Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

Original Article

Relationship between the Role of School Management Committees and Quality Education Delivery in Public Junior High Schools in Krachi Nchumuru District, Ghana.

Hinneh KUSI[1*] & Emmanuel Kumah ANUABEROR[2]

[1]Department of Educational Administration and Management, School of Education and Life-Long Learning, University of Education, Winneba; hkusi@uew.edu.gh/hinnehkusi@yahoo.com
[2]Department of Educational Administration and Management, School of Education and Life-Long Learning, University of Education, Winneba; anuabeor@gmail.com

*Correspondence: hkusi@uew.edu.gh/hinnehkusi@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between the roles of School Management Committees and quality education delivery in public Junior High Schools in Krachi Nchumuru District, Ghana. Anchored in Urie Bronfenbrenner's (1977) Ecological Systems theory, the study employed a quantitative research approach using a correlational research design. A total of 191 School Management Committee members were selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique for the study. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire and analysed using descriptive statistics such as means, standard deviations, and Pearson's correlation. It emerged that the components of quality education delivery included teacher motivation, community involvement, regular school visits, and problem-solving efforts. The study further established that the committee members play crucial roles in supporting schools by facilitating communication with district education authorities, fostering collaboration with local communities, and monitoring school progress. However, their engagement was less prominent in areas such as organisation of school events and enhancement of student academic performance. Moreover, the study established a strong and statistically significant positive relationship between the committees' involvement and quality education delivery, suggesting that increased committees' participation positively influenced educational outcomes. It was, therefore, recommended that the Krachi Nchumuru District education directorate should formulate educational policies to institutionalise and intensify the role of School Management Committees and establish frameworks for collaboration among key stakeholders such as school heads, and community representatives for a more improvement in quality education provision.

KEYWORDS: Community, Delivery, Education, School Management Committee, Quality, Role

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A participatory approach that actively involves all relevant stakeholders is essential in achieving sustainable growth and development in any sector. This inclusive process ensures that diverse perspectives, resources, and expertise are harnessed to support and enrich decision-making. In this regard, both direct and indirect beneficiaries of an activity or programme must be involved in any meaningful planning or implementation process aimed at achieving set goals and objectives. The World Bank Report (2007) indicated that, over the past three decades, there has been a growing global shift toward local governance, with decentralisation gaining momentum as a strategy to reduce over-reliance on central planning agencies. The report highlighted that many countries have adopted decentralisation to more effectively respond to the specific needs of local actors. Decentralisation, in this context, represents a governance model that empowers stakeholders at regional, district, and community levels to participate meaningfully in decision-making processes and contribute to local development efforts. Within this framework, the education sector stands out as a critical pillar in national development, given its role in nurturing human capital and enhancing productivity. As such, the management and governance of education must be approached with a high degree of stakeholder collaboration. Effective decentralisation in the education sector requires shared responsibility among all key actors, including service providers, beneficiaries (students and parents), and the broader community in which the school operates. Kusi (2008) and Odei-Tettey (2017) emphasised that school governance must be a collective effort if it is to lead to meaningful and lasting improvements in educational outcomes.

The School Management Committee (SMC) initiative was introduced in Ghana, under the Ghana Education Service Act of 1994, as a key intervention to enhance community participation, mobilise support for education delivery, and promote quality teaching and learning in all basic schools (Kusi, 2017). Despite this initiative, there is growing concern among stakeholders including parents, headteachers, and teachers in Krachi Nchumuru District regarding the declining quality of education at the basic school level. Specifically, the impact and visibility of School Management Committees (SMCs) in improving learning outcomes appear minimal. A study conducted by Anuaberor in 2019 revealed that most of the public Junior High Schools (JHSs) in the district continue to face significant challenges, including lack of essential teaching and learning materials, which are critical for effective instruction. Anuaberor (2019) added that the district experiences a severe shortage of qualified teachers, particularly in the more remote and underserved areas, which further compounds the problem of poor education delivery.

Although the Ministry of Education, through the Ghana Education Service, post teachers to the remote areas in the district, many decline to assume their postings and opt to relocate to towns where they have access to basic social amenities such as water and electricity (Anuaberor, 2019). This situation continues to undermine efforts to ensure equitable and quality education delivery across the district. The challenges facing the district in relation to quality education delivery point out the urgent need for focused attention to improve education outcomes. Central to addressing this issue is a critical examination of the roles played by SMCs in supporting education delivery. Studies have been conducted in Ghana on the role of SMCs in school improvement across various geographical and educational contexts, employing diverse methodological and theoretical

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

frameworks. For instance, Nyarko (2016) conducted a case study research in peri-urban schools in Ghana's Central Region, revealing that whilst SMCs significantly contributed to infrastructure development and teacher supervision, their effectiveness was constrained by inadequate training and irregular engagement.

