

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIOURAL STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS  
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES (Adult and Lifelong  
learning unit)**

**FACTORS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION OF ADULTS IN LITERACY  
PROGRAMS IN EAST SHOA ZONE OF OROMIA REGION**

By

**Takele Kebede Mererra**



**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARIES  
P.O. BOX 1176  
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA**

**June 2010  
Addis Ababa**

**FACTORS AFFECTING PARTICIPATION OF ADULTS IN  
LITERACY PROGRAMS IN EAST SHOA ZONE OF OROMIA  
REGION**

**A Thesis Presented to School of Graduate Studies, Addis Ababa University in  
Partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in  
Adult and Lifelong Learning**

**By**

**Takele Kebede Mererra**



**June 2010**

**Addis Ababa**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**Factors Affecting Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs in  
East Shoa Zone of Oromia Region**

By

**Takele Kebede Mererra**

Approved By the Board of Examiners

Abdelaziz Hussien

Chairman, Department  
Graduate Committee



Signature

Date

7-7-2010

Dr. Dessu Worku

Advisor

Signature

Date

7-7-10

Lemma Setegn

Examiner

Signature

Date

07/07/2010

## **Acknowledgements**

First, my deep appreciation and special thanks go to my advisor Dr. Dessu Wirtu who helped me during the various stages of the study and made valuable suggestions to improve the content and forms of the study. I am grateful for his politeness, patience, encouragement, interest and understanding without which this study would have never reached its present stage. In short, I find no words to express my appreciation to my advisor for his unreserved support in finalizing this thesis.

Next, I would like to thank Addis Ababa University for its financial support; and Oromia Region Teachers' Association (ORTA) for its financial and material support without which this study would have not been finalized. I would also thank Oromia Education Bureau (OEB) which sponsored me to attend this MEd program.

At the same time, I would like to give my deep appreciation to my sons Galasa Takele and Olyad Takele who have been with me resisting challenges and encouraging me in the due course of my works.

Finally, I would like to thank all respondents who gave me their precious time to provide me the necessary information for my research study.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Table of contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	v
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	ix
Abstract.....	x
	<b>Page</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE: The Problem and Its Approach.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction and Background of the study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the problem.....	4
1.3 Objectives of the study.....	5
1.3.1 General Objective.....	5
1.3.2 Specific Objectives.....	5
1.4 Significance of the study.....	5
1.5 Delimitation of the study.....	6
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.7 Organization of the study.....	7
1.8 Definitions of key terms.....	7
<b>CHAPTER TWO: Review of Related Literatures.....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Literacy: A Conceptual Framework.....	9
2.1.1 Definitions.....	9
2.1.2 Concepts of Literacy.....	11
2.1.3 Historical Development of Literacy Programs.....	14
2.1.4 Different Approaches to Teaching and Learning literacy.....	21
2.1.4.1 Social awareness or ‘liberation’ approaches.....	22
2.1.4.2 Development-oriented or ‘functional’ approaches.....	23
2.1.4.3 Formal education or continuing adult education approaches.....	24
	ii.

2.1.5 State Objectives for Launching Literacy Programs.....	25
2.1.5.1 Socio-political objectives.....	26
2.1.5.2 Economic Objectives.....	26
2.1.5.3 General Demand-meeting Objectives.....	27
2.1.6 Adult Learning Principles.....	28
2.1.6.1 Adults need to know why.....	28
2.1.6.2 Responsibility for decisions taken.....	29
2.1.6.3 Learners' experiences.....	29
2.1.6.4 Coping with real life.....	29
2.1.6.5 Real-life applications.....	30
2.1.6.6 Motivation to learn.....	30
2.1.7 Adult Literacy Practices in Ethiopia.....	31
2.1.7.1 Adult Literacy Practices in Imperial Ethiopia.....	31
2.1.7.2 Adult Literacy Practices in Socialist Ethiopia (1974-1990).....	34
2.1.7.3 Current Adult Literacy Practices in FDRE .....	36
2.1.8 Literacy and its Contribution to National Development.....	37
2.1.9 Literacy Practices in Oromia Regional State.....	42
2.2 Reasons for Lack of Adequate Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	43
<b>CHAPTER THREE: Research Design and Methodology .....</b>	<b>55</b>
3.1 Research Design.....	55
3.2 Sources of Data.....	55
3.3 Sampling Techniques.....	55
3.4 Data Collection Tools.....	56
3.5 Procedures of Data Collection.....	57
3.6 Data Analysis and Management.....	57
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: Presentations and Interpretations of Data.....</b>	<b>58</b>
4.1 Characteristics of the Respondents.....	58
4.2 Andragogical Issues to be considered in the Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	61

4.3 What Motivates Adults to Participate in Literacy Programs?.....	63
4.4 The Trends of Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	64
4.5 Factors Affecting Participation of Adults in Literacy programs.....	67
4.5.1 Andragogical Factors.....	67
4.5.2 Administrative Factors.....	77
4.5.3 Motivational Factors.....	84
4.5.4 General Issues.....	86
4.5.4.1 What is Literacy? .....	86
4.5.4.2 Literacy: Right or Obligation.....	87
4.5.4.3 Construction of Adult Literacy Program Centers.....	88
4.5.4.4 Reasons for Decreasing Trend of Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	88
4.5.4.5 Measures to be taken to increase the Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	91
4.5.4.6 The Major Problems/obstacles to the Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	95
4.5.4.6.1 The Five Major Problems.....	96
4.5.4.6.2 Possible Solutions to the Major Problems/obstacles to Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs.....	97
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>101</b>
5.1 Summary.....	101
5.2 Conclusions.....	105
5.3 Recommendations.....	107
References	
Appendices	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table1: Characteristics of the Respondents by Geographical location, Sex, Age, Marital status, Service year in teaching adults, and work experience.....	59.
Table2: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on the level of interest of adult learners in literacy programs.....	62.
Table 3: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on what motivates adults to attend literacy programs.....	63.
Table 4: The adult literacy program facilitators; and education officials responses on the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs.....	64.
Table 5: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on the participation rate of women in adult literacy programs.....	66.
Table 6: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on the textbook to participant ratio on the average.....	69.
Table 7: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on the duration of the literacy program.....	70.
Table 8: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on the time of delivery of a test or examination to literacy program participants.....	72.
Table9: The responses of education officials on relevance of the curriculum.....	76.
Table 10: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on age-limits of the adult literacy program participants.....	77.
Table11: The responses of adult literacy program facilitators, and education officials on supervision of the literacy centers.....	79.

Table12: The responses of adult literacy program facilitators and education officials on the frequency of the follow-up or supervision to the literacy centers.....	80.
Table 13: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on the type of community participation in the construction of literacy centers.....	81.
Table14: The responses of education officials on the existence of a responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the education structure.....	81.
Table15: The responses of education officials on the status of a responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the education structure.....	82.
Table16: The responses of education officials on the availability or existence of selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators.....	82.
Table17: The responses of education officials on the body that set the selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators.....	83.
Table18: The responses of education officials on the existence of formulated adult education strategy in the region.....	84.
Table19: The responses of adult literacy program facilitators; and education officials on whether literacy is a right or an obligation.....	87.

Table20: The adult literacy program facilitators' responses on who has constructed adult literacy centers.....88.

Table21: The responses of adult literacy program facilitators and education officials on reasons for the decreasing trend of adult literacy program participants.....89.

Table22: The responses of adult literacy program facilitators and education officials on measures to be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs.....92.

## **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

ADEA - Association for Development of Education in Africa

ANFE -Adult and Non-Formal Education.

BPR –Business Process Reengineering.

CSA - Central Statistics Agency.

EFA - Education For All.

ESDP - Education Sector Development Program

EWLP - Experimental World Literacy Program.

FAL -Functional Adult Literacy.

FDRE- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

IIEP - International Institute for Educational Planning

LLL -Lifelong Learning.

MoE - Ministry of Education

NLCCC -National Literacy Campaign Coordinating Committee.

OEB - Oromiya Education Bureau.

TGE - Trasiional Govenment of Ethiopia.

UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNDP - United Nations Development Program.

UPE - Universal Primary Education.

## **Abstract**

*Prompted by increased concern about adult literacy, the study was conducted to establish the magnitude and identify the factors affecting participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia Region using data obtained from 33 adult literacy program facilitators, nine literacy program participants, and 28 education officials in four Woredas of East Shoa Zone. The methodology employed was the mixed approach which makes use of both quantitative and qualitative methods. The sampling techniques used in this study included: purposive (judgmental) sampling, availability sampling and random sampling techniques. Data collection tools were questionnaires, semi-structured interviews and observation checklist. The data analysis was made using percentage of frequency, median, and ranking methods. The major findings were: participation of adults in literacy programs was affected by lack of awareness, lack of time, distance of the literacy center, lack of appropriateness or relevance of the program, inaccessibility of the literacy centers, attitudes towards their age, lack of resource including budget allocated to the program, migration in search of work. Based on the findings certain conclusions were drawn and the following major recommendations were made: stakeholders of adult literacy program should work to reverse the decreasing trend of adult participation; facilitators of adult literacy program should get short term trainings on adult learning principles and methods; stakeholders should enhance the participation of more adult women in literacy program; awareness creation activities about the importance of adult literacy should be continuously carried out; the Regional Education Bureau should revise the program to ensure its relevance to the needs of the target group; and adequate budget should be allocated for the program by mobilizing governmental and non-governmental organizations, the private economy, individuals and the local community.*

# **CHAPTER ONE: The Problem and Its Approach**

## **1.1 Introduction and Background of the Study**

Literacy lies in the heart of basic education that is carried out both in formal and non-formal education. Literacy is regarded as the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, compute and use printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning to enable an individual to achieve his or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society (Lind, 2008:42).

Eighty percent of the world population was literate in 1998 according to the United Nations definition of literacy as the ability to read and write a simple sentence in a language. Using a definition of “age 15 and over can read and write”, the U.S.CIA World Fact book estimated in 2007 that, the overall world literacy rate was 82%.

Literacy rates can vary widely from country to country or region to region. This often coincides with the region’s wealth or urbanization, though many factors play a role, such as social customs which limit the education of females in some countries.

Many policy analysts consider literacy rates as a crucial measure of a region’s human capital. This claim is made on the grounds that literate people can be trained less expensively than illiterate people, generally have a higher socio-economic status and enjoy better health and employment prospects. Policy makers also argue that literacy increases job opportunities and access to higher education. In India, for example, female and child mortality rates declined dramatically in the 1960s, when girls who were schooled according to the education reforms after 1948 began to raise families. Recent researchers argue, however, that such correlations may have more to do with the overall

effects of schooling rather than literacy alone. In addition to the potential for literacy to increase wealth, wealth may promote literacy, through cultural norms and easier access to schools and tutoring services. Therefore, literacy has a paramount effect on the overall development and welfare of any society.

Ethiopia is a country where many nations and nationalities live together in harmony. According to the 2007 Population and Housing census result, its population is more than 73 million. The country stands second in population among African countries, of which more than 80% live in the rural areas. According to United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Report 2009 the Literacy rate of the country is 35.9%; that is, 64.1% of the countries population is illiterate. (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/list-of-countries-by-literacy-rate>).

Education is a key instrument for development; moreover, literacy is a fundamental human right. With respect to this citizen's right to literacy and the realization of economic and social benefits that emanate from education, a massive movement has been carried out in Ethiopia through successive Education Sector Development Programs (ESDP) launched in line with the Education and Training Policy (TGE, 1994).

As a result of the implementation of successive education sector development programs, access to formal schooling has significantly grown from its previous low level. Concerning adult education, the National Adult Education Strategy (2008: 1-2) states that "...the status of adult education has remained low in terms of both accessibility and relevance." Furthermore, it indicates that, adult education programs implemented so far have not been geared towards problem solving and not relevant to the day-to-day life of the adult population that is directly involved in production activities.

For adults and youth who did not get the chance to take part in regular programs, implementation of literacy is of great importance, in order to accelerate the on going development activities in Ethiopia. Oromia is the largest regional state in population of the country with a population size of 27,158,471 (CSA, 2008). Among this number 14,228,881 (52.39%) is a population with age of 15 years and above. This number comprises adults. However, the adults' participation rate (enrollment rate) in literacy programs in 2008/09 was only 12.8% (OEB, 2008:3).

Though Oromia has directives, rules and regulations to run the educational activities of the region the literacy activities are not significant. Some official reports show that the trends of participation is decreasing in the last few years, specifically from 418,435 in 1993 E.C to 61,824 in 2000 E.C. If we take the recent data of the study area, that is East Shoa zone specifically, the adult participation (enrollment) rate of the last two years, that is 2000 E.C. and 2001 E.C. it is 37.74% and 26.12% respectively, and it is decreasing by 11.62% in a single year.

For instance, out of the 17,973 planned; participation of adults in 2000 E.C., those who participated were only 6783 (37.7%) and from the planned 44,056 for the year 2001 E.C., only 11,526 (26.1%) adults participated in literacy programs.

For this reason, this study is intended to identify factors that affect the participation of adults in literacy programs in one of the Oromia zones particularly East Shoa zone, due to the fact that; statistically it seems this zone is in a better position in literacy activities compared to the other zones of the region.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Education is a fundamental human right enshrined in all major United Nations and other international charters, and the need to provide adult literacy education and eradicate illiteracy among adults and provide them with occupation-oriented skills necessary for increased economic productivity has been of great concern worldwide. The adult literacy sub-sector is, therefore, important for acquisition of skills, especially for those outside the framework of the formal school system.

Human resource development will take the first priority to take our country and region out of the current low level of development to an accelerated and sustained development. It is clearly stated in different development policies and strategies that there is a necessity to build the capacity of the economically active human power (the youth and the adult) through education and training in order to increase productivity by proper utilization of land and other material resources. But, adult literacy is still engaged with problems accumulated through years. A research study conducted by Fadil (2009) for example indicates that adult literacy conceptions and practices in the country are not significant. Even though a number of researches have been conducted on areas of alternative basic education designed for out-of-school children, areas of adult literacy are not adequately studied. Hence, the researcher believes that this study would contribute to filling the existing gap. To this end, the following basic research questions were set:

1. What are the andragogical issues that influence the participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia?
2. What are the administrative issues that have impacts on the participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia?

3. What are the motivational factors that have impact on the participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia?

### **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

#### **1.3.1 General Objective**

The general objective of this study is to identify factors affecting the participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia region, and forward possible solutions to the problems based on the findings of the study.

#### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

- Assess the current situation (status) of the literacy activities of the zone;
- Evaluating the provision, organization and management of adult literacy in the zone;
- Assess the participation rate of adults in literacy programs in the zone;
- Asses the trend of participation (enrollment) of adults in literacy programs in the last few years in the zone;
- Assess major problems that have encountered the participation of adults in literacy programs in the zone;
- Propose possible solutions to the problems based on the findings of the study;
- Suggest the literacy prospects in the zone.

#### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

The study is significant for the following major reasons:

1. The study would create awareness among educational planners and policy makers of the region on the factors that affect participation of adults in literacy programs, the

measures to be taken and the strategies to be devised in an attempt to make literacy programs (activities) more effective.

2. The study may help woreda Education Officials and the Zonal communities to improve the organization and management of literacy provision.
3. The study may help primary school teachers and facilitators of adult literacy activities of the zone to improve their methods of teaching literacy.
4. The study would contribute to the knowledge, experience and confidence of the researcher and thereby encourages him for further studies.
5. This study may also help researchers as a source or additional material for further study in the area.

### **1.5 Delimitation of the Study**

It would have been better if the study had included more zones of the region; however, due to time and financial constraints the study was delimited to four woredas; namely Adama, Ada'a, Gimbichu, and Fantalle. These woredas have been selected on the basis of purposive (judgemental) sampling technique based on accessibility. Specifically, Adama-woreda is very near to the zonal seat, Ada'a-woreda is near to the regional seat (Addis Ababa), Gimbichu-woreda is nearer to the main road to Addis Ababa, and Fantalle-woreda is nearer to Adama town and to the main road. In addition, these woredas were where the adult literacy activities were taking place.

In addition, it deals with only andragogical, administrative and motivational variables; and also, the study considered only the literacy program centers run by government.

## **1.6 Limitations of the Study**

The researcher had to try several times to get Woreda Education Officials because they were busy. In addition, the weak organization and management of the literacy activities were very challenging. However, the researcher was able to manage the problems and able to complete his research study.

## **1.7 Organization of the Study**

This research study consists of five chapters. The first chapter deals with the background of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significance of the study, delimitation and limitations of the study. The second chapter presents the review of related literature. Chapter three deals with research design and methodology, whereas chapter four presents the data analysis and interpretation. Finally, chapter five presents the summary of the major findings, the conclusions drawn and recommendations made.

## **1.8 Definitions of key terms**

*Literacy* - refers to written communication (reading and writing text and numbers) in its various expressions, development contexts and life domains.

*Adult literacy* - literacy skills and literacy rates among the adult population aged 15 and over, organized learning programmes for youth and adults focusing on literacy, and how adults use and apply their literacy skills.

*Functional literacy* - is the same as meaningful literacy.

*Participation* - is the term used for the number of learners registered in programs.

*Andragogy* – is the art and science of helping adults to learn.

## **CHAPTER TWO: Review of Related Literatures**

It is widely recognized that mastering literacy is essential for living in a modern society, just as a literate population is essential for a country to compete in a globalized world. Literacy is a human right; it is also key to achieving many development goals; it leads to improved nutrition and health, increased productivity and poverty reduction, enhanced political participation, conscientization of the poor, empowerment of women, or sensitization to environmental issues. Last, but not least, literacy is necessary to facilitate any further learning. In recent years the international community has been mobilized to achieve the goal of primary education for all by 2015. Unless children learn how to read and write while in school, it is unlikely that the adult population will ever be literate.

According to the 2008 Global Monitoring Report, 774 million adults are still illiterate, compared to 864 million 10 years previously (Lind, 2008:11). Progress has been made worldwide, but, with the exception of China, this progress has been very slow. More attention has to be paid to organizing literacy programmes for youngsters and adults in sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia and some Arab states; otherwise the problem of illiteracy will remain serious, compromising the success of poverty reduction strategies, health campaigns, rural development programmes, and governance reforms. The fourth objective of the Dakar Framework for Action will also be in great danger of not being met (Lind, 2008:11).

Oromia is the largest region of the country with adult population of 14,228,881 (52.39%), and 12.8% adult literacy participation rate. And the country has the plan to increase the participation (enrollment) rate from 30% to 50% as per EFA goals (MoE, 2005:43). This country plan works for the region too. But the official documents of Oromia regional

Education Bureau (OREB) shows that, the region is not in a good position with regard to adult literacy participation. So, this study is intended to identify factors affecting the participation of adults in literacy programs in one of the Oromia zones (East Shoa zone) and propose a solution based on the findings.

In this chapter, information from various sources, works of scholars, research results concerning literacy, and factors affecting the participation of adults in literacy programs are going to be reviewed and summarized.

## **2.1 Literacy: A Conceptual Framework**

### **2.1.1 Definitions**

The definitions of literacy are often varying and vague in literatures. Various definitions have been proposed by various scholars and organizations at different times in accordance with the prevailing situations. Since the world is dynamic and ever changing it is difficult to have one specific definition for the term literacy.

The concept of literacy in literatures is often a mixture of values, objectives, functions, methods, and levels and contents of skills required. So, the different components of literacy are rarely necessary for a clear definition of literacy. Definitions made by UNESCO or others in literature rarely correspond to the operational criteria used in practice in different countries or programs.

Among the various definitions given by different scholars and organizations are:

For Graunbard (1991:1), literacy means “Minimally, it means the ability to read and write, to decode and encode. Maximally, it means being well read, learned; hence well educated.” According to David, literacy is explained in such away that it extends from the ability to read and write to understanding and analyzing. David (1991: 1-2) further

explained that; it is education we should be talking about first, and only then the place within it for kinds and levels of literacy. This view stresses that the interconnection of education and literacy is strong and unavoidable. Accordingly one cannot talk of literacy without education; and literacy is the necessary issue to education. He further stressed that: "Literacy is, of course, necessary to a good education. But it is surely not sufficient." He further elaborated the concept that, the sort of literacy which is even a necessary condition of good education is not an independent condition, not a sort of platform on which all else can somehow be built. The roots of literacy are many, not all of them obvious or even understood. But the metaphor of the platform is wrong. Literacy is more like a many branching tree, one we must climb for some, but surely not all, of the fruits of education. Some of the roots of literacy lie near the surface (Graunbard, 1991:2). Another important concept to be considered in defining literacy is a "literate person". According to UNESCO a person is literate "who can with understanding both read and write a short simple statement on his everyday life" (Lind and Johnston 1990: 30).

The traditional definition of **literacy** is considered to be the ability to use language to read, write, listen, and speak. In modern contexts, the word refers to reading and writing at a level adequate for communication, at a level that lets one understand and communicate ideas in a literate society, so as to take part in that society. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has drafted the following definition: " 'Literacy' is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, compute and use printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning to enable an individual to achieve his

or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society.”

(Literacy- Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Literacy>).

Literacy is the acquisition of the skills of writing, reading and dealing with elementary arithmetic (Burnet 1965, Cited in Mulugeta, 2002:15).

According to Bhola (1984:3), Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in the mother tongue, but sometimes literacy could be defined also as the ability to read and write in the national or even international language.

### **2.1.2 Concepts of Literacy**

The concept of literacy in literatures is often a mixture of values, objectives, functions, methods, and levels and contents of skills required. So, the different components of literacy are rarely necessary for a clear definition of literacy. It is widely recognized that mastering literacy is essential for living in a modern society, just as a literate population is essential for a country to compete in a globalized world.

In literature and practice, the term literacy is used in varying and vague ways. Beside the varying and vague uses of the term it is useful to review major trends in the development of the concept of literacy in the international context of adult education. The intention of the reviewer is not to review the academic debates or all the variable definitions of the term literacy.

Lind (2008) described that, ‘literacy’, ‘illiteracy’, ‘literate’ and ‘illiterate’ are relative concepts, because what is required to be literate can differ depending on the context. This relativity and the confusion made between ignorance and illiteracy have led to the conclusion that one should try to avoid calling people illiterate. She further explained

that, the terms ‘non-literate’ or ‘functionally illiterate’ are preferred terms for describing persons who, for a variety of reasons, are not able to make use of written communication. She cited that, non-literate or functionally illiterate men and women are adults with valuable knowledge, life skills, and relevant work and family experiences. They must not be treated as ignorant.

UNESCO defined a literate person to be someone “who can, with understanding, both read and write a short simple statement on his [her] everyday life” (UNESCO, 2005:158). This definition can still be useful as an indicator of initial learning of literacy skills, a first step on the way to achieving a more applicable level of skills, i.e. functional literacy. UNESCO, during its General Conference of 1987, defined a ‘functionally literate’ person as someone who is able to “engage in all those activities in which literacy is required for effective functioning of his [her] group and community and also for enabling him [her] to continue to use reading, writing and calculation for his [her] own and the community’s development” (UNESCO, 1978:18). This definition is still valid. It shows that the kind and level of functional literacy varies and depends on the environment and the context in each given society or community at a given time. It also highlights another feature of literacy: that learning and using literacy is a continuous process, making it difficult, or even misleading, to try to draw a definite line between literate and non-literate (Lind, 2008:42).

Literacy is relevant for all ages. Adults who need and desire to engage in organized basic learning and education are often, like out-of-school youth, those who missed out on part or all of their formal education. This reason for this is often linked to poverty, i.e. having to earn a living/livelihood for them and their families. The approaches and factors to be

taken into account in enabling youth and adults to take advantage of learning opportunities and basic literacy and education programs are often very similar. It is therefore suggested to include out-of-school youth and young adults (normally aged 15 or over) when referring to adult literacy and adult basic education, and consequently, not to treat youth and adult education as separate areas or themes. Nonetheless, it is always necessary to analyze and adapt to the context and the specific needs and motivations of different program beneficiaries or potential participants, which means taking into account gender, age, language, occupation, family relations and other socio-cultural characteristics.

According to Lind (2008), literacy skills should be of interest and use to adult learners. Nonetheless, there are normally at least two phases in basic literacy programs; in the first, the emphasis is on learning to read and write, while in the second and subsequent phases are more geared towards learning the written contents (Lind, 2008:43).

After the EFA conference in Jomtein, non-formal education (NFE) seemed to take precedence as the term for adult education among international organizations such as UNESCO, UNICEF and ADEA (Association for Development of Education in Africa). Used as an overarching term, it covers a wide range of alternative educational activities related to second-chance primary education, literacy, vocational training, etc. for children, youth and adults. Flexible and responsive non-formal approaches are indeed important and should be encouraged, especially in addressing the diversity of youth and adult learning needs.

Lind (2008) puts that, in discussions and documents about literacy for adults, there are at least three ways of using the term adult literacy, i.e. first, literacy referring to reading,

writing and arithmetic skills; second, literacy referring to the process of acquisition of reading and writing skills (text and numbers) within or outside adult literacy learning programs; and third, literacy referring to the uses of literacy for different purposes (Lind, 2008:45).

### **2.1.3 Historical Development of Literacy Programs**

The theoretical concepts normally differ a lot from the operational criteria used in practice for evaluating literacy learning achievements in different countries or programs. It is natural that literacy cannot be defined without connecting it to its purpose or to its context. At the same time, in practical terms, it is nearly impossible to measure the broader impact of literacy in isolation from other variables in the environment.

Literacy, in the context of adult education in particular, has been the topic of international policy discussions, conferences, declarations and decisions since the 1950s, with UNESCO often playing a leading role in these discussions. During this time, the understandings of literacy have evolved, while some of the basic assumptions have, in principle, remained unchanged. This is, in particular, true regarding the concept of literacy as an instrument for development and literacy as a fundamental right. These two premises for advocating literacy for all, or ‘the eradication of illiteracy’, have guided UNESCO’s discourse ever since its creation in 1945.

The evolution of internationally adopted concepts of the role of literacy and its implications for adult literacy programs can roughly be divided into six periods, all of them obviously not completely distinct from each other, rather characterized by ideas coming and going back and forth (Lind, 2008:48-55).

### **(A) 1945-1964: Reading and writing in the mother tongue**

The traditional concept of literacy as reading and writing skills as an end in themselves, was, in theory, abandoned by UNESCO shortly after its creation. In 1946, the concept of 'fundamental education' was adopted to describe a broad field of development activities, of which one was non-formal literacy programs for children and adults. In practice, it became merged with the community development movement, which stressed that literacy must be used for something of practical importance in order to result in development. This was so strongly adhered to that "adult education has been neglected altogether or turned into something so 'practical' that it no longer encompasses any serious attempt to make people literate" (Myrdal, 1978: 1687).

The notions of functional literacy evolved gradually during this period, partly related to providing equivalence to a certain minimum number of completed years of basic school education. Four or five years of education was proposed as a minimum standard for functional literacy, with the understanding that this would vary according to context. Literacy itself was conceived as exclusively reading and writing skills, preferably acquired through learning in the mother tongue. The concepts of literacy being both a continuum and necessarily functional were evolved. Numeracy was, however, not yet included in the definitions of functional literacy (Gray, 1969).

### **(B) 1965-1973: Work-oriented functional literacy**

It was during this period that the human capital theory had a great impact on education policies with its emphasis on vocational and technical training adapted to labor-market needs. This, together with poor progress in spreading literacy, in particular through adult literacy programs, resulted in UNESCO and UNDP deciding, in 1964, to adopt a new

work-oriented functional literacy approach. This was done by launching the Experimental World Literacy Program (EWLP) in order to find ways of turning literacy into an effective instrument for social and economic development.

The World Conference of Ministers of Education on Eradication of Illiteracy in Teheran; in 1965, stated that functional literacy should “not be confined to teaching of reading and writing but should include professional and technical knowledge, thus promoting a fuller participation by adults in economic and civic life” (UNESCO, 1968: 48).

Each literacy pilot program in the EWLP, implemented in 11 countries between 1967 and 1973, was to be linked to a specific economic project in industry or agriculture. The contents would be centered on the production process linked to each project. The assumption was that the lack of motivation identified in past experiences would be eliminated since the adults working in the economic projects would already have felt the need to become literate.

### **(C) 1974-1980: Literacy as a means of liberation**

A critical assessment of the EWLP results by UNESCO, together with the growing influence of Paulo Freire, on adult literacy philosophy and practice, led to a review of the literacy concept and a new ideology on literacy. Paulo Freire was present at the International Symposium for Literacy held in Persepolis in 1975 and was awarded a literacy prize by UNESCO. The conference declaration stressed the political, human and cultural aspects of literacy. It conceived literacy as “a contribution to the liberation of man and to his full development” (Bataille, 1976: 273). Literacy was seen as a fundamental human right and ‘a political act’.

The recommendations from the evaluation of EWLP coincided with this perspective in its review of the narrowly technical/economic concept of functional literacy adopted in the work-oriented pilots, declaring:

*[...] the concepts of functionality must be extended to include all its dimensions: political, economic, social and cultural. Just as development is not only economic growth, so literacy [...] must aim above all to arouse in the individual a critical awareness of social reality, and to enable him or her to understand, master and transform his or her destiny (UNESCO/UNDP, 1976: 191).*

#### **(D) The 1980s: Mass campaigns for the eradication of illiteracy and social justice**

Paulo Freire's philosophy of liberating education and pedagogy continued to have a great influence among most people and organizations working in the area of adult education, literacy in particular. Both his ideas on the political and cultural functions of literacy, and the human capital theories linking literacy to economic functions, were having an impact on the content and design of adult programs. The focus of debates and discussions seemed more geared towards organizational strategies and the scale of programs, rather than on the contents and methods as before.

