic and External Factors in the Appreciation of the Real Exchange Rate in Uganda	March 1999
9	Marios Obwona	Estimating Unreported Income of the Self-Employed and Tax Evasion in Uganda: An Expenditure-Based Approach	March 1999
8	Francis Nathan Okurut, Jonathan J.A.O. Odwee & Asaf Adebua	Determinants of Regional Poverty in Uganda	February 1999
7	Adam Mugume & Marios Obwona	Public Sector Deficit and Macroeconomic Performance in Uganda	August 1998
6	Michael Atingi-Ego & Winnie Rwebeyanga	The Effectiveness of the Treasury Bill as an Instrument of Monetary Policy in Uganda	October 1998
5	Marios Obwona	Savings Mobilisation and Credit Conduits: Formal and Informal Financial Sector Linkages	January 1998
4	Marios Obwona	Determinants of Foreign Direct Investments and their Impact on Economic Growth in Uganda	December 1998
3	Fred Opio	The Impact of Structural Adjustment Programme on Poverty and Income Distribution in Uganda	September 1997
2	Marios Obwona & John Ddumba-Ssentamu	Nature and Determinants of Domestic Savings in Uganda	August 1997
1	John Matovu & Luke Okumu	Credit Accessibility to the Rural Poor in Uganda	May 1997



Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC)  
51 Pool Road Makerere University Campus P. O. Box 7841 Kampala, Uganda  
Tel: 256-41-541023 Fax: 256-41-541022 Email: [eprc@eprc.or.ug](mailto:eprc@eprc.or.ug)