De Grauwe (2005) used a comparative qualitative approach to examine school governance in several Sub-Saharan African countries, including Mali and Senegal. Akyeampong et al. (2007), in a national-level investigation of basic education reforms in Ghana, emphasised the critical role of SMCs in promoting accountability and resource mobilisation but did not specifically address JHS or district-level dynamics such as those prevailing in Krachi Nchumuru. Bruns et al. (2011), through a global review of school accountability, identified that local school management bodies can enhance educational outcomes when granted sufficient authority and support. However, the focus of their study was on Latin America and South Asia, providing limited insight into Ghana's decentralised education system. Osei (2006) examined broader education decentralisation policies in Ghana, underscoring the need for localised studies to capture the operational roles of SMCs at the grassroots level to better understand their impact on education quality delivery. This present study, however, adopts a quantitative research approach, and is grounded in Urie Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems theory. This theoretical lens provides a holistic examination of the relationship between the roles of SMCs and quality education delivery in the public JHSs in Krachi Nchumuru District. The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the components of quality education delivery in the public JHSs in the district?
2. What are the roles of the SMCs in enhancing quality education provision in the schools?
3. What is the relationship between the roles of the SMCs and quality education delivery in the schools?

The findings of the study are significant in diverse ways. First, the findings help the SMCs to appreciate their significant role in children's education as they form part of the ecology of children's learning, according to Urie Bronfenbrenner's (1977) Ecological Systems theory. Specifically, the findings help the members of the committee to understand how they can collaborate with schools to enhance quality education provision. The study also contributes to existing literature on the role of stakeholders, particularly SMCs in quality education provision.

1.1 Theoretical Framework

This study was underpinned by Urie Bronfenbrenner's (1977) Ecological Systems theory, which posits that a child's development is influenced by the interaction between the child and the multiple environmental systems surrounding them. Bronfenbrenner's theory categorises these environments into five nested levels: the microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. These interconnected systems provide a holistic framework to understand how various stakeholders, especially the SMCs influence quality education delivery at the basic school level. In the context of this study, the theory provides a lens to examine the role of SMCs as part of the broader ecosystem shaping the academic environment of the JHS students in the Krachi Nchumuru District. It is assumed that the quality of education delivery cannot be achieved in

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

isolation; rather, it requires the active collaboration of families, communities, school administrators, and policy actors, which aligns with Bronfenbrenner's emphasis on multi-layered systems of influence.

The microsystem is the immediate environment such as the school, home, peer group, and immediate community that directly interacts with the student. In this study, the school is where the SMC plays a visible and functional role by supporting the provision of teaching and learning materials, facilitating teacher recruitment, providing accommodation, mobilising community resources, and monitoring school attendance and performance. These interactions influence the day-to-day experiences of students. A supportive SMC fosters an enabling school environment, thereby contributing to better educational outcomes. Kusi (2008) emphasised that the SMC is vital in the management and functioning of basic schools. However, when these committees are ill-equipped or lack decision-making power, their impact on quality education delivery significantly diminishes (Anuaberor, 2019). This highlights the direct link between the strength of SMC engagement and the academic development of learners within their microsystem.

The mesosystem, according to Bronfenbrenner, refers to the interrelationships between the different microsystems, especially between home and school. In the context of this study, the SMC acts as a bridge between parents and the school, facilitating communication, involvement, and joint problem-solving. Effective coordination between these environments ensures that students receive consistent support, both academically and socially. For instance, an SMC that organises frequent parent-teacher forums creates opportunities for feedback and collaborative decision-making, thereby enriching the school environment. This supports National Education Assessment Unit (NEAU)'s (2018) view that learning is shaped by experiences both within and outside of the school, and that partnerships between home and school are essential for sustained student development.

The exosystem of the Ecological Systems theory includes broader social structures, such as the workplaces of parents, district education offices, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs), and media that indirectly influence the student. In this study, the effectiveness of an SMC can be influenced by external policies, funding decisions, and administrative support from entities like the Ghana Education Service, and the local government. For example, if a parent is unable to participate in SMC meetings due to a rigid work schedule, or if the district office fails to release Capitation Grants on time, the SMC may face challenges in mobilising resources and executing projects. Thus, although students do not interact directly with these external institutions, the quality of education they receive is affected by decisions and conditions in the exosystem.

Bronfenbrenner (1977) indicated that the macrosystem comprises the cultural values, national policies, societal attitudes, and belief systems that shape the broader context in which education takes place. In this study, factors such as community attitudes toward education, traditional authority involvement, and national education policy on school governance form part of the macrosystem. SMCs are expected to operate within these cultural and institutional parameters, and their ability to influence school outcomes often depends on how much community values align with national priorities on education. For example, when SMCs are supported by local traditions

that value education, and national policies that empower local governance structures, they are more likely to positively influence school performance.

Urie Bronfenbrenner further indicated that the chronosystem of the theory introduces the element of time, reflecting how changes in systems or environments over time affect the child. In the context of this study, this includes shifts in SMC structure, community engagement trends, leadership transitions, and changes in national education policy. For instance, a change in the SMC leadership might bring about a new approach to school improvement planning. Similarly, the implementation of a national policy that mandates SMC training could improve the committee's capacity to enhance education quality. Over time, such developments either positively or negatively influence students' academic trajectories.