The organization of national mass campaigns or programs became a topic of international conferences and books on adult literacy. It was recognized that mass literacy campaigns had made significant inroads on reducing literacy in a number of developing countries (e.g. Tanzania, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Ethiopia). The eradication of illiteracy by the year 2000 was set as a target by the United Nations (UN). It was hoped that the dual strategy, recommended by UNESCO, of combining UPE for children and special programs for adults, would help to eradicate illiteracy as part of national strategies to overcome poverty and injustice (Bhola, 1983). UNESCO took several initiatives to

encourage larger-scale literacy efforts. In the previous decades, small-scale pilot projects had been targeted. A study commissioned by UNESCO on campaigns, discussed at a seminar on campaigning for literacy in Uidapur in 1982, concluded with a literacy Declaration. It was in many ways typical for this period, declaring, for example: “A literacy campaign is a potent and vivid symbol of a nation’s struggle for development and commitment to a just society. It creates a critical awareness... Legislative measures and resolutions should reflect a national sense of urgency, define the order or priorities attached to the elimination of illiteracy, and set out the responsibilities and rights of citizens in taking part in the campaign” (Bhola, 1983: 246).

The concepts of literacy adopted or accepted by the seminar typically referred to UNESCO’s standard definition on reading and writing a short sentence, the definition of functional literacy proposed at the Teheran Conference, and the Freirean concepts adopted in Persepolis. These were apparently seen as complementary, not contradictory or exclusive. The report from the seminar can be considered a handbook in planning mass adult literacy campaigns. Contrary to what critics of campaigns have claimed, post-literacy and the integration of adult literacy with development and formal education were both stressed.

Other initiatives also focused on planning and implementing national adult literacy programs or campaigns. From the beginning of the 1980s, the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) renewed its concern for adult literacy as one of the key dimensions of education, because literacy education for adults and schooling for children were seen as “two sides of the same coin” (Carron and Bordia, 1985). International workshops were organized for senior-level planners and organizers of literacy and post-

literacy programs. These were based on IIEP's translation into planning terms of the new concept of literacy, meaning "the explicit stimulation of people's initiative and participation and the constant co-ordination of literacy with other sectors of economic, social, cultural and political development" (Carron and Bordia, 1985: 5). During this period, it was taken for granted in these international contexts that governments should take the lead in providing adult literacy programs, albeit in partnership with a wide range of governmental and non-governmental institutions.

**(E) The 1990s: From basic learning needs defined in Jomtien to vagueness and NGO-ization of adult literacy programmes**

The EFA World Conference and the Jomtien Declaration from 1990, coinciding but not co-ordinated with the International Literacy Year, focused on meeting basic learning needs, including literacy, in its expanded vision of EFA, stating:

*Every person-child, youth, adult shall be able to benefit from educational opportunities designed to meet their basic learning needs. These needs comprise both essential learning tools (such as literacy, oral expression, numeracy, and problem solving) and the basic learning content (such as knowledge, skills, values and attitudes) required by human beings to be able to survive, to develop their full capacities, to live and work in dignity, to participate fully in development, to improve the quality of their lives, to make informed decisions, and to continue learning... (WCEFA, 1990:3)*

While this vision encompassed the right to education for all ages in any modality- formal, non-formal and informal- in practice, the provision of adult literacy programs was neglected during the 1990s.

The interest in and space for such adult literacy initiatives and adult education overall began to erode already in the mid-1980s in the context of cold war, economic crisis, growing national debt, structural adjustment programs, deteriorating social services, globalization of markets and technology, privatization, decentralization with meager

budgets, poverty, and growing unemployment. An ideology that the state should limit its services only to formal education was globalized. This ‘NGO-ization’ of ABE and of NFE in general, developed during the 1990s in countries where the role of the state was eroding, was reinforced by a narrow interpretation of the Jomtien EFA commitment. In practice “all was reduced to children, basic education to primary education and Universal Primary Education to enrollment” (Torres, 2002: 24).

While literacy for children through formal primary education, and to some extent non-formal primary education, was boosted by the EFA conference in Jomtien, ABE programs were *de facto* set back by the EFA context and agenda.

**(F) 2001 onwards- Dakar to present, Contradictions and inconsistencies: lifelong learning, literacies, and literate societies**

Globalization in economic, technological and socio-political terms has led to a new education paradigm for the twenty-first century: the need to enhance LLL, and promote learning and knowledge societies. In order to be able to understand and cope with these changing and contradictory realities, new competencies are required. This is why ‘learning to learn’ or ‘learning to know’ was identified by the Delors Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century (Delors et al., 1996) as one of four pillars of education. The others were ‘learning to do’, ‘learning to be’ and ‘learning to live together’.

The origin of the renewed focus on LLL and NFE can be traced to contexts and initiatives in the North, where the demand and supply of organized learning for the adult population has increased tremendously, mainly related to employment and adapting skills to new

developments in the labour market. A number of international declarations have also reinforced the renewed interest in adult education and NFE.

While the Delors Commission focused on the formal education system- especially for children and youth- and neglected non-formal adult education, the UNESCO Conference in Hamburg (CONFINTEA, 1997) formulated an “enlarged vision of adult learning”. Nonetheless, CONFINTEA seems to have had little impact in countries where the EFA Dakar (2000) framework remains the overarching international platform for basic education in developing countries until 2015.

Importantly, the Dakar EFA framework (EFA-FORUM, 2000) re-affirmed the Jomtien (1990) expanded vision of basic education and included ABE in two of its six goals:

- Ensuring that the learning needs of all young people and adults are met through equitable access to appropriate learning and life skills.
- Achieving a 50 percent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015, especially among women, and equitable access to basic and continuing education for adults.

The UN Literacy Decade (2003-2013), approved by the UN General Assembly in December 2001, proposes a renewed vision of universal literacy under the motto ‘Literacy for Freedom’. Creating literate environments and literate societies is seen as part of the goal of universal literacy.

#### **2.1.4 Different Approaches to Teaching and Learning Literacy**

Literature reviews of literacy for adults and youth discuss links between literacy and other learning needs, such as those related to citizenship or ‘conscientization’, and/or to

development, as well as the advantages of integrating literacy into other activities, and the need to create and support literacy development.

Literacy “approaches” or strategies refer to the models of planning and implementation of literacy activities. The approaches adopted arise directly from the objectives of the deliverers of the programme, as regards both choosing literacy as the means of operation and making the contents and methods fit the overall aims.

Some of the most important issues/questions to be considered for a literacy strategy according to Johnston & Lind, (1990: 68) are: the priority aims; groups should be included; the scale of the programme, in number of the participants and period of time; motivation to be created or used; the framework of organization supervision; level of literacy to be reached; kind of teachers can or should be recruited; training they need; languages, contents and methods should be used in the teaching programme; kind of evaluation should be used; and follow-up activities or facilities exist or need to be created to attach to the programme.

Three most common approaches to teaching adults literacy have been identified, of which the two former are normally non-formal (Lind, 2008: 95-102): (1) the social awareness-raising approach (derived from Paulo Freire’s work and theories); (2) the development-oriented (functional) approach; and (3) the ‘formal education’ approach.

#### **2.1.4.1 Social awareness or ‘liberation’ approaches**

Social awareness approaches have been adopted mainly by NGOs and popular movements inspired by Freirean ‘conscientization’ literacy perspectives, especially in Latin America. They have explicit political and social objectives, such as ones related to citizenship. Literacy is seen as contributing to social transformation and empowering

people to participate actively in democratic processes. The goal is, basically, to overcome oppression. The ideas of the ‘liberation’ or ‘transformation’ pedagogy of Paulo Freire (Freire, 1972) have been adopted by most adult educators and adult education programmes, at least rhetorically. In Latin America, the influence of Freire on adult literacy was so widespread in the 1970s and 1980s that one could hardly find any governmental or non-governmental literacy programme that did not define itself as liberating or conscientizing.

#### **2.1.4.2 Development-oriented or ‘functional’ approaches**

Development-oriented approaches to literacy are, perhaps, the most common among both NGO and governmental programmes; often called ‘functional literacy programmes’, they refer to the inclusion of development-oriented programme components or learning contents about health practices, agriculture, marketing, environmental issues, and other so-called life or livelihood skills.

Large-scale government-led national programmes, not run as campaigns, typically have general socio-economic objectives intended to meet demand and contribute to social justice, development and/or modern attitudes.

‘Integrated’ approaches to literacy have also tried to respond to the concerns of poor people wanting to break out of poverty and learn how to improve their livelihoods. In practice, these approaches begin with either livelihood or literacy training, and then add the other components.

The practices of linking literacy to other functional or development-oriented skills, or even income generation, are very mixed. The two more common ways of relating the two are: first, to run literacy and income-generating activities in parallel but separately; or

second, to run literacy activities first, followed by income-generation activities (Oxenham, et al., 2002:10). The review analysis defines two main strategies of combining literacy with livelihood: 'literacy with livelihood components' and 'livelihood training with literacy components'. Each experience of either kind seems to have had mixed results, and difficulties in finding both the right instructors for each of the components, and the necessary institutional and financial support for achieving the objectives.

#### **2.1.4.3 Formal education or continuing adult education approaches**

Most adult literacy programmes seem to be labeled or considered non-formal, without links to formal or continuing education. Frequently, this is pointed out as a weakness by researchers, policy-makers, educators and learners themselves. Several studies, for example from South Africa and Namibia (Papen, 2005), have shown that many adult literacy learners are happy with, or actually prefer, a formal school-like approach with textbooks, exams and certificates, as compared to a non-formal community-oriented approach without textbooks or certificates.

There is clearly a demand for bridges and ladders to formal paths of continuing education for adults who have been through non-formal literacy programmes. Very little progress has been made on this. However, in some countries, literacy campaigns have been linked to building up a formal continuing education system for adults, such as was done in Cuba, and to some extent, in Mozambique.

Johnston & Lind (1990) further explained that, none of these approaches are complete or exclusive strategies. They focus on different aspects and there certainly exist mixtures and variations of those approaches. All literacy programmes do not necessarily fit into

these categories, and some can be fitted into one while they are clearly influenced in certain aspects by others.

Accordingly, the growing experience of literacy in the world means that even programmes with rather different aims may borrow successful aspects from each other.

### **2.1.5 State Objectives for Launching Literacy Programmes**

In general, the state (in the form of the ruling party or the government) constitutes the deriving force for launching literacy activities. It may wish to respond to demand from the people, or have to yield to pressure from international sources, from the public, or from opposition groups. It may even take over the literacy initiative to defuse or neutralize its potential for supporting or legitimizing opposition groups. State provision of literacy may, as was historically the case in Europe, represent a strategy for social control, social discipline, and legitimating of inequality (Graff, 1977, Cited in Johnston & Lind, 1990: 49). Adult literacy is, however, a chancy strategy for social control, and two positions are to be found as a result, to control via literacy, or to control through leaving people illiterate.

When the state actively promotes literacy activities, its motivation is usually based on the expectation that they will serve as an instrument for making other changes in the society, i.e. literacy is conceived within the framework of the state's development strategy. Hence, to run literacy programmes the state always has to devote significant resources to them, which will be limited by the level of economic development and will also automatically represent some other non-realized investment. Thus the state will try to make the most of its investment in terms of overall outcomes, i.e. the transformation of the society or some part of it, politically, socially and/or economically. The state itself is

not monolithic, furthermore, so often its literacy programme will in fact include diverse aims responding partially to various different pressures, some seeing the political potential of the programme, others the economic aspects. Thus a statement of national literacy aims is often a mixture of human rights declarations, political objectives, social aspirations, and economic strategy (Johnston & Lind, 1990: 49-50).

#### **2.1.5.1 Socio-Political Objectives**

First of all, the mere promotion of literacy activities can benefit the state, and give it some legitimacy in the eyes of the people: “the state is doing something for us.” (Johnston & Lind, 1990:50). Accordingly, the project represents both an immediate consumption good for the under-privileged and an apparent investment in the participants’ future, as well as having the advantage of transferring the responsibility for making good use of the opportunity onto the population itself. The activity can serve the intended objectives both through its process and through its results. Socialist states have explicitly made use of the process to attain political objectives.

#### **2.1.5.2 Economic Objectives**

It has been argued that, political and economic objectives are closely intertwined in the long run, from the state’s point of view. Thus it is rare to find a literacy programme which is justified solely from an economic standpoint. However, some kind of economic reasoning lies behind all state literacy projects, and in many, it predominates. This is logical, not only because literacy requires investment, but also because the decision to use literacy as a point of departure is rooted in a vision of society (or part of it) becoming different, i.e. “more developed”, where literacy and numeracy play a role in the relations of production.

Giving emphasis to literacy's economic potential can give rise to large-scale programmes or to small highly selective projects, contrary to a situation where primarily political objectives automatically lead the state to large-scale activities. In general, the allocation of predominantly economic functions to literacy represents an evolutionary view of social change, i.e. the programme is redolent of expressions such as "self-help", "raising the standard of living", etc., implying a process of gradual improvement, rather than rapid social restructuring. On the one hand, predominantly economic objectives for literacy can result in a highly work-oriented programme, which tries to build an immediate link between "theoretical" study and productive practice, and which incorporates a large amount of technical information about production.

### **2.1.5.3 General Demand-meeting Objectives**

One also finds a number of quite large-scale programmes which are not directly integrated into a development plan and which have at most an "evolutionary" political perspective. These are often to be found in countries where illiteracy is not regarded by the state as a major problem but where the state decides to respond to public (and even international) pressure to "do something about it". Given this decision, literacy is then seen as something which could be a long-term socio-economic investment which gives "hidden reserves of talent" an opportunity to manifest themselves. Use is not made of direct and constant social pressure to impel enrollment. Rather the programme provides access to education for those who want it. In such cases, it may even turn into a long-term indicative plan for the eradication of illiteracy. Apart from low-key mobilizational tactics, such programmes are marked by a general curriculum, by careful attention to the techniques of teaching literacy, and by the creation of a technical infrastructure composed

of trained local literacy officers as well as paid teachers (often with relatively high level of schooling). This arises because the main attraction of the programme is its pedagogical quality. The state is usually fairly ambivalent about the programme, and, if it fails to attract much enrollment, is prepared to discontinue it without much remedial effort. In this kind of programme it is also notable that the state is often prepared to give NGOs a fairly large role (Johnston & Lind, 1990: 52-53).

### **2.1.6 Adult Learning Principles**

There are six adult learning principles (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 1998:64-68). The six principles are based on the psychological definition of what it means to be an adult. As adults, self-direction and responsibility are necessities. In contemporary African society, as in any other society, the following principles of adult learning are especially meaningful (Amutabi et al 2005:10-13).