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems theory provides a comprehensive foundation for analysing how the SMC operates across multiple environmental layers to shape the educational experiences of learners or students. The theory supports the central assumption of this study that quality education delivery in the public JHSs is significantly influenced by the capacity, engagement, and contextual conditions of the SMC. Understanding the interplay between or among these ecological layers not only reinforces the need for empowered and well-resourced SMCs, but also highlights the importance of intersectoral collaboration among families, communities, educators, and policymakers to achieve holistic educational improvement in the Krachi Nchumuru District.

1.2 The Concept of Quality Education

Quality education is a comprehensive and context-sensitive concept that extends beyond mere access to schooling, encompassing the effectiveness, relevance, inclusiveness, and impact of educational experiences. As emphasised in the Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), the global education agenda now prioritises not just universal enrolment, but the provision of inclusive and equitable quality education and the promotion of lifelong learning opportunities for all by 2030 (UNESCO, 2021). At its core, quality education involves well-trained and motivated teachers, relevant and culturally responsive curricula, safe and inclusive learning environments, appropriate assessment systems, and the achievement of measurable learning outcomes such as foundational literacy, numeracy, critical thinking, life skills, and global citizenship values (UNICEF, 2022). Educational theorists and researchers argue that the interpretation and realisation of quality education are inherently shaped by political, economic, and socio-cultural contexts. Vavrus and Bartlett (2013) contend that factors such as teacher qualifications, language of instruction, classroom practices, community engagement, and resource allocation vary widely across countries, making quality education a localised rather than universal construct.

One of the factors that influence quality education is teacher quality (Bampo & Anuaberor, 2023; Anuaberor, 2019). Teacher effectiveness is widely recognised as the most significant in-school factor influencing student learning, and studies by Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) and Akyeampong et al. (2018) emphasise the importance of initial teacher training, continuous professional development, and adequate remuneration in improving classroom practices, particularly in low-income and Sub-Saharan African contexts.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

Additionally, curriculum relevance plays a central role in fostering education quality. Alexander (2012) and the Brookings Institution (2020) advocate for competency-based, forward-looking curricula that prioritise critical thinking and problem-solving over rote memorisation, which remains prevalent in many education systems, especially in the Global South. Equally vital is the emphasis on equity and inclusion. Ainscow and Sandill (2010) point out that inclusive practices are essential to ensure that all learners, especially girls, children with disabilities, and linguistic minorities, have equitable access to meaningful learning opportunities. Despite progress, many systemic barriers, including gender bias, inadequate infrastructure, and discriminatory policies continue to exclude marginalised groups from quality education (Bampo & Anuaberor, 2023; UNICEF, 2022).

Furthermore, assessment and accountability systems serve as essential tools for monitoring and improving education quality. However, Wagner (2018) cautions against the over-reliance on high-stakes standardised testing, which can distort educational priorities and marginalise holistic learning objectives. Instead, balanced assessment practices that inform instruction and support learning are advocated. Importantly, safe and supportive learning environments free from violence, overcrowding, and resource scarcity are indispensable for student well-being and cognitive development, particularly in fragile and conflict-affected settings (UNICEF, 2022).

Generally. available literature reveal that quality education is a multidimensional and evolving construct that requires a holistic, contextually grounded approach involving the alignment of curriculum, pedagogy, teacher capacity, equity measures, assessment systems, and inclusive school governance. Sustainable improvement in education quality demands coordinated action among stakeholders at local, national, and global levels, supported by strong policies, adequate investment, and an unwavering commitment to equity and learning for all.

1.3 SMCs and their Roles in Quality Education Delivery

SMCs have emerged as critical stakeholders in the governance and improvement of basic education, especially in decentralised educational systems. SMCs are typically composed of parents, community members, teachers, and local leaders, tasked with supporting the management, accountability, and performance of public schools (World Bank, 2018). The introduction of SMCs aligns with global advocacy for community participation in education, particularly emphasised in Education for All (EFA) and Sustainable Development Goal 4. The primary roles of SMCs include overseeing school development planning, monitoring teacher attendance and student performance, managing school finances, and fostering community-school relationships (UNESCO, 2015). According to Banerjee et al. (2010), when SMCs are effectively empowered, they can enhance transparency, promote local accountability, and improve the quality of education services. In Ghana, for instance, SMCs play a crucial role in the management of the Capitation Grant, and the development of School Performance Improvement Plans (SPIPs) (Akyeampong, 2011).

Studies have shown mixed results regarding the effectiveness of SMCs. In some contexts, strong SMCs have contributed to better school infrastructure, reduced teacher absenteeism, and improved learning outcomes (Ganimian & Murnane, 2016). In Kenya and India, for example, the involvement of SMCs has correlated with improvements in school accountability and resource

utilisation (Ngware et al., 2015; Pradhan et al., 2013). However, the effectiveness of these committees is often influenced by factors such as members' literacy levels, training, local power dynamics, and access to resources (De Grauwe, 2005).