#### **2.1.6.1 Adults need to know why**

Knowles, Holton and Swanson (1998:64-68) noted that ‘adults need to know why they need to learn something before they will take the time to learn it.’ The need to know could include the benefit to be gained from knowledge acquired or from skills learnt, and any negative effects for not learning new skills or not enrolling in a specific learning programme. As Knowles, Holton and Swanson (1998:64) stated, ‘if adult learners can discover the gap between where they are now and where they want to be, they will become more conscious of their “need to know” new knowledge and skills’. In many African societies, men learnt skills that were considered necessary to make them useful members of society.

### **2.1.6.2 Responsibility for decisions taken**

As an adult, the individual's tendency is to always defend his or her established identity. Adults have a need to be seen by others as being capable of directing themselves. When adults realize others are imposing ideas on them, they may withdraw by not returning to class or they may voice their concerns to the teacher. This is not common with children. Therefore 'when planning for adult learning, efforts must be made to create experiences for adults where they can go from being dependent to independent or self-directed learners' (Knowles, Holton and Swanson, 1998:65).

### **2.1.6.3 Learners' experiences**

Lindeman (1998) emphasized the value of the learner's experience with regards to adult education, observing that the approach to teaching adults should be through situations rather than subjects. He noted that 'experience is the adult learner's living textbook' (Lindeman, 1998:8). Knowles, Holton and Swanson (1998:26) stated that 'adult learners bring to the classroom a diversified range of individual differences related to their experiences, interests, backgrounds, goals and learning styles. The best way to manage the differences between adult learners is by creating activities that tap into the adults' experience, such as group discussions, problem-solving activities and simulations'.

### **2.1.6.4 Coping with real life**

This is applicable to many adult learning situations especially in African communities. The main issue in this principle is not one of age or maturity but what is conducive to effective teaching. Also, the focus on immediate application of skills learnt may not be true with regard to adult literacy classes in many African countries. The majority of learners enrolled in adult literacy classes are often motivated to learn for reasons related

to personal growth (internal motivation), rather than for materialistic (external) needs. Adults who missed an opportunity to receive education are often fascinated by their new ability to read and write. For some adults, learning is enjoyable and is motivated by no specific goal in mind.

#### **2.1.6.5 Real-life applications**

Knowles (1984) suggests that this means that when designing a curriculum for adult learners, courses should be organized around the acquisition of skills necessary for one to earn a living. These skills may include computer skills, farming skills, business skills and teaching skills.

#### **2.1.6.6 Motivation to learn**

Knowles, Holton and Swanson (1998:68) have stated that ‘even though adults can be motivated by external factors (such as higher salaries, promotions, better jobs in the future), they are more motivated to learn by internal pressures, such as the desire for increased job satisfaction, self-esteem and quality of life issues’. The other important factors that can motivate adult learners as identified by Lieb (1999) may include:

- Social relationships, such as making new friends;
- External expectations;
- Social welfare, such as improving the ability to serve others;
- Personal advancement
- Escape from boredom by providing a break from the routine of work or home;  
and
- Cognitive interests, such as satisfying an inquiring mind and seeking knowledge  
for its own sake.

### **2.1.7 Adult Literacy Practices in Ethiopia**

Modern secular education was introduced in Ethiopia with the establishment of Menelik II School at Addis Ababa during the first decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Tekeste, 1990: 1). Prior to the opening of Menelik II School; traditional educations (Church and Quranic schools and others) have dominated the education system of the country. After the opening of Menelik II School in 1908 several other “modern” schools were constructed in different parts of the country.

Though the expansion of “Modern” secular schools had been continued year after year, large percentage of the population remained illiterate (90%) till the outbreak of the 1974 popular revolution.

#### **2.1.7.1 Adult Literacy Practices in Imperial Ethiopia**

In Ethiopia the government proclamation on adult literacy education was issued in 1955, and the Ministry of Education was made responsible to coordinate the program. In the public notice of the proclamation, every illiterate citizen of the country whose ages are between 18-50 was requested to learn in the nearest government, private schools or to hire private literacy teacher, which could teach them basic education (Hailegebriel, 1971). At this period subjects to be taught were reading and writing in Amharic. All government, private, religious and charity organizations were also requested to show their cooperation and support in the implementation of the program (MOE, 1981 E.C.). Because of its delegated responsibility, the Ministry of Education has consecutively established the Majette, Debre Berhan and Mobile schools in 1956, 1957 and 1960/61 respectively. In addition to this effort, “Beherawi Ye Fidel Serawit” was also established as a voluntary organization to promote literacy activities by using foreign aids.

After ten years of government proclamation on adult literacy education, the Ministry of Education established the adult education and literacy department in 1967, which was responsible to facilitate and coordinate non-formal education programs. In the same year, the department has got assistance from various international organizations, UNDP, UNESCO, FAO and ICO, and started the work-oriented adult education program (ibid).

In Ethiopia prior to 1974, several agencies and organizations were participating in adult education program. According to Yalew the main contributors in adult education and their programs were:-

- A) Government sponsored adult literacy programs, include activities of MOE, Ministry of National Community Development and the armed forces.
- B) Church and Mission sponsored programs that were supported mainly by Ethiopian Orthodox and Evangelican church.
- C) Voluntary Organization i.e., National Literacy Campaign Organization, Ethiopian Women Welfare Association, Youth and Women Christian Association.
- D) International agencies (UNDP and UNESCO) also supported work oriented adult literacy projects (WOALP), which were aiming at to bring over all social and economic development in the country.

Generally, the main objectives of agencies that sponsored adult literacy programs in Ethiopia were (Mulugeta, 2002: 39-40):

1. To eradicate illiteracy out of the country.
2. To assist illiterates on voluntary bases.
3. To educate the uneducated and to enable them to be participants and contributors in economic activities.

4. To implement the proclamation issued by the government in to practice.
5. Due to the moral responsibility that literates have to teach the illiterates.
6. To make private organization more profitable.

At the first level, the above mentioned organizations were teaching illiterate adults reading and writing (in Amharic), and at the second level, arithmetic and English were provided. Moreover, some institutions train participants in vocational training which is mainly about Hygiene and Home economics (Hailegebriel, 1971) (ibid).

The major problems that faced these programs were the following (Mulugeta, 2002: 40):

- The program was mainly emphasizing on reading and writing.
- There was shortage of teaching materials and teaching aids.
- Budget was not allocated for teachers.
- Voluntary teachers were discontinuing teaching and they weren't carrying out the program seriously.
- Most of the programs were conducted dominantly in urban areas.
- Lack of cooperation from government authorities.
- Cultural problems (Women weren't participants).
- Cooperation among agencies and literacy program centers.
- The work-oriented Agriculture Education program was designed to reach only small number of people.

The above stated problems of the programs were the main causes for adults to discontinue their participation, particularly in the rural areas (ibid).

In general, during this period adult education program in general and adult literacy in particular, were not taken seriously. Hence, though adult literacy education has long

history in the country, it couldn't show remarkable contributions in improving the literacy rate of the country. Consequently, over 90% of the population was illiterate in 1974, the year for the overthrow of the Imperial system (Tekeste, 1990).

#### **2.1.7.2 Adult Literacy Practices in Socialist Ethiopia (1974-1990)**

The literacy practice and experience in Ethiopia dates back to 1940s, specifically when the first adult education institute in 1948 was established. In 1962, a voluntary body "The Literacy Campaign Organization" was set up. In the year 1969, it claimed to have enabled 80,000 people become literate (Dessu 2007: 1). In the early 1970s, some European nations such as the Netherlands, Germany, and the United States of America sponsored some Ethiopians for short- and long- term training so that they could train Ethiopian fellowmen in their country.

The provision of literacy education during the National Literacy Campaign was preceded by the United Nations' Work-oriented Functional literacy project that could offer adult education courses in certain selected areas of the country.

The national literacy campaign began in early 1975 when the government mobilized more than 60,000 students and teachers, sending them all over the country for two-year terms of experience. This experience was crucial to the creation in 1979 of the National Literacy Campaign Coordinating Committee (NLCCC) and a nationwide effort to raise literacy levels. The government organized the campaign in rounds, which began in urban centers and spread outward to the remote parts of the country up to Round 12. Officials originally conducted the literacy training in five languages: Amharic, Oromo, Tigrinya, Welaitinya, and Somali. The number of languages was later expanded to fifteen, which represented about 93 percent of the population. By the end of Round 12, in the late

1980s, about 17 million people had been registered, of whom 12 million had passed the literacy test. Women represented about half of those enrolled.

According to government sources, about 1.5 million people eventually worked in the campaign. They included students, civil servants, teachers, military personnel, housewives, and members of religious groups, all of whom, it was claimed, offered their services freely. Adult literacy classes used primary and secondary school facilities in many areas. Officials distributed more than 22 million reading booklets for beginners and more than 9 million texts for post-literacy participants. The Ministry of Education also stocked reading centers with appropriate texts. These books focused on topics such as agriculture, health, and basic technology. To consolidate the gains from the literacy campaign, the government offered follow-up courses for participants up to grade four, after which they could enroll in the regular school system. In addition, national newspapers included regular columns for new readers. The literacy campaign received international acclaim when the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) awarded Ethiopia the International Reading Association Literacy Prize in 1980.

(U.S. Library of Congress, <http://countrystudies.us/ethiopia/73.htm>).

During the National Literacy Campaign, there were two programs of literacy education. These were Basic Literacy I and Basic Literacy II.

In Basic Literacy I and II; medium of instruction was nationality language; numeracy; and environmental education. These could be followed by post literacy education which in turn had two programs known as post literacy I and post literacy II.

Literacy lies in the heart of basic education that is carried out both in formal and non-formal education. Ethiopia has had rich experience in literacy education, especially, the National Literacy Campaign of 1979-1990, which was the most popular literacy education the country has experienced so far.

### **2.1.7.3 Current Adult Literacy Practices in the FDRE**

After the fall of the Derg regime in May 1991, the administrative structure introduced in Ethiopia was a Federal system. Following the introduction of the federal system, decentralization of authority was implemented based on the proclamation that empowered the newly organized regions to manage their own affairs.

Literacy is a fundamental human right. With respect to this citizen's right to literacy and the realization of economic and social benefits that emanate from education, a massive movement has been carried out in the country through successive Education Sector Development Programmes (ESDP) launched in line with the Education and Training Policy (ETP).

The main thrust of ESDP is to improve educational quality, relevance, efficiency, equity and expand access to education with special emphasis on primary education in rural and underserved areas, as well as the promotion of education for girls as a first step to achieve Universal Primary education by 2015 (ESDP III, 2005:1). Regarding the Adult and Non Formal Education program it has been stated in ESDP III that "The adult and non-formal education program includes a range of basic education and training components for children and adults who are out of school. The program focuses primarily on literacy and numeracy in order to enhance the skills and develop problem-solving abilities of those who are enrolled." (MOE, 2005: 6-7). It further states that, the program has three sub-

components: a scheme for out-of-school children between the ages of 7-14, a literacy program for youth and adults who are older than 15, and basic skill training to youth and adults in the community skill training centers (MOE, 2005: 6-7). In this regard the government has put a special emphasis and also put literacy as a priority issue. The practicality or the implementation and its effectiveness are the question under question mark. The government put the adult and non-formal education program as an important instrument to combat the present high rate of illiteracy with a particular focus on women. And also the government stressed on the participation of NGOs in the delivery of Adult and Non-formal Education program is important and their continuous and increasing participation is welcome.

### **2.1.8 Literacy and its Contribution to National Development**

The role of trained/educated human power in development of a country is paramount. In countries with high per capita income their literacy rate is also high. It is possible to say that the development of a country has a positive relation with the literacy rate of the citizens of the country. The contribution of literacy is for an individual and also for a society as a whole. Concerning the role of literacy Bhola stated that, “Besides literacy have advantages for the individual to be independent in his daily activities; it helps the individual to increase productivity, to improve his status in the society and to assist him in the ‘upward mobility’ in the social structure.” Besides its role in increasing individual’s productivity and improve his status in the society; Bhola further expressed that, “in addition, it contributes also to the community to experience improvements in ‘demographic transformation, through change in fertility and mortality rates...’ (Bhola, 1984).

Even though there are arguments on the positive relationship between level of literacy and the social, economic and political development of the society; (Bhola, 1984: 29), Cisse (2001: 129), stated that “illiteracy could hinder development...however; literacy alone doesn't automatically lead to development”.

It is assumed by different writers that, illiteracy is associated with poverty and underdevelopment, where as, literacy is the manifestation of development. Supporting these writers assumption, Wanagoola (1988: 184) indicated that:

*...the struggle against illiteracy is actually a war against poverty, against the control of techniques and the prevention of inventions. However, within countries it is the most exploited, the poorest, who are also illiterate, between countries, it is the oppressed countries, the most exploited ones, that also experience the highest levels of illiteracy.*

Blaugh (cited in Bhola, 1984: 28) also confirmed that, “the map of the world illiteracy and the map of world poverty to be congruent”. Hamadache et al., (1986: 12, cited in Mulugeta, 2002: 20) also stated that, throughout the world illiteracy principally affects the least privileged groups, frequently, as an accompaniment to poverty. The highest rates are encountered in rural areas, which is where two-thirds of the world population live often in extreme poverty.

In defining development, Fagerlind and Saha (1991) explained that development is ambiguous and have been argumentative. This is because development is associated with political and ideological interpretations and used in variety of contents that “there are differences in the concept it holds”.

Fagerlind and Saha (1991: 4) further stated that there are many words with similar meanings with development, such as: social change, growth, evolution, progress,

advancement and modernization. With the exception of social change, all others imply change in a specific direction, which is regarded by users as positive, or highly valued.

Bhola and Bhola (1992: 19-20) view that, “development is related to higher production, consumption and services, particularly in the third world countries”. However, this couldn’t be actualized without using achievements of science and technology, which are associated with modernization. According to these writers, definition for development is many, but Modernization and Democratization are at the core of all definitions.

According to Bhola and Bhola (1992) development includes democratization, which is the participation of the people in the political, social and economic affairs of the society.

The participation of the people in the political, social and economic affairs enables them to ensure that what institutions are performing is related with the benefit of the society.

All the assumptions stated above couldn’t be realized without acquiring basic knowledge, skills and attitudes. So, literacy should be at the center of all development support activities. The support of the views and assumptions stated above, Fagerlind and Saha (1991: 41) argue that basic writing and basic arithmetic appear to have been major requirements for the emergence of civilization. There is a qualitative difference between pre-literate and literate societies, in terms of the mobilization of human resources through more effective and efficient communication, more complex forms of social organization and the ability to create and utilize higher levels of technology.

According to Knzol (cited in Limage, 1987: 299), “the illiterate...has been crippled in at least three ways; first, by economic and societal exclusion, second, by the inability to see historical precedents for that exclusion, and thereby to make use of what has already been said by others.” (Mulugeta 2002: 22). Moreover, Bhola (1984: 25) described that literacy

is “one of human kind's paramount achievements-the invention and use of symbolic systems-illiteracy is the denial of the essential elements of human heritage and the imposition of an intellectual bondage” (Mulugeta 2002: 22). Bhola (1984: 24) for Mandermez and Henkes, the “constants that accompanied illiteracy” are “difficulty in perceiving images, inability to reason and consequent dependence on intuition, difficulty in rationalization and calculation.” According to Bhola (1984:28) literacy contributed to economic development in:

- a) raising productivity of new literate,
- b) expanding the flow of general knowledge to individuals (instruction about health and nutrition), and thus reducing cost of transmitting useful information,
- c) stimulating the demand for vocational training and technical education,
- d) selecting the more able and enhancing their occupational mobility, and
- e) Strengthening the tendency for people to respond positively to a rise in the rate of reward for their efforts.

Furthermore, illiteracy is seen as a danger to the principle of the equality of man. It not only violates the individuals right to education; it is one the major obstacles to the enjoyment of other human rights too (Bhola 1984: 29).

Goody and Watt (cited in Fagerlind and Saha 1991: 40), pointed out the importance of literacy was not only trade, commerce and the economic sector of society radically altered, but also the nature of human interaction was transformed (Mulugeta 2002: 23).

As a conclusion Bhola (1984: 28) puts that literacy alone may not create a just society, but it is important for the establishment and sustenance of egalitarian and participative institutions. However, regarding the relation between literacy and development, Aderson

(cited in Mamo, 1999: 22), suggested that a threshold of Male literacy of 40 percent was necessary, before there could be any significant take-off in economic development. Similarly, the study by Peaslee reached to a conclusion that in the past 100 years no country had reached to a significant economic growth with out enrolling 10 percent of its total school age population in primary schools.

From the above assumptions it is possible to draw a conclusion that there is a relation between development and education in general and literacy in particular. Therefore, it is possible to quote from the consensus of the international conferences of adult education on the decisiveness of education for personal and national development (cited in Mamo 1999: 49):

- The right to learn is an indispensable tool for the survival of humanity.
- There can be no human development without the right to learn.
- If we want peoples of the world to be self-sufficient in food production and other essential human needs; they must have the right to learn.
- There will be break-through in agriculture and industry, no progress in community health and indeed, no change in living conditions without the right to learn.

Education in general and literacy in particular play a decisive role in the development of a country, in the poverty alleviation. Considering the role played by education the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopian government formulated various policies and strategies. Among these policies and strategies the Education and Training Policy is one. In the Education and Training Policy it has been stated that, education enables individuals and society to make all-rounded participation in the development process by acquiring

knowledge, ability, skills and attitudes (TGE, 1994:1). The ETP further explains that, of the aims of education is to strengthen the individual's and society's problem-solving capacity, ability and culture starting from basic education and at all levels. It helps man to improve, change, as well as develop and conserve his environment for the purpose of an all-rounded development by diffusing science and technology into the society (TGE, 1994:1). The other strategy/program the government (FDRE) is implementing is PASDEP, in which education is the priority.

The development issue is a heart of education sector, and much attention is given to development and is put as a mission of education sector.

### **2.1.9 Literacy Practices in Oromia Regional State**

The adult literacy practices in Oromia pre FDRE were not different from that of Ethiopia because of obvious reasons. It is better to treat the literacy issues in Oromia after the downfall of the Derg regime.

Oromia is the largest regional state in population of the country with a population size of 27,158,471 (CSA, 2008). Among this number 14,228,881 (52.39%) is a population with age of 15 years and over. This number represents the number of adults of the region.

Oromia comprises 18 zones and 6 towns with zone status. The majority of the people in the region are engaged in subsistence agriculture. According to the official sources of Oromia Education Bureau there are 115,619 adults enrolled in the literacy programmes, and this is 12.8% of the plan (OEB, 2009). There are 9808 adult literacy facilitators and 3029 literacy centers in the region. If we take the participation/enrollment/ rate of adults in literacy programmes in 2008/09 it is only 12.8% (OEB, 2009:4). Oromia has directives, rules and regulations, particularly Oromia has its own adult education strategy,

to run the educational activities of the region, much progress has been recorded in primary and secondary educations, but the literacy activities are not significant. The region is with large number of illiterate adults with low attention given to the adult education in general and adult literacy in particular.

Regarding the adult literacy activities of the region the researcher couldn't get a research conducted on the region. But official documents from the regional education bureau show that the participation of adults in literacy programmes shows a decreasing trend in the last few years. There are no clear justifications for the decreasing trend of the participation of the adults in literacy programmes. The official report of the Oromia education bureau put lack of attention given by all stakeholders to the programme as a main reason for the low participation of adults in the programme (OEB, 2009:3).

## **2.2. Reasons for Lack of Adequate Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs**

Historically, participation in adult education is largely a voluntary activity. Not only is there curiosity about who volunteers to participate, but without volunteer learners, there would be a much smaller enterprise of adult education. Providers of adult education therefore need to know who is participating, why they are participating, and what conditions are likely to promote greater participation. Conversely, knowing who is not involved can be important information for providers who wish to attract new learners.

Knowledge about participation is useful to policy makers in terms of funding and to those who plan and implement programs.

Worldwide in industrialized and developing countries, researchers know that the rates of participation in adult literacy and basic education are dismally low.

*Participation* is the term used for the number of learners registered in programs. The main body of research on participation and non-participation is American; and dominated by a few names, including Beder, Valentine, Darkenwald, and more recently, Quigley. They have investigated the reasons why people either do or do not participate in adult education, in particular, basic education and literacy.

If we consider the other perspectives of participation and non-participation; adults are busy people. Most spend at least eight hours a day working and often as many hours attending to family, household, and community concerns. Teachers, counselors, administrators, and policymakers all have a keen interest in understanding why people do or do not participate in learning activities. There could be various approaches to answer this question. Among these approaches the two are considered here (Caffarella & Merriam, 1999:51): to ask people their reasons for participating (survey studies); and to try to determine the underlying motivational orientations or barriers to participation of certain groups of learners.

A survey study conducted in 1991 by U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, indicated that the reason of participation most commonly is job-related motives (Caffarella & Merriam, 1999:52). In this survey study the researchers concluded that “vocational goals most frequently direct adults into continuing education” (p.144) (ibid). The eight surveys of participation conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) have consistently revealed job-related reasons as the most frequently cited, with personal development courses a close second in the most recent study (Caffarella & Merriam, 1999:52). In the most recent UNESCO survey, fully 90.6 percent cited career-or job-related reasons for participation, and 9.4 percent cited

“personal interest” (Valentine, 1997, cited in Caffarella & Merriam, 1999:52). When asked about the goal of the learning activity, the largest percentage (58 percent) said it was professional or career upgrading, 18.3 percent “other,” 17.6 percent to earn a college or university degree, 3.8 percent to earn a vocational or apprenticeship certificate, and 2.3 percent to complete secondary school (Valentine, 1997, cited in Caffarella & Merriam, 1999:52). This survey study indicates that, clearly there is a strong linkage between one’s work life and participation in adult education. Cross (1981) explains this relationship as quite logical given most adults’ life situations (Caffarella & Merriam 1999:52):

*People who did not have good jobs are interested in further education to get better jobs, and those who have good jobs would like to advance them. Women, factory workers, and the poorly educated, for example, are more likely to be pursuing education in order to prepare for new jobs, whereas men, professionals, and college graduates are more likely to be seeking advancement in present jobs. Men are more interested in job-related learning than women are, and young people are far more interested in it than older people are. Interest in job-related goals begins to decline at age 50 and drops off sharply after age 60. Those who are not currently participating in learning activities (most often the economically disadvantaged and poorly educated) are even more to express an interest in job-related education than are their more advantaged peers, who can afford the luxury of education for recreation and personal satisfaction. [1981, pp.91-92]*

Approaching people’s reasons for participating in adult education from a somewhat different angle, Aslanian and Brickell (1980) sought to test the hypothesis that life transitions motivate adults to seek out learning experiences. They found that 83 percent of the learners in their sample could describe some past, present, or future change in their lives as reasons for learning. The other 17 percent were engaged in learning for its own sake-that is, to stay mentally alert-or for the social aspects or because learning is a satisfying activity. Those going through transitions, such as marriage, retirement, job changes, birth of children, and so on, were able to identify specific events, such as getting

fired or promoted, that triggered their transition. The authors noted seven kinds of transitions. Those relating to career and family accounted for 56 percent and 16 percent of the transitions, respectively. The other transitions, in descending importance, concerned leisure (13 percent), art (5 percent), health (5 percent), religion (4 percent), and citizenship (1 percent) (Caffarella & Merriam 1999:53). And the authors of the survey study concluded that, "To know an adult's life schedule," "is to know an adult's learning schedule" (pp.60-61, cited in Caffarella & Merriam 1999).

The survey studies have been helpful in identifying reasons adults give for participating in learning activities. Caffarella & Merriam (1999:53-54) stated that, since most adult learners are employed and derive much of their identity from their work, it is not surprising to find that at least half of them are involved in education for job-related reasons.

Within the literature of adult education a good deal of attention has been given to 'non-participation'. The problem for researchers is that simply going up to people and asking them why they have not taken part in education projects and programs does not necessarily tell us very much. For example, there is some evidence that people may be either embarrassed about their reasons e.g. around finance and literacy, or lack a detailed analysis concerning the operation of the system.

Knowing why adults participate in adult education do not tell us why many do not. That is, we cannot assume that those who are not participating are happily employed and satisfied with their family, community, and leisure activities. The two most often cited reasons for nonparticipation are lack of time and lack of money. These are socially acceptable reasons for not doing something, of course, and probably very legitimate

reasons for adults who are busy people trying to become or stay economically solvent and take care of their families and themselves. Johnstone and Rivera (1965) in their national study of participation found that 43 percent cited cost as a reason for not attending adult education courses and 39 percent said they were too busy. These were also the two major reasons for nonparticipation cited in the UNESCO study (Valentine, 1997). Forty-five percent of respondents said lack of time was a barrier for job-related education; this figure climbs to 60.1 percent for non-job-related education. Interestingly, 33.4 percent gave cost as a barrier for job-related education, but 25.4 percent reported cost as a barrier for non-job-related education (Valentine, 1997). For both types of education, “family responsibilities” was cited as the next most salient barrier.

Reasons that adults do not participate have been clustered by several researchers into types of barriers. Johnstone and Rivera (1965) clustered ten potential barriers into two categories: external, or situational, and internal, or dispositional, barriers. External barriers are “influences more or less external to the individual or at least beyond the individual’s control” (p.214), such as cost of the program. Internal barriers reflect personal attitudes, such as thinking one is too old to learn. Older adults, for example, cited more dispositional barriers, and younger people and women were more constrained by situational barriers. On the other hand, Valentine’s (1997) analysis of the UNESCO data revealed that situational barriers affected both men and women: “Women were more likely than men to report that family responsibilities interfered with both job-related and non-job-related education. Men were more likely than women to report that work demands interfered with non-job-related education.” To situational and dispositional barriers, Cross (1981, p.98) added a third cluster: institutional barriers, consisting of “all

those practices and procedures that exclude or discourage working adults from participating in educational activities.” Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) also cite institutional and situational barriers but divide the dispositional barrier into psychosocial obstacles (beliefs, values, attitudes, and perceptions about education or about oneself as a learner) and informational, which reflects the lack of awareness as to what educational opportunities are available.

Darkenwald and colleagues have gone beyond the three-part or four-part barrier typologies in developing a scale of deterrents to participation that can be factor analyzed to reveal the structure of reasons underlying nonparticipation (in much the same way the EPS does for participation). A form of the Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS) used with the general adult public revealed six factors of nonparticipation: lack of confidence, lack of course relevance, time constraints, low personal priority, cost, and personal problems (such as child care, family problems, and personal health) (Darkenwald and Valentine, 1985). In a later analysis of the same data, Valentine and Darkenwald (1990) derived a typology of adult non-participants. Their analysis puts the adult non-participants in the general public cluster into five distinct groups. People are deterred from participating by personal problems, lack of confidence, educational costs, and lack of interest in organized education generally, or lack of interest in available courses (Caffarella & Merriam, 1999: 56-57).

A study by Patricia Cross in 1981 named three categories of deterrents: situational, dispositional and institutional, and the last involving discouraging practices and procedures in schools.

**Situational barriers:** those arising from one's situation at a given time.

- Lack of money- the cost of studying, the cost of child care and soon.
- Lack of time, for example, because of job and home responsibilities.
- Lack of transport to study venue.

**Institutional barriers:** those practices and procedures that exclude or discourage adults from participating in activities.

- Inconvenient schedules or locations for programmes.
- Lack of relevant or appropriate programmes.
- The emphasis on full-time study in many institutions.

**Dispositional barriers:** those related to attitudes and self-perceptions about oneself as a learner.

- Feeling 'too old' to learn.
- Lack of confidence because of 'poor' previous educational achievements.
- Tired of school, tired of classrooms (Cross 1981:99).

It was during the 1980s that studies began to look more at individuals, specifically at psychological factors such as negative expectations of programs and negative self-evaluation. They also addressed informational issues-that is, lack of information about available programs and the failure of many adults to seek such information. As McGivney (1993:17) comments, a common finding in participation research is that non-participants have little or no knowledge of the educational opportunities available.

Additional factors appeared in a scale published in 1984 by Scanlan and Darkenwald to measure deterrents to participation. These included disengagement, family or work constraints, cost, perceived lack of benefit and lack of quality programs.

Studies show that, even if adult learners are/were motivated, they do not have time to attend regular literacy classes long enough to complete a programme due to work and caring for their families (which mostly affects women). Agricultural seasons often interfere with programme timetables in rural areas. Unemployed adults (mostly men) frequently look for jobs in places far from home and work on seasonal, temporary contracts. Literacy programmes need to adapt and be flexible in addressing the challenge of available time for potential learners in different situations. When learners themselves claim they cannot participate due to lack of time, this is almost always true; although, there may also be other reasons for reluctance behind this, such as shyness, lack of confidence, inadequate programme design, etc. (Lind, 2008:69-70).

In addition, non-literate adults themselves, as well as policy-makers, say that they believe adults are too old to learn. But, it is never too late to learn. Adults with little or no literacy skills are normally poor and lack self-confidence in relation to the written word and education. They have worked hard with their hands; have often been hungry and malnourished, and have age-related sight problems at a lower average age than more wealthy literate people. As a result, they need special attention to raise their self-confidence and awareness of the value of their knowledge and wisdom, as well as pre-literacy exercises in holding and using a pen on paper, proper light, appropriate size and print of text, provision of spectacles, etc. (Lind, 2008:70).

The other very important issue to be considered in adult literacy is the motivation to learn or participation in literacy programmes. Motivation is the key to successful adult literacy acquisition; more so than in other forms of education, born from the normally miserable living conditions of non-literate people. All factors involved in programme development

and implementation should, therefore, ensure, reinforce or maintain motivation, without which the whole endeavour would collapse. The motivational patterns of learners and potential learners are thus important to understand and diagnose in each context.