Despite their potential, many SMCs face significant operational challenges. Lack of training, limited decision-making authority, political interference, and poor communication with education authorities can hinder their performance (Carr-Hill et al., 2016). Gender representation is also a concern, as women who are key to child welfare and education are often underrepresented or marginalised in decision-making processes (Akaguri, 2014). Duflo et al., (2015) reveal that even when communities are formally involved through SMCs, the lack of proper follow-through and government responsiveness can dampen the committees' motivation and effectiveness. Thus, the institutional framework and political will supporting SMCs are critical to their success.

For SMCs to function effectively, there is a growing consensus on the need for continuous capacity building and institutional support. Programmes that provide training on financial management, leadership, school planning, and inclusive participation tend to enhance the functionality of SMCs (Global Partnership for Education, 2022). Sustainability of SMCs also depends on clearly defined roles, community buy-in, and regular engagement with school stakeholders. Available literature shows that SMCs can be powerful tools for improving education governance and outcomes, especially in low-resource settings. However, their impact is highly dependent on training, empowerment, supportive policies, and sustained engagement with education systems (Anuaberor, 2019; Odei-Tettey, 2016; Szuba &Young, 2003; SMC Handbook, 1994). Strengthening SMCs requires deliberate investment in capacity-building, institutional frameworks, and inclusive practices to ensure that they contribute meaningfully to quality education delivery.

2.0 METHODS

In line with the positivist paradigm, this study adopted a quantitative research approach, employing correlational research design. The correlational research design is a type of non-experimental research design within the quantitative research framework where researchers attempt to establish relationships between two or more variables (Patten & Newhart, 2018). Creswell and Creswell (2018) explain that, in applying the correlational research design, researchers are unable to manipulate any variable because it has already occurred or it is beyond the control of the researchers. Patten and Newhart (2018) indicate that in the correlational research, researchers make an observation of existing situations, and establish the relationship between the variables. The focus of this study was to determine the relationship between the roles of SMCs and the delivery of quality education in the public JHSs in the Krachi Nchumuru District, meriting the correlational research design.

The study's population comprised all 372 members of SMCs in 31 public JHSs across the Krachi Nchumuru District. The membership of each of the committees comprised District Director of Education or the representative, the school Head, a District Assembly Representative

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

(Assemblyman), a Unit Committee Representative, a Chief's appointee, a representative from the Educational Unit (for unit schools), two members of the teaching staff (one each from the primary and JHS levels), a representative from the past pupils association, where applicable, a Parent-Teacher Association representative, and optionally, co-opted members for specific functions (SMC Resource Handbook, 2013).

The Krachi Nchumuru District had 6 Circuits (education zones), which were Banda, Borae A, Borae B, Chinderi A, Chinderi B, and Grubi. The population and sample of the SMC members in the Circuits are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Population of SMC Members

Circuit	SMC Members	Percentage	Sample Size
Banda	108	29.0	56
Borae A	60	16.1	31
Borae B	24	6.5	12
Chinderi A	96	25.8	49
Chinderi B	36	9.7	18
Grubi	48	12.9	25
Total	**372**	**100.0**	**191**

Table 1 presents the distribution of the 372 SMC members in the Circuits. Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) table for sample size determination was employed to select 191 participants for the study using the proportionate stratified random sampling technique. This implied that the sample size for each Circuit was relative to their respective proportion in the population. For instance, Banda, which constituted 29% of the total population, a sample of 56 respondents (108 divided by 372, multiplied by 191) were selected.

The proportional allocation ensured equitable representation of SMC members across all the 6 Circuits. To achieve fairness and balanced representation, we employed a proportionate stratified sampling technique. The schools were first grouped based on their Circuit locations to reflect the population structure within the district. After stratification based on the Circuits and the number of respondents to be selected based on their respective proportions, a simple random sampling technique, specifically the lottery method, was used to select the individuals from each Circuit, ensuring that every individual within a Circuit had an equal chance of being included in the study.

Data for the study was collected through a structured questionnaire developed by the researchers. Kusi(2012) indicates that a structured questionnaire is a commonly used tool in quantitative studies, designed with standardised questions to elicit numerical data for statistical analysis. The questionnaire in this study was designed in the form of a Likert scale, consisting of items directly

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

aligned with the study's research questions. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each statement on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 indicated "Strongly Disagree" and 5 indicated "Strongly Agree."

The validity of the instrument was established before being used for data collection. Two forms of validity were established: face and content validity. The face validity was established by some postgraduate students at the Department of Educational Administration and Management at the University of Education, Winneba, whilst the content validity was granted by two experts in the field of educational leadership and management. The instrument's reliability was established through internal consistency by pre-testing it with 34 SMC members within the district, who were not selected for the main study. The data from this pre-test was analysed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which yielded a coefficient of 0.941, indicating high internal consistency of the instrument. According to Ary (2014), a reliability coefficient above 0.50 is generally acceptable for research.

The data collected in this study was analysed using statistical tools, including frequencies, percentages, mean, standard deviation, and Pearson's Product Moment correlation with the aid of SPSS Version 26. Specifically, data on research questions 1 and 2 were analysed through descriptive statistics, including the mean and standard deviation, whilst data on research question 3 was analysed using the Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficient.

3.0 RESULTS

This section of the paper focuses on the analysis and discussion of results relating to each of the research questions formulated to guide the study. The results are analysed and discussed in relation to relevant literature.

3.1 Research Question 1: What are the components of quality education delivery in the public JHSs in the Krachi Nchumuru District?

This question sought to identify the key elements or components that stakeholders perceive as essential for delivering quality education in the JHSs. A set of items related to school governance, infrastructure, teacher support, community engagement, and student welfare were assessed using mean scores and standard deviations. These metrics reflect the importance and consistency of each component in contributing to quality education. The results are presented in Table 2.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

Table 2: Components of Quality Education Delivery in the District

Item	M	SD
Protection of school property	3.74	1.10
Paying regular visit to school	4.20	0.85
Infrastructure maintenance	3.92	1.10
Availability of teaching and learning materials	3.11	1.18
Community education	4.08	0.91
Teacher motivation	4.27	0.81
Decent accommodation for teachers	3.48	1.35
Orientation of new teachers	3.53	1.20
Visiting teachers regularly	3.88	1.09
Rewarding hardworking teachers	3.11	1.41
Solving school problems	4.02	1.02
Sensitising parents on student needs	4.05	1.03
Lobbying for support from NGOs	3.52	1.26
Inviting feedback on student performance	3.66	1.13
Discussing student performance at SPIP	3.78	1.14
Playing other important roles	3.74	1.08
Mean of means/Standard deviation	**3.76**	**1.10**

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

Table 2 presents stakeholders' perceptions regarding various components that constitute quality education delivery in the district. The overall mean score of 3.76 across the listed items indicates that, on average, respondents generally agreed that the identified components play an important role in promoting quality education. A mean score closer to 5 suggests strong agreement, whilst one closer to 1 suggests strong disagreement; hence, a mean around 3.76 reflects moderately high agreement. Accompanying this, the overall standard deviation of 1.10 shows a moderate level of variability in responses. A lower standard deviation (closer to 0) would indicate that most respondents had similar views, whereas a higher one indicates more diverse opinions.

The standard deviation scores in Table 2 suggest that whereas there is general agreement on what constitutes quality education, some differences exist in how strongly respondents rated individual components, likely due to varying experiences across schools. Among the individual items, teacher motivation received the highest mean score (M = 4.27, SD = 0.81), indicating a strong consensus that motivating teachers is central to quality education provision. The low standard deviation also reflects consistent views among respondents. Paying regular visits to school (M = 4.20, SD = 0.85), community education (M = 4.08, SD = 0.91), solving school problems (M = 4.02, SD = 1.02), and sensitising parents on students' needs (M = 4.05, SD = 1.03) also recorded high mean scores. These

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

suggest that the respondents value administrative support, community involvement, and problem-solving strategies as essential aspects of effective school leadership and education quality.

On the other hand, moderately rated items such as infrastructure maintenance (M = 3.92, SD = 1.10), visiting teachers regularly (M = 3.88, SD = 1.09), and discussing student performance at SPIP (M = 3.78, SD = 1.14) in Table 2 point to structural and academic oversight factors that are acknowledged as important, although not rated as highly as teacher motivation or parental involvement. Conversely, some items received relatively low ratings, highlighting areas where stakeholders perceive weaknesses. Both availability of teaching and learning materials and rewarding hardworking teachers had mean scores of 3.11, with standard deviations of 1.18 and 1.41, respectively. These high standard deviations suggest a wide range of responses—some schools may have access to materials and reward systems in place, whilst others do not. Table 2 also shows that decent accommodation for teachers (M = 3.48, SD = 1.35) and orientation for new teachers (M = 3.53, SD = 1.20) were also rated below the average, pointing to a gap in teacher welfare and support systems. These variations imply that experiences with these factors are inconsistent across the district.

Another moderately rated component, lobbying for NGO support (M = 3.52, SD = 1.26), indicates some recognition of the role external partners play in improving education delivery, although responses varied, possibly due to uneven access to such support. The findings suggest that although there is a foundational structure supporting quality education in the district, targeted interventions in the areas of teaching and learning materials, teacher incentives, and welfare are needed to further boost education delivery outcomes. Stakeholder engagement, teacher supervision, and motivation remain core pillars in the perception of what constitutes quality education in the district's public JHSs. These corroborate existing literature, such as UNESCO (2017), which highlights teacher quality, school climate, and community participation as key quality drivers. The significance of these variables reflects the microsystem and mesosystem levels of Bronfenbrenner's (1977) Systems theory, where the immediate environment (teachers, parents, school infrastructure) directly affect students' educational outcomes. When these factors are well-coordinated and mutually reinforcing, they form a robust environment conducive to student learning.