Recent surveys, studies or evaluations from different developing countries on reasons or motivations for joining adult literacy programmes confirm findings from similar earlier studies that non-literate adults have a general desire to learn to read, write and calculate in order to be able to sign their names, write letters, avoid being cheated in money transactions, and generally know more and have access to school-like education (Papen, 2005, cited in Lind, 2008:74-75).

An analysis of the wider implications of an evaluation of the Functional Adult Literacy (FAL) programme in Uganda (Carr-Hill, 2001) observed that: “The main driver of demand seems uncomplicated: most of the people asked simply wanted to know how to read, write, and do some arithmetic. In this they are not unique; people in Indonesia, Namibia, Senegal, and elsewhere have given similar answers. This observation suggests that, where schooling and literacy become widespread, they acquire a value in themselves” (Lind, 2008:75).

In a recent youth and adult literacy survey in Rwanda (MINEDUC/Non-Formal Education unit, 2005), the findings on learners’ desire to learn showed that (Lind, 2008:75):

- “97.5% of the potential learner’s sample said yes when asked whether they wanted to learn read and write;
- 71.7% choose reading and writing as their first choice when asked what they wanted to learn if given a chance to learn anything;

- 97% of instructors rate learners' interest in learning very high or high;
- Most learners (51.7%) want to read the newspaper as their first choice, followed by the Bible (38.3%) and documents in kinyarwanda (36.7%)” (MINEDUC/Non-Formal Education unit, 2005:3).

An overall evaluation of the national literacy programme in Namibia, based on a national survey directed to all literacy groups, also found that the most common motivations by learners for attending literacy classes were quite general, such as (Lind, 2008:75-76):

- To learn to read and write;
- To gain more knowledge;
- To learn mathematics;
- To read and write letters;
- To control money when buying and selling;
- To help children with school works;
- To communicate in English, especially to facilitate traveling, filling in forms; and
- To continue education (Lind, 1996:20).

“The wish to be self-reliant and be in control of common life situations, such as ‘keeping secrets’ and ‘not being cheated’ was expressed by many learners in their explanations for why they wanted to be able to read and write letters, deal with money and master English” (Lind, 1996:64).

Female learners, almost everywhere, state a desire to help their children with schoolwork. They also express a wish to become more self-reliant and in control of their personal life, free from isolation and submission, as well as to be actors in the same way as men.

Typically, more women than men participate in adult literacy classes worldwide, especially in rural areas (Lind, 2008:76).

Lind (2008) states that, learners' self-reported statements on the benefits of participating in adult literacy programmes include the positive experiences of the process and the social meeting space of literacy groups.

Many studies have shown that although motivation for literacy is strong, the barriers preventing many of the potential learners from participating are the same as those leading to high drop-out rates and irregular attendance of enrolled learners. These barriers are linked to poverty, as shown in several studies on adult literacy in Mozambique (e.g. in Borges-Mansson, 1995). In Namibia, the evaluation studies revealed that reasons for dropping out or for not joining the programme were often external factors reflecting poor living conditions, such as hunger, alcoholism, health problems, unemployment, migration, long distances, need to harvest, and lack of water. "Specific reasons for men not attending regularly were cattle herding, negative attitudes among other men and the fact that there were too many women in the classes. Resistance among husbands, and childcare and domestic duties prevented women from attending regularly. Shyness was a strong factor preventing, both men and women, from coming to classes" (Lind, 1996:94-95).

To sum up; different factors which can affect participation of adults in literacy programmes have been forwarded by different scholars at different times based on the rationales justified by these scholars. The works of these scholars have been reviewed by the researcher with care as much as possible though it is not exhaustive.

From the researcher's point of view, these factors can be categorized into three; that is; external or situational; internal or dispositional; and institutional. This approach of categorizing the factors is similar to Cross' with minor adjustments.

The external or situational factors are the factors which are external to the individual (learner) or at least beyond the individual's control. These may include: the cost of studying, the cost of child care, lack of time (because of job and home responsibilities), lack of transport to study venue, personal problems (such as child care, family problems, and personal health), poor living conditions, such as, hunger, alcoholism, health problems, unemployment, migration, long distances, need to harvest, lack of water, cattle herding (for men), negative attitudes among other men and the fact that there are too many women in the classes (for men), resistance among husband, and child care and domestic duties (for women), shyness (for both men and women). Younger people and women are more constrained by these factors.

The internal or dispositional factors are the factors related to beliefs, values, attitudes, and self-perceptions about oneself as a learner. These may include: feeling 'too old' to learn; lack of confidence; lack of interest in organized education; low personal priority; lack of awareness about the programmes. Older adults are more constrained by these factors.

Institutional factors are all those practices and procedures that exclude or discourage working adults from participating in literacy activities. These factors may include: inconvenient schedules or locations for programmes; lack of relevant or appropriate programmes; lack of quality programmes; lack of flexible time of study.

## **CHAPTER THREE: Research Design and Methodology**

### **3.1 Research Design**

A mixed research approach was employed in this study. That means; both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed. Descriptive survey method was used to generate quantitative information. The qualitative data obtained through interview and observations were triangulated with the quantitative data (Creswell, 2003).

### **3.2 Sources of Data**

The major sources of the data were the facilitators of the adult literacy program, the officials of the woreda education office and zonal education desk. Besides, the officials of Oromia Education Bureau were the sources of data to supplement the study. Furthermore, statistical information from the literacy program centers, the woreda education offices, zonal education desk, and Regional Education Bureau were used to secure the relevance of the statistical data.

### **3.3 Sampling Techniques**

#### **a) Zone**

East Shoa zone is selected based on the purposive (judgmental) sampling technique among the 18 zones of Oromia.

#### **b) Woredas**

As it is already stated under the delimitation part, four woredas were selected based on purposive sampling technique among the 10 woredas in East Shoa zone based on their accessibility to modern transport services.

### **c) The Literacy centers**

The adult literacy program centers were selected based on availability sampling method, i.e. in Fentalle woreda there were two literacy centers "functioning" and the two were selected; in Adama woreda three centers were "functioning" and the three of them were selected; in Ada'a woreda three centers were "functioning" and the three of them were selected; and in Gimbichu two centers were selected.

### **d) The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators**

The adult literacy program facilitators had been selected based on both random and availability sampling techniques, i.e. in Fentalle two ALPF were there and both were taken; in Adama woreda 23 formal school teachers were facilitators; and 9 facilitators were selected randomly; and in Ada'a woreda 27 formal school teachers were facilitators and 12 facilitators were selected randomly; and in Gimbichu among 31 formal school teachers who were facilitators 8 facilitators were selected randomly.

### **e) Education Officials**

Regarding education officials; four education officials from woreda education offices, Zonal education desk, and Regional Education Bureau were selected randomly. That is, a total of 16 woreda education officials were included as sources of data.

## **3.4 Data Collection Tools**

For the purpose of this particular study the following tools were employed: Questionnaires (with open-ended and closed-ended items), semi-structured interviews, and observation checklist.

### **3.5 Procedures of Data Collection**

The following procedures were followed in identifying the factors affecting participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia region.

- Statistical data from different documents were secured and analyzed.
- The draft of data gathering tools were prepared and first given/distributed to three education professionals, i.e. one MA- first year student at Addis Ababa University, College of Education, who was working for more than ten years in woreda education office as a coordinator on Adult and Non-Formal Education; one with MA in Educational Administration, who had been working on different areas including Adult and Non-Formal Education , and teaching at TTCs for 20 years; and one with MA in Educational Planning and Management, who had been working on different areas in education sector including teaching for 16 years in order to check the relevance of the tools, and these professionals were not included in the final study as the sources of data.

### **3.6 Data Analysis and Management**

The collected data from various sources were analyzed and interpreted, the findings were drawn and the conclusions and recommendations were forwarded.

In the analysis the names of peoples used were pseudo names. High and very high were taken together as high; low and very low were taken together as low for convenience.

## **CHAPTER FOUR: Presentations and Interpretations of Data**

### **4.1 Characteristics of the Respondents**

As it has been indicated in the methodology section a 15 pages questionnaire with 39 closed-ended and 14 open-ended items was prepared using two different approaches for two different categories. One is for adult literacy program facilitators (teachers); and the other is for education officials at different levels (Woreda, Zone, and Region). 31 copies of questionnaires were distributed to 31 (25 Male and 6 Female) adult literacy program facilitators; and 24 copies of questionnaire were distributed to 24 (20 Male and 4 female) education officials at different levels.

However, 27 (87.1%) of the questionnaires distributed to adult literacy program facilitators; and 22 (91.67%) of the questionnaires distributed to education officials at different levels were filled and returned. In other words, 21 (84%) male and 6 (100%) female adult literacy program facilitators; and 19 (95.24%) male and 3 (75%) female education officials at different levels returned the questionnaire to the researcher. In short, 40 (81.63%) male and 9 (90%) female respondents filled and returned the questionnaire.

In addition to the questionnaires, interviews were conducted with three categories of respondents; the adult literacy program facilitators, education officials at different levels and adult literacy program participants. That is, 18 interview questions for 6 (5 male and 1 female) adult literacy program facilitators; 8 interview questions for 6 (4 male and 2 female) education officials at different levels; and 7 interview questions for 9 (6 male and 3 female) adult literacy program participants were used and their responses were

triangulated with the quantitative data obtained through the questionnaire where appropriate and necessary.

Furthermore, the researcher employed observation checklist. Finally, the data obtained through these instruments were tallied, tabulated, analyzed and interpreted in the context of factors affecting participation of adults in literacy programs to make the findings as clear as possible.

**Table1:** Characteristics of the Respondents by Geographical location, Sex, Age, Marital status, Service year in teaching adults, and Work Experience

(i) Geographical Location and Sex

Items and options	ALPF				EO				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sex	21	77.80	6	22.20	19	86.36	3	13.64	40	81.63	9	18.37
Geographical location												
Ada'a	7	58.33	5	41.67	3	75.00	1	25	10	20.41	6	12.24
Adama	9	100	-	-	2	66.67	1	33.33	11	22.45	1	2.04
Fantalle	-	-	-	-	4	100	-	-	4	8.16	-	-
Gimbichu	5	83.33	1	16.67	4	100	-	-	9	18.37	1	2.04
Zone	-	-	-	-	4	100	-	-	4	8.16	-	-
Region	-	-	-	-	3	100	-	-	3	6.12	-	-
Total	21	77.78	6	22.22	20	90.90	2	9.09	41	83.67	8	16.33

It is indicated in Table 1(i) that, 42 (85.71%) of the respondents were from adult literacy program facilitators and woreda education officials, and 7 (14.29%) of the respondents were from zone education desk and Regional Education Bureau. This indicates that 85.71% of the data sources of the questionnaire were those who were very near to the issue.

(ii) Service Year and Work Experience

Items and options	ALPF				EO				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Service year												
1-5 yrs	15	55.56	5	18.52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6-10 yrs	4	14.81	1	3.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
11-15 yrs	1	3.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16-20 yrs	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above 20 yrs	1	3.70	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Median service	5.67		4.83									
Work experience												
1-10 yrs	-	-	-	-	3	13.64	1	4.55	-	-	-	-
11-20 yrs	-	-	-	-	12	54.55	2	9.09	-	-	-	-
21-30 yrs	-	-	-	-	3	13.64	-	-	-	-	-	-
Above 31 yrs	-	-	-	-	1	4.55	-	-	-	-	-	-
Median work experience	-				17.42		13					

Table 1 (ii) indicates that, the average (median) service of ALPFs in teaching adults was 5.25 years. That means they have average experience in teaching adults. And also, the average (medium) work experience of the EO was 15.21 years. This indicates that the EOs have long work experience so that they can provide reliable information.

(iii) Age and Marital Status

Items and options	ALPF				EO				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Age												
20-30 yrs	18	66.67	6	22.22	3	13.64	2	9.09	21	42.86	8	16.33
31-40 yrs	2	7.41	-	-	10	45.45	1	4.55	12	24.49	1	2.04
41 and above	1	3.70	-	-	6	27.27	-	-	7	14.29	-	-
Total	21	77.78	6	22.22	19	86.36	3	13.64	40	81.63	9	18.37
Median age	26.57		25		37.84		29.67					
Marital Status												
Single	7	25.93	3	11.11	2	9.09	1	4.55	9	18.37	4	8.16
Married	14	51.85	3	11.11	17	77.27	2	9.09	31	63.27	5	10.20
Divorced	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	21	77.78	6	22.22	19	86.36	3	13.64	40	81.63	9	18.37

Table 1 (iii) shows that the average age of ALPFs was 25.79 years; and that of EOs was 33.76 years. This indicates that the ALPF are under age 30, and EO is above age of 30. And also, 40 (81.63%) of the respondents were male and 9 (18.37%) were females. This indicates that more of the data were collected from males.

#### 4.2 Andragogical Issues to be considered in the Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs

Knowles, Holton and Swanson (1998: 64) stated, 'if adult learners can discover the gap between where they are now and where they want to be, they will become more conscious of their "need to know" new knowledge and skills'. So the interest to learn for

adults is basic. Accordingly, ALPF were asked how they could rate the interest of adults in literacy programs. The following table summarizes the results of the respondents. In the table, the responses were calculated using the frequency count and ranked.

**Table2:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on the Level of Interest of Adult Learners in Literacy Programs

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Very high	5	19.23	1	3.85	6	23.08
High	1	3.85	2	7.69	3	11.54
Average (medium)	8	30.77	1	3.85	9	34.62
Low	3	11.54	2	7.69	5	19.23
Very low	3	11.54	-	-	3	11.54

ALPF = Adult Literacy Program Facilitators

As it is already indicated above, it was intended to see the degree of interest of adults to participate in literacy programs.

Table 2 indicates that the interest of adults to participate in literacy programs is not low; it is average (medium) as it is indicated by 34.62% of the respondents. Moreover, 34.62% of the respondents indicated the interest of adult literacy program participants to participate in literacy programs is high. And also, 30.77% of the respondents indicated that the interest of the adult literacy program participants to participate in literacy programs was low.

Regarding the learners' interest in participating in literacy program; 66.67% (Male= 50%, Female= 16.67%) of the adult literacy program facilitators reported that it was low; but 33.33% (Male= 33.33%) indicated that the interest was high.

This implies that, there is no problem on the interest of the adults in participating in literacy programs; it is promising.

### 4.3 What Motivates Adults to Participate in Literacy Programs?

Regarding the motivation to learn for adults; Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998: 68) have stated that ‘even though adults can be motivated by external factors, they are more motivated to learn by internal pressures, such as the desire for increased job satisfaction, self-esteem and quality of life issues’. Thus, an issue that motivates adults to attend literacy programs is assessed. Accordingly, ALPF were asked to identify what motivates adults to attend literacy programs. The following table summarizes the result of the respondents. In the table the responses were calculated using the frequency count and ranked.