3.2 Research Question 2: What are the roles of the SMCs in enhancing quality education provision in the schools?

To answer this question, data was collected on various activities and responsibilities often undertaken by the SMCs in managing and supporting the schools. The aim was to assess the extent of their involvement in school development, infrastructure provision, stakeholder collaboration, and support for teaching and learning. The results are presented in Table 3.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

Table 3: The Roles of the SMCs in Quality Education Delivery

Item	M	SD
SMC levies parents for school development	3.22	1.36
SMC visits school regularly to know school problems	3.84	1.12
SMC provides decent accommodation for teachers	2.99	1.41
SMC organises Speech and Prize- Giving Day	2.21	1.17
SMC lobbied for school projects	2.56	1.27
SMC creates relationship with community and school for development	3.85	1.01
SMC organises extra classes to improve student academic performance	2.95	1.32
SMC develops relationship with Unit Committee for school improvement	4.36	0.80
SMC ensure good communication between district and circuit	4.58	0.73
Mean of mean/standard deviation	**3.40**	**1.13**

Source: Fieldwork, 2025

The analysis of responses regarding the roles of SMCs in the public JHSs in the Krachi Nchumuru District in Table 3 reveals a moderately positive perception of their involvement, with an overall mean of 3.40 and a standard deviation (SD) of 1.13. This suggests that, on average, the respondents agree that SMCs play important roles, although the variability in responses indicates differing levels of SMC activity across schools. Among the items, the highest-rated role was the SMC's responsibility for ensuring good communication between the District and various Circuits, which received a mean score of 4.58 and a low SD of 0.73. This indicates a strong consensus that SMCs are effectively bridging administrative gaps, a role consistently carried out across schools. Similarly, developing relationships with the Unit Committee for school improvement was also highly rated (M = 4.36, SD = 0.80), highlighting the SMC's effectiveness in fostering local collaboration.

The role of 'creating a relationship between the community and the school for development' received a mean of 3.85 with a moderate SD of 1.01, showing general agreement and relatively consistent practice across institutions. Moderate agreement was also found regarding SMCs visiting schools regularly to understand school problems, with a mean of 3.84 and SD of 1.12. Although most respondents recognise this role, the variation in responses suggests it may not be uniformly practiced. Table 3 point out that the function of levying parents for school development had a mean of 3.22 and a relatively high SD of 1.36, reflecting more divided opinions, while some communities may support such initiatives, others may face challenges in mobilising parental contributions.

In contrast, some roles received lower ratings. For instance, organising Speech and Prize-Giving Days had the lowest mean of 2.21 and SD of 1.17, indicating general disagreement or infrequent execution of this role. Similarly, lobbying for school projects scored 2.56 (SD = 1.27), suggesting that whereas some SMCs engage in lobbying efforts, it is not a widespread practice. The role of organising extra classes to improve student academic performance was also rated lower (M = 2.95, SD = 1.32), possibly due to limited resources, teacher availability, or unclear mandates.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

The item on providing decent accommodation for teachers received a mean of 2.99 and SD of 1.41 (Table 3), suggesting mixed perceptions. Whereas it is recognised as a responsibility, many SMCs may lack the financial or logistical capacity to fulfil it, hence the widespread in responses. Overall, the relatively high standard deviations for many items reflect variability in how different SMCs function, which may be influenced by factors such as community engagement, leadership capacity, and access to resources.

Generally, these findings affirm that although SMCs play vital roles in communication and collaboration, their involvement in infrastructure, academic support, and ceremonial functions is limited or inconsistent. Strengthening their capacity through training, clear guidelines, and support mechanisms could help standardise their contributions across schools. These findings align with literature such as Adu-Gyamfi (2015) and Nyarko (2020), which emphasise the importance of active and capable SMCs in enhancing school governance and student outcomes. The findings also reflect elements of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Systems theory, suggesting that the SMCs functioning within the exosystem and mesosystem structures that, although indirectly involved in the student's learning process, significantly influence the educational environment.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between the role of the SMCs and quality education delivery in the JHSs in the district?

To determine the relationship between the roles of the SMCs and the delivery of quality education in schools, a Pearson Product Moment correlation analysis was conducted. This statistical technique measures the strength and direction of the linear relationship between two continuous variables. The interpretation of the strength of the relationship was based on Kothari (2004), who recommends that if the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.3 but less than 0.5, then the relationship is moderate; the relationship is weak if the correlation coefficient is less than 0.3; and the relationship is strong if the correlation coefficient is 0.5 or greater. The results, presented in Table 4, provide clear evidence of a strong and statistically significant relationship.

Table 4: Relationship between the Roles of the SMCs and Quality Education Delivery

Variable	Mean	*Sd*	r	p
Role of SMC	3.40	1.13	0.894	0.000
Quality Education Delivery	3.76	1.10		

Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Source: Fieldwork

The findings in Table 4 show that the average score for the roles of the SMCs was 3.40, with a standard deviation (SD) of 1.13, indicating a moderately positive perception of their roles, although with some variability across schools. The mean score for quality education delivery was 3.76, with a standard deviation of 1.10, suggesting that the variations in respondents' score were low. The Pearson correlation coefficient (r) between the roles of SMCs and quality education delivery was 0.894, which is considered as very strong and positive correlation. This means that

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

as the SMC increases the performance of their roles, there is a strong tendency for the quality of education delivered in the schools to also improve. The strength of this relationship suggests that SMCs have a substantial influence on educational outcomes, particularly when they are actively involved in governance, planning, communication, and school development initiatives. Moreover, the associated p-value of 0.000 confirms that this relationship is statistically significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). A low p-value provides strong evidence against the null hypothesis, indicating that the observed correlation is not due to chance. Therefore, the results validate the hypothesis that the roles of the SMCs significantly correlate with the quality of education provided in the district's JHSs.

Generally, the findings imply that enhancing the functionality of SMCs could be a critical strategy for improving education delivery. Providing the SMC members with proper training, logistical support, and a clear understanding of their roles could significantly contribute to better school management and, consequently, improved student outcomes. This aligns with the work of Akyeampong et al. (2011), who emphasised that community participation and school-based governance play central roles in education quality enhancement. The findings further corroborate with Anuaberor (2019) who recognises the key roles of stakeholders, including the SMCs in improving quality education delivery. From a theoretical perspective, the results are consistent with Bronfenbrenner's (1977) Ecological Systems theory. The SMCs function within the macrosystem and exosystem, larger structural and governance frameworks that indirectly influence the educational development of learners. Their effective engagement in these systems can significantly shape the microsystem (the child's immediate learning environment), demonstrating how interconnected layers of influence affect student outcomes. Empowering SMCs, therefore, supports a holistic model of educational development that acknowledges the critical role of community-based governance in nurturing academic success.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Three key conclusions were drawn from this study. Firstly, the study concluded that the SMCs contribute significantly to school development and performance through supportive and facilitating roles such as maintenance of communication between schools and school authorities, developing relationships with community structures, and addressing school problems. The high mean scores for roles involving strategic partnerships and communication underscore the SMCs' capacity to influence educational outcomes when properly engaged. Therefore, it is recommended that any effort made by the Krachi Nchumuru education directorate to improve the quality of education in the area must simultaneously prioritise strengthening the operational effectiveness, capacity, and involvement of SMCs. These will ensure that the foundational elements of quality education are not only identified but also sustained through community-driven support and accountability.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

Secondly, the study concluded that whereas the SMCs were actively involved in community engagement and communication with stakeholders, they were less involved in organising academic interventions and providing the teachers in the district with accommodations. It is, therefore, recommended the district education authorities in the study area should introduce capacity-building initiative to equip the SMC members with relevant knowledge and skills for effective functioning in all aspects of school development.

Last but not least, the study established a strong and statistically significant relationship between the role of SMCs and the delivery of quality education, highlighting the critical influence of community governance structures on educational outcomes. It is, therefore, recommended that the Krachi Nchumuru District education directorate should formulate educational policies to institutionalise and intensify the role of SMCs and establish frameworks for collaboration among key stakeholders such as school heads, and community representatives for a more improvement in quality education provision.

4.1 Limitations of the Study

Like most research works, this study is not devoid of limitations. Quantitative researchers often intend generalising the findings of their studies to a wider context based on sample representativeness. However, the sample of this study was only a representative of the SMC members in the Krachi Nchumuru District, making it inappropriate to genralise the findings beyond that setting. Also, a structured questionnaire containing Likert Scale items was employed for data collection, implying numerical data was elicited from the respondents. Therefore, the underlying reason/s for some quantitative results could not be determined. This problem could have been addressed using qualitative data gathered through a semi-structured interview guide.

DECLARATION

Data Availability: Access to the anonymised dataset can be made available upon reasonable request to the author, subject to institutional data-sharing policies and appropriate ethical approval.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest: The author declares that there is no conflict of interest associated with this study.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate: Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from relevant academic gatekeepers. Informed consent was sought and obtained from all participants prior to the administration of the data collection instrument.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgements: None declared.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

REFERENCES

Adu-Agyem, J., & Osei-Poku, P. (2012). Quality education in Ghana: The way forward. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, 1*(9), 164–177.

Ainscow, M., & Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organisational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(4), 401–416.

Akaguri, L. (2014). Fee-free public or low-fee private basic education in rural Ghana: How does the cost influence the choice of the poor? *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 44(2), 140–161.

Akyeampong, K. (2011). *Revisiting Free Compulsory Universal Basic Education (FCUBE) in Ghana*. CREATE, University of Sussex.

Akyeampong, K., Lussier, K., Pryor, J., & Westbrook, J. (2011). Improving teaching and learning of basic maths and reading in Africa: Does teacher preparation count? *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(3), 173–180.

Akyeampong, K., Lussier, K., Pryor, J., & Westbrook, J. (2018). Improving teaching and learning of basic maths and reading in Africa: Does teacher preparation count? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 39, 168–178.

Akyeampong, K., Pryor, J., Westbrook, J., & Lussier, K. (2007). *Teacher training and school effectiveness in Ghana: A study of preparation and early development of primary teachers*. Sussex, UK: University of Sussex, Centre for International Education.

Alexander, R. (2012). *Education for All, the Quality Imperative and the Problem of Pedagogy*. CREATE Pathways to Access.

Anuaberor, E. K. (2019). *The role of school management committee in quality education delivery in selected public junior high schools in the Krachi Nchumuru district of the Oti Region, Ghana* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Education, Winneba, Ghana.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, K. C., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bampo, J., & Anuaberor, E. K. (2023). An exploration of the effectiveness of the Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene programme in the provision of facilities in public basic schools in the Krachi Nchumuru District. *Global Educational Research Journal, 11*(6), 1–47.