**Table 3:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators’ Responses on What Motivates Adults to Attend Literacy Programs

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
To learn to read and write	16	31.37	6	11.76	22	43.13
To gain knowledge and skills	17	33.33	4	7.84	21	41.17
To help children with school work	7	13.73	1	1.96	8	15.69

*The total number of the responses is greater than the sample size because each respondent gave more than one answer for each item.*

As it is indicated above, it was intended to see the factors that motivate adults to attend literacy programs. The above table (Table 3) indicates that what mainly motivates adults to attend literacy programs was to learn to read and write (43.13%) and very nearly to gain knowledge and skills (41.17%). The result of the above table

indicates that the adults attend the literacy programs mainly to learn to read and write; and to gain knowledge and skills. Regarding this issue, the researcher interviewed one of the adult literacy program participants, Dirriba, who said the following:

"We are victims of illiteracy, we couldn't write and read, even our names; and we are motivated to attend the literacy program mainly to read and write..."(April 10, 2010). The finding of this table confirms what was stated in the literature review.

#### 4.4 The Trends of Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs

The trends of participation of adults in literacy programs; whether it is increasing or decreasing poses questions to know what is behind this trend. Thus, the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs is assessed. Accordingly, ALPF and EO were asked how they could evaluate the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs. The following table summarizes the result of the respondents. In the table responses were calculated using the frequency count.

**Table 4:** Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' and Education Officials' Responses on the Trend of Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs

Item	Responses											
	ALPF						EO					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Increasing	9	34.62	3	11.54	12	46.16	3	13.64	-	-	3	13.64
Decreasing	10	38.46	3	11.54	13	50	13	59.09	3	13.64	16	72.73
No change	1	3.85	-	-	1	3.85	3	13.64	-	-	3	13.64

*EO- Education Officials*

Table 4 shows that 50% of the respondents of adult literacy program facilitators; and 72.73% of the respondents of the education officials indicated that the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs was decreasing.

Regarding the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs all the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators; and 83.33% (M= 50%, F= 33.33%) of the education officials indicated that the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs was decreasing. And also from the personal data collected the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs was decreasing; in some areas e.g. in Fentalle Woreda there were 31 adult literacy centers that had been built by Goal Ethiopia (an NGO) but only two centers were functioning; and the rest were closed; and even these centers were not functioning in practical terms. According to data obtained from the Woreda education office, there were 1322 (M =899, F= 423) adults participating in adult literacy programs in 2001 E.C; and 233 (M= 159, F= 74) adults were participating in literacy programs in 2002 E.C. In Adama Woreda, among the three centers where adult literacy was said to be "functioning"; in Dawaro 92 (M= 53, F= 39) adults; in Boqoji 71 (M= 34, F= 37) adults; and in Bashule 66 (M= 39, F= 27) adults had been registered; however, no adult was participating. In Ada'a, three centers were said to be "functioning", i.e. Dirre Shokii, Bakkajjoo, and Dirree; and in Dirree Shokii 25 (M= 24, F= 1) adults; in Bakkajjoo 7(M= 7, F= -) adults; and in Dirree 35 (M= 35, F= -) adults and this number was 69 in 2001 E.C. were registered and no adult was participating.

In Gimbichu the data obtained from Woreda education office shows that 2470 (M= 1682, F= 788) adults had been registered to attend the literacy program and no adult was participating.

This implies that the data of adult literacy program reported to education structures were nominal data.

**Table 5:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on the Participation Rate of Women in Adult Literacy Programs

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Very low	13	50	3	11.54	16	61.54
Low	2	7.69	1	3.85	3	11.54
Average	4	15.38	2	7.69	6	23.07
High	1	3.85	-	-	1	3.85
Very high	1	3.85	-	-	1	3.85

Table 5 shows that 73.08% of the respondents indicated that the rate of participation of women in adult literacy programs was low.

Regarding the rate of participation of women in adult literacy programs all the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that the participation of women in adult literacy programs was low and it was nil in some areas. Regarding this issue interview was conducted with one of adult literacy program facilitators, Bontu, and she said the following:

"The participation of women in adult literacy programs is low; since women are occupied with domestic duties..."(March 26, 2010).

The results of the questionnaire (Table 5) and the interview indicate that no attention was given to the participation of women in literacy programs.

## **4.5 Factors Affecting Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs**

### **4.5.1 Andragogical Factors**

#### **1) Delivery of Induction Training**

In teaching adults adult learning principles are basic. As Andragogy is the art and science of helping adults to learn, the adult literacy program facilitator is expected to have some basic concepts of adult learning and adult teaching. So, training of facilitators is paramount. Thus, the delivery of training to adult literacy program facilitators is assessed. Accordingly, ALPF were asked whether they have got induction training on methods and principles of teaching adults.

Regarding the provision of induction training on methods and principles of teaching adults, 4 (M= 3, F= 1); i.e.15.39% said 'Yes', and 22 (M= 17, F= 5); i.e. 84.61% indicated that there was no induction training on methods and principles of teaching adults given to ALPF.

The interview conducted with the adult literacy program facilitators also indicated that they didn't receive any induction training. For example, Chala, a facilitator of adult literacy program said:

"No induction training was provided for us even though it was very necessary to have the training as beginners" (March 20, 2010).

This implies that, the adult literacy program facilitators did not get any induction training on methods and principles of teaching adults, which is different from teaching children.

## **2) Delivery of Textbooks**

Textbooks serve as facilitating agents in any education system. The important instrument in teaching-learning activity next to the teacher (facilitator) is the textbook. Textbooks are very important to work the home works, group works, reading further in the free time of the learner. Thus, the delivery of textbooks for adult literacy program participants (learners) is assessed. Accordingly, ALPF were asked whether the literacy centers provide textbooks to adult learners. Among the ALPF respondents 14 (M= 13, F= 1); i.e. 51.85% indicated that there was delivery of textbooks to adult learners; and 13 (M= 8, F= 5); i.e. 48.15% indicated that there was no delivery of textbooks to adult learners.

This implies that, the education structures were supplying (providing) the textbooks to adult learners, so there is no problem for adult learners to get reading textbooks.

### **2.1) Textbook to Participant Ratio**

The distribution of textbooks to learners is another important issue to be considered. Accordingly, ALPF were asked to indicate the textbook to participant ratio. The following table summarizes the result of the responses. In the table the responses were calculated using the frequency count.

**Table 6:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on the Textbook to Participant Ratio on the Average

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
a. 1:1	7	50	-	-	7	50
b. 1:2	4	28.57	-	-	4	28.57
c. 1:3	1	7.14	1	7.14	2	14.28
d. 1:4	1	7.14	-	-	1	7.14

Table 6 shows that 50% of the facilitators indicated that the textbook to participant ratio was 1:1; and this is according to the standard. However, 50% of the remaining facilitators asserted that the textbook to participant ratio is not 1:1.

Regarding this, the researcher interviewed one of the woreda education officials, Kassahun, who said the following: "The textbook to participant ratio is up to the standard, meaning, it is almost 1to 1" (April 8, 2010). This implies that it was more likely that there was no lack of textbooks for participants of adult literacy program.

### **3) Duration of the Literacy Program**

The duration or the time given to the literacy program is basically to complete the curriculum provided according to the given time delivering the necessary knowledge and skills. So, the ALPF were asked to indicate the duration of the literacy program. Table 7 summarizes the result of the responses. In the table the responses were calculated using the frequency count.

**Table 7:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on the Duration of the Literacy Program

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
About 3 months	9	36	-	-	9	36
4-5 months	3	12	2	8	5	20
6 months	4	16	2	8	6	24
> 6 months	4	16	1	4	5	20

Table 7 shows that 36% of the respondents indicated that the duration to conduct the literacy program was about 3 months; 24% of the respondents indicated that the duration (length of time) to conduct the literacy program was 6 months; 20% of the respondents indicated the duration to conduct literacy program was 4-5 months; and 20% of the respondents also indicated the duration to conduct the literacy program was more than 6 months.

Regarding the various duration of the literacy programs, that is days in a week; hours in a day; and period in a year, the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators responded in the following manner:

*Regarding the days in a week 50% indicated "no fixed time";*

*16.67% indicated "four days per week"; 16.67% indicated "three*

*days in a week"; and 16.67% indicated "two days in a week".*

*Regarding the number of hours in a day 50% indicated "no fixed*

*time"; 33.33% indicated "2-3 hours in a day"; and 16.67%*

*indicated "one and half hours in a day". Regarding the duration of literacy program in a year 66.67% indicated "situational (conditional)"; 16.67% indicated "four months (February- May)"; and 16.67% indicated that "two months per year".*

This implies that, the duration of the literacy program was not uniform.

#### **4) Delivery of a Test or Examination**

Test or examination is one of the instruments to evaluate the achievement of the learners and the outcome of the teaching-learning program. The delivery of test or examination to literacy program participants is assessed. Thus, the ALPF were asked to indicate whether test or examination was given to literacy program participants. Among the respondents 20 (M= 15, F= 5); i.e. 76.92% of the respondents indicated that, there was a test or an examination given to adult literacy program participants. However, 6 (M= 5, F= 1); i.e. 23.08% of the respondents indicated that there was no test or examination given to adult literacy program participants.

This implies that, there was an assessment (evaluation) of the achievement of the adult learners and the outcome of the program.

#### **4.1) Time of Delivery of a Test or an Examination**

The time the test or examination was given to the learners shows the type of assessment or evaluation of the learners. Based on the availability of a test or examination given to literacy program participants; the time the test or examination is given is assessed. Thus, the ALPF were asked to indicate when the test or examination was given to literacy program participants. The table below summarizes

the result of the responses. In the table the responses were calculated using the frequency count.

**Table 8:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on the Time of Delivery of a Test or Examination to Literacy Program Participants

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
At the mid of the program	-	-	-	-	-	-
At any time in the program duration	14	66.67	5	23.81	19	95
At the end of the program duration	1	5	-	-	1	5

Table 8 suggested that 95% of the respondents showed that the test or examination given to literacy program participants was delivered at any time in the program duration. However, 5% of the respondents said that the test or examination given to literacy program participants was delivered at the end of the program duration. This implies that, there was no fixed time for the delivery of a test or examination to literacy program participants.

### 5) Delivery of Certificates

Certificate is used as evidence which shows a successful completion of a certain program. In the above analysis it is indicated that there is a time allocated to the program; there is an examination given to the adult literacy program participants. So, the researcher wanted to know whether there was a certificate for adult literacy program participants after their completion of the program. Thus, the ALPF were asked to indicate whether there was certification of literacy program participants after

they completed the program or not. Among the respondents, 21 (M= 16, F= 5); i.e. 77.78% of the respondents indicated that there was a certificate given to adult literacy program participants after they completed the program; and 6 (M= 5, F= 1); i.e. 22.22% of the respondents depicted that there was no certificate given to the literacy program participants after they completed the program. Regarding this, the researcher interviewed one of the woreda education officials, Jaleta, who said: "There is certification at the end of the program. Successful participants get certificates"(April 5, 2010).

#### **6) Attendance of the Participants**

The attendance of the literacy program participants is crucial for the success and even for the existence of the program. What type of attendance is the most important point to be considered? So, whether the participants are attending the program regularly or not is assessed. Thus, the ALPF were asked to indicate whether the literacy program participants are attending the program regularly or not. Among the respondents, 23 (M= 19, F= 4); i.e. 92% of the respondents indicated that the adult literacy program participants did not attend the literacy program regularly. However, 2(M= 1, F= 1); i.e. 8% of the respondents indicated that the adult literacy program participants attended the program regularly. The researcher asked two of the facilitators to show him the attendance sheet they used. It was clear from the attendance sheet that most of the participants were not attended regularly.

Regarding this, the researcher interviewed one of the adult literacy program participants, Gurmu, who said the following:

"We know that attending in literacy programs regularly is very important. Since we are farmers; we are occupied with farming activities; and we couldn't attend the program regularly" (March 25, 2010).

### **7) Use of Learning Classes**

The organization and use of the classes in which adult literacy program takes place is paramount in creating conducive environment for the teaching learning activities. So, the ALPF were asked to indicate whether they used separate classes for male and female learners or not. Among the respondents, 24 (M= 18, F= 6); i.e. 96% of the respondents stated that there was no use of separate classes for male and female learners. However, 1(M= 1, F= -); i.e. 4% of the respondent indicated that separate classes were used for male and female learners.

Regarding the use of separate classes for male and female adult literacy program participants all the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that the same classes are used in teaching male and female adult literacy program participants.

Regarding the use of separate or the same classes; the negative aspects of using the same classes a total of 15 (M= 12, F= 3); 55.56% of the total respondents of adult literacy program facilitators responded to this particular question and forwarded the following negative aspects of using the same classes:

- It was difficult to teach about family planning and reproductive issues. e.g., about safe sex, and gender equality.
- Females were afraid to express their ideas when they were with males.

- The female learners may be afraid to participate in the class room; and females' participation was less frequent in learning- teaching and attending the classes than that of males.
- There was a problem of shyness between female and male learners.
- Females were afraid sitting with males.
- Participation of the males dominated in the classroom.

Regarding the use of the same classes for male and female adult learners in the literacy program all the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that "no complaint". Regarding this, the researcher interviewed one of the adult literacy program participants, Marge, who said: "We are attending the program in the same classes with males, and we are not comfortable in sitting with males in the same classes..." (March 26, 2010).

This implies that, arranging separate classes for male and female learners is crucial in literacy programs.

### **8) The Relevance of the Curriculum**

The most important characteristics of Non- Formal Education program is its greater and more direct relevance of its curriculum to the educational needs and aspirations of the learners. So, the relevance of the curriculum was assessed. Thus, Education Officials were asked to indicate the level of relevance of the curriculum. Table 9 summarizes the result of the responses. In the table the responses were calculated using the frequency count.

**Table9:** The Education Officials' Responses on Relevance of the Curriculum.

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Very high	2	9.09	-	-	2	9.09
High	2	9.09	-	-	2	9.09
Average	7	31.82	-	-	7	31.82
Low	8	36.36	3	13.64	11	50
Very low	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 9 shows that 50% of the respondents indicated that the relevance of the curriculum for adult literacy program was low; and 31.82% showed that it was average. That is 81.82% of the respondents indicated that the relevance of the curriculum was average and below average.

Regarding the relevance of the curriculum of the literacy program 33.33% (M= 16.67%, F= 16.67%) of the education officials reported that the curriculum is not relevant; 33.33% (M= 33.33%, F=0.00%) indicated that they are not sure about the relevance of the curriculum; and 33.33% (M= 16.67%, F= 16.66%) indicated that the curriculum was relevant.

Regarding the relevance of the curriculum the researcher tried to see some of the textbooks of adult literacy programs, and observed that their preparation lacks attention and their relevance too.

The implications of the above analysis is , the curriculum of the adult literacy program was not inline with the participants' (learners') needs and aspirations, which could be a cause for dropout.

### **9) Age-limits of the Adult Participants**

Studies show that age is one of the important issues to be considered in adult literacy programs. So, the age-limits of the majority of the adult literacy program participants was assessed. Thus, the adult literacy program facilitators were asked to indicate the age-

limits of the majority of adult literacy program participants. Table 10 summarizes the result of the responses. In the table the responses were calculated using frequency count.