Banerjee, A., Banerji, R., Duflo, E., Glennerster, R., & Khemani, S. (2010). Pitfalls of Participatory Programs: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Education in India. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 2(1), 1–30.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brookings Institution. (2020). *Leapfrogging Inequality: Remaking Education to Help Young People Thrive*.

Carr-Hill, R., Rolleston, C., & Schendel, R. (2016). *The Effects of School-Based Decision Making on Educational Outcomes in Low and Middle Income Contexts: A Systematic Review*. EPPI-Centre, University of London.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Learning Policy Institute.

De Grauwe, A. (2005). Improving the quality of education through school-based management: Learning from international experiences. *International Review of Education, 51*(4), 269–287.

Duflo, E., Dupas, P., & Kremer, M. (2015). School Governance, Teacher Incentives, and Pupil–Teacher Ratios: Experimental Evidence from Kenyan Primary Schools. *Journal of Public Economics*, 123, 92–110.

Ganimian, A. J., & Murnane, R. J. (2016). Improving Education in Developing Countries: Lessons from Rigorous Impact Evaluations. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(3), 719–755.

GEM Report. (2023). *Technology in Education: A Tool on Whose Terms?* UNESCO.

Ghana Ministry of Education. (2018). *Education strategic plan 2018–2030*. Accra, Ghana: Ministry of Education.

Global Partnership for Education. (2022). *Community Participation and School Governance*. Retrieved from www.globalpartnership.org

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*(3), 607–610.

Kusi, H. (2008). *Managing junior secondary schools in Sunyani municipality (Ghana): The challenges for headteachers and their professional development needs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Leicester, UK.

Kusi, H. (2012). *Doing qualitative research: A guide for researchers*. Accra, Ghana: Emmpong Press.

Kusi and Anuaberor (2025), Vol. 6, Iss. 3, Pg. 41-59
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16273561

National Education Assessment Unit (NEAU). (2018). *2018 National Education Assessment: Report on pupils' performance in English and Mathematics*. Accra, Ghana: Ministry of Education.

Ngware, M. W., Oketch, M., & Ezeh, A. (2015). What Quality of Primary Education are Children in Urban Schools Receiving? Evidence from Nairobi. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 45(2), 49–63.

Nyarko, R. A. (2016). *The impact of teacher qualification on the academic performance of pupils in basic schools in Ghana* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Cape Coast, Ghana.

Nyarko, R. A. (2020). Teacher competence and learners' academic achievement in rural basic schools in Ghana. *International Journal of Educational Research and Development, 7*(1), 45–52.

Odei-Tettey, K. (2016). Less bad than their reputations: A systems analysis view of problem interdependencies associated with the multiarena policy process in selected West Gonja District failing schools in the Northern Region of Ghana. *International Journal of Education Learning and Development, 4*(8), 11–30.

Odei-Tettey, K. (2017). Breaking out of the challenging heights: The contradictions of multi-level actors' decisions for school improvement in the Northern Region of Ghana. *International Journal of Education Learning and Development, 4*(8), 11–30.

Osei, G. M. (2006). Teachers in Ghana: Issues of training, remuneration and effectiveness. *International Journal of Educational Development, 26*(1), 38–51. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2005.07.015

Pradhan, M., Suryadarma, D., Beatty, A., & De Ree, J. (2013). Improving Educational Quality through Enhancing Community Participation: Results from a Randomized Field Experiment in Indonesia. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 6(2), 105–126.

School Management Committee Resource Handbook. (1994). Accra, Ghana: Ministry of Education.

School Management Committee Resource Handbook. (2013). Accra, Ghana: Ministry of Education.

Sumarsono, R. B., Imron, A., Wiyono, B. B., & Arifin, I. (2016). Parents participation in improving the quality of elementary school in the city of Malang, East Java, Indonesia. *International Education Studies, 9*(10), 1–8.

Szuba, T., & Young, R. (2003). *Planning guide for maintaining school facilities*. Washington, DC: National Forum on Education Statistics.

UNESCO. (2011). *Improving the conditions of teachers and teaching in rural schools across African countries*. Paris, France: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2015). *School Management Committees: Strengthening Community Participation in Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2017). *Accountability in education: Meeting our commitments (Global Education Monitoring Report 2017/18)*. Paris, France: UNESCO. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000259338

UNESCO. (2021). *Understanding SDG 4: Education 2030*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNICEF. (2022). *The State of Global Learning Poverty: 2022 Update*.

Vavrus, F., & Bartlett, L. (2013). *Critical Approaches to Comparative Education: Vertical Case Studies from Africa, Europe, the Middle East, and the Americas*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wagner, D. A. (2018). Learning as development: *Rethinking international education in a changing world*. Routledge.

World Bank Report. (2007). What do we know about school-based management? *World Bank Working Paper, No. 44921*. Washington, DC: The World Bank.

World Bank. (2018). *World Development Report: Learning to Realize Education's Promise*. Washington, DC: World Bank.