**Table 10:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on Age-limits of the Adult Literacy Program Participants

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
15-29 yrs	5	23.81	1	4.76	6	28.57
30-45 yrs	13	61.90	1	4.76	14	66.67
>45 yrs	-	-	1	4.76	1	4.76

Table 10 shows that 66.67% of the adult literacy program facilitators' responses indicated that the age-limits of the majority of adult literacy program participants were 30-45 years. Regarding the age-limits of the adult literacy program participants 50% (M= 50%, F= 0.00%) of the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that all age-groups were participating; 33.33% (M= 33.33%, F= 0.00%) indicated age-limits of 15-40 years were participating; and 16.67% (M=0, F= 16.67%) indicated that age-limits of below 18 years were participating in the literacy program.

This implies that, the majority of the participants were the economically active human power, who plays a decisive role to increase productivity by proper utilization of land and other material resources.

#### 4.5.2 Administrative Factors

The administrative issues in this case are mainly: the time of the literacy program delivery, the location of the literacy centers, supervision, and community participation.

Among the ALPF respondents, 15 (M= 12, F= 3); i.e. 57.69% of the respondents indicated that the time (the day, hour, and month) in which the literacy program was delivered was convenient for literacy program participants. So, there was no problem in

the adjustment of time. And 15 (M= 8, F= 3); i.e. 42.31% of the respondents indicated that the time (the day, hour, and month) in which literacy program was provided was not convenient for literacy program participants.

Regarding the convenience of the time (the day, hour, and month) for literacy program participants all the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that the time was convenient.

From this analysis it could be implied that, there was no problem on the adjustment of the time for literacy program participants.

Regarding the suitability of the location of the literacy centers; 11 (M= 11, F= -); i.e. 56% of the respondents indicated that the location of the literacy centers was not suitable for adult learners to participate in the literacy program, and 14 (M= 8, F= 6); i.e. 44% indicated that the location of the literacy centers was suitable for adult learners to participate in the literacy programs.

Regarding the suitability of the literacy centers for adult literacy participants all the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that the location of the literacy centers were suitable for adult literacy participants.

From these analyses it can be implied that, the adult literacy program centers were not accessible to adult learners.

The Non- Formal Education in general and literacy program in particular requires follow-up (supervision) and monitoring. So, the availability of supervision to the literacy program centers was assessed. Thus, the ALPF and EO were asked to indicate whether there is supervision to literacy program centers by Education Officials or not. The table

below summarizes the result of the responses. In the table the responses were calculated using the frequency count.

**Table11:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' and Education Officials' Responses on Supervision of the Literacy Centers

Item	Responses											
	ALPF						EO					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	6	22.22	2	7.41	8	29.63	14	63.64	2	9.09	16	72.73
No	15	55.56	4	14.81	19	70.37	5	22.73	-	-	5	22.73
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4.55	1	4.55

It has been indicated in Table11 that 70.37% of the adult literacy program facilitators' respondents showed that there is no any follow-up or supervision to the adult literacy program centers by education officials. In this table 72.73% of the respondents of the education officials indicated that there is follow-up or supervision to adult literacy program centers by education officials.

Regarding the supervision or follow-up to the literacy centers 50% (M= 50%, F= 0.00%) of the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators; and 50% (M= 33.33%, F= 16.67%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that there is supervision or follow-up by education officials to adult literacy program centers. And 50% (M= 33.33%, F=16.67%) of the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators; and 50% (M= 33.33%, F= 16.67%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that there is no supervision or follow-up by education officials to the literacy centers. The researcher observed from unstructured interview with some education officials that there is no supervision or follow-up specific to adult literacy programs but they put it on their supervision checklist as one of the components of educational supervision and on their way to other educational issues; and

this is mainly done by CRC supervisors. This implies that, much attention was not given to the program.

**Table12:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators; and Education Officials' Responses on the Frequency of the Follow-up or Supervision to the Literacy centers

Item	Responses											
	ALPF						EO					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Monthly	2	25	-	-	2	25	1	6.25	2	12.5	3	18.75
Quarterly	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	43.75	-	-	7	43.75
As they want	4	50	2	25	6	75	6	37.50	-	-	6	37.50

It has been indicated in table12 that; 75% of the respondents of the adult literacy program facilitators who said "Yes" in the availability of follow-up or supervision to the adult literacy program centers indicated that the education officials conduct supervision as they want. And 43.75% of the respondents of education officials who said "Yes" in the availability of supervision to adult literacy centers indicated that the supervision is conducted quarterly; and 37.50% indicated "as they want". That is, 56.25% of the EO respondents indicated that the supervision is not quarterly.

Regarding the participation of community in the construction of literacy centers; 15 (M= 12, F= 3); i.e. 62.5% of the ALPF respondents indicated that there was community participation in the construction of the literacy centers, and 9 (M= 7, F= 2); i.e. 37.50% of ALPF indicated that there was no community participation in the construction of literacy centers. This implies that, there was no problem in mobilizing community in the construction of literacy program centers.

**Table 13:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on the Type of Community Participation in the Construction of Literacy Centers

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
By contributing money	6	30	2	10	8	40
By contributing labor	10	50	2	10	12	60

The number of respondents is greater than the number who said "Yes", because there are respondents who responded more than one times.

Table13 shows that 60% of the respondents indicated that the local community participates in the construction of the adult literacy program centers by contributing labor. So, there was a commitment on the side of the community.

**Table14:** The Education Officials' Responses on the Existence of a responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the Education structure

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	13	59.09	3	13.64	16	72.73
No	6	27.27	-	-	6	27.27
Not sure	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table14 shows that 72.73% of the respondents indicated that there is a responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the educational structure.

Regarding this issue, 50% (M= 16.67%, F= 33.33%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that there is a responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the educational structure and its status is "performer". And 50% (M= 50%, F= 0.00%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that there is no responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the educational structure. Regarding this issue the

researcher tried to see the BPR document of OEB and observed that; it is put as one of the duties of Education support providing work process; which is run by performers.

**Table15:** The Education Officials' Responses on the Status of a Responsible Body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the Education structure

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Department	2	13.33	1	6.67	3	20
Taskforce	-	-	1	6.67	1	6.67
Panel	-	-	-	-	-	-
Focal person	10	66.67	1	6.67	11	73.34

Table15 shows that 73.34% of the respondents indicated that the responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the education structure exists in the focal person status. And the researcher tried to identify the status of the responsible organ and is "performer" according to the BPR.

**Table16:** The Education Officials' Responses on the availability or existence of selection criteria for Adult Literacy Program Facilitators

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	14	63.64	1	4.55	15	68.19
No	4	18.18	2	9.09	6	27.27
Not sure	1	4.55	-	-	1	4.55

Table16 shows that 68.19% of the respondents indicated that there are selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators.

Regarding the availability (existence) of selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators 50% (M= 33.33%, F= 16.67%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that there is no selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators. And 33.33% (M= 16.67%, F= 16.67%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that they are not sure of the existence of the selection criteria; and 16.67% (M= 16.67%, F= 0.00%) indicated that there is selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators.

In addition to this the researcher tried to assess the documents whether there is facilitators' selection criterion and found that there is selection criteria for ALPF in Non Formal Education Programs strategy implementation guideline; published by the Regional Education Bureau.

**Table17:** The Education Officials' Responses on the Body that set the Selection Criteria for Adult Literacy Program Facilitators

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Woreda Education Office	5	33.33	-	-	5	33.33
Zone Education Desk	1	6.67	-	-	1	6.67
Regional Education Bureau	7	46.67	-	-	7	46.67
Adult literacy center	1	6.67	1	6.67	2	13.34

Table17 shows that 46.67% of the respondents indicated that the selection criterion for adult literacy program facilitators is set by Regional Education Bureau. This indicates that, there was a uniform selection criterion across the region.

**Table18:** The Education Officials’ Responses on the Existence of Formulated Adult Education Strategy in the Region

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Yes	11	50	2	9.09	13	59.09
No	6	27.27	1	4.55	7	31.82
Not sure	2	9.09	-	-	2	9.09

Table18 shows that 59.09% of the respondents indicated that there is regional adult education strategy. This indicates that, there was no problem in formulating strategies and regulations.

#### 4.5.3 Motivational Factors

Salary is one of the motivating factors for adult literacy program facilitators. In this case the existence of payment or salary to adult literacy program facilitators was assessed.

Thus, the Education Officials were asked to indicate whether there was salary or payment for ALPF. Among the respondents; 16 (M= 13, F= 3); i.e. 69.57% of the respondents indicated that there was no any payment for adult literacy program facilitators, and 7 (M= 7, F= -); i.e. 30.43% indicated there was a payment or salary for ALPF.

Regarding the payment or salary (incentive) for adult literacy program facilitators 83.33% (M= 50%, F= 33.33%) of the interviewed education officials indicated that there was no any payment or incentive for adult literacy program facilitators.

This implies that, adult literacy program facilitators were not provided with incentives or payments which could be a reason for dropout of the program participants.

Regarding the alternatives to motivate the facilitators of the adult literacy programs a total of 12 (N= 11, F= 1); 54.55% of the total respondents of education officials responded to this particular question and forwarded the following:

- giving experience certificates which can be used for different competitions.
- providing certificates for their free service (for the service rendered).
- giving awards for their effective works.
- giving priority to compete for regular teaching profession basically for primary education teachers.

## 4.5.4 General Issues

### 4.5.4.1 What is Literacy?

The adult literacy program facilitators; and education officials were asked to write the meaning of literacy for them. Accordingly; a total of 20 (M= 18, F= 2); 74.07% of the total respondents of adult literacy program facilitators responded to this particular question and forwarded various definitions to literacy. Among this number, 20% (M= 15%, F= 5%) responded or put the meaning of literacy very differently or opposite to the ordinary meaning of literacy. To quote some; "is the person who can not read and write..."; "Literacy is an enemy, it must be eradicated". On the other hand 80% (M= 70%, F= 10%) of the respondents responded or put the meaning of literacy in related terms with the ordinary meaning of or definition of literacy. To quote some; "it is the ability to read and write"; "is the ability, the skill and knowledge to communicate with others in expressing ideas in a written form".

And also a total of 17 (M= 15, F= 2); 77.27% of the total respondents of education officials responded to this particular question and forwarded various definitions to the term literacy. Among this number 35.29% (M= 35.29%) responded or put the meaning of literacy very differently or opposite to the ordinary meaning of literacy. To quote some; "is lack of knowledge about ones environment, usage of natural resources, lack of information to cope-up with globalization"; "is lack of awareness in economical, social and political situation, plus not writing and reading". On the other hand 64.71% (M= 52.94%, F= 11.76%) of the respondents responded or put the meaning of literacy in related terms with the ordinary meaning of or definition of literacy. To quote some; "is

acquiring numeracy skill, writing, reading and basic knowledge"; "is the ability to write and read certain reading materials in any language and understanding its idea".

From the above analyses it can be implied that, the ALPF had a better understanding of literacy than EO.

#### 4.5.4.2 Literacy: A right or Obligation

**Table19:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators; and Education Officials' Responses on Whether Literacy is a Right or an Obligation

Item	Responses											
	ALPF						EO					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Right	15	60	2	8	17	68	14	60.87	2	8.69	16	69.57
Obligation	5	20	1	4	6	24	5	21.74	-	-	5	21.74
Don't know	-	-	2	8	2	8	1	4.35	1	4.35	2	8.69

Table 19 shows that 68% of the respondents of adult literacy program facilitators; and 69.57% of the education officials indicated that literacy is a right.

Regarding whether literacy is a right or an obligation; 66.67% of the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators reported that literacy is an obligation.

This implies that, still there is a misconception whether literacy is a right or an obligation among the ALPF and EO, but literacy is a fundamental human right.

#### 4.5.4.3 Construction of Adult Literacy Program centers

**Table20:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators' Responses on who has Constructed Adult Literacy Centers

Item	Responses					
	Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
CRC Supervisors and farmers' association leaders	1	5.26	-	-	1	5.26
The local community	7	36.84	1	5.26	8	42.10
The formal school teachers	2	10.53	-	-	2	10.53
Woreda education office	4	21.05	2	10.53	6	31.58
No constructed literacy center	2	10.53	-	-	2	10.53

Table20 shows that 42.10% of the respondents indicated that the adult literacy program centers are constructed by the local community; and 31.58% of the respondents also indicated that the centers are constructed by Woreda Education Office.

This implies that, most of the literacy program centers were constructed by the local community.

#### 4.5.4.4 Reasons for Decreasing Trend of Participation of Adults in Literacy

##### Programs

In table 4 it has been indicated that the number of adults participating in literacy programs is decreasing. The possible reasons for this decreasing trend should be addressed by this study.

**Table 21: The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators, and Education Officials Responses on Reasons for the Decreasing Trend of Adult Literacy Program Participants**

Items and options	Responses																					
	ALPF										EO											
	5		4		3		2		1		Total	5		4		3		2		1		Total
	f	R	f	R	f	R	f	R	f	R		f	R	f	R	f	R	f	R	f	R	
Lack of time	3	15	4	16	6	18	1	2	-	-	51	2	10	7	28	5	15	3	6	2	2	61
Lack of interest in learning	1	5	2	4	5	15	3	6	4	4	38	5	25	6	24	6	18	3	6	1	1	74
Lack of appropriateness of the program	1	5	4	16	3	9	9	18	1	1	49	2	10	5	20	6	18	4	8	3	3	59
Lack of immediate benefit from the program	3	15	2	8	4	12	2	4	4	4	43	7	35	4	16	2	6	6	12	1	1	70
Distance of the literacy center	4	20	5	20	-	-	5	10	1	1	51	2	10	-	-	8	24	7	14	4	4	52
Health problems	-	-	2	8	3	9	2	4	8	8	29	-	-	1	4	2	6	3	6	14	14	30
Migration in search of work	5	25	-	-	1	3	5	10	4	4	42	3	15	5	20	3	9	5	10	5	5	59
Need to harvest	6	30	4	16	2	6	3	6	-	-	58	8	40	4	16	5	15	2	4	2	2	77
Lack of awareness	8	40	2	8	3	9	-	-	2	2	59	6	30	1	4	5	15	6	12	2	2	63
Inconvenience of the time literacy program	-	-	3	12	7	21	4	8	-	-	41	2	10	2	8	7	21	5	10	4	4	53
Child care and domestic duties	5	25	4	16	5	15	1	2	-	-	58	8	40	3	12	9	27	1	2	-	-	81

In the table above: f - represents frequency, R- represents result; and Result = frequency x Value of the Rank.

Table 21 shows that the adult literacy program facilitators respondents put the possible reasons for decreasing trend of participation of adults in literacy programs in the sequence (order) that: Lack of awareness with 59 points; need to harvest, and childcare and domestic duties with 58 points; distance of the literacy centers, and lack of time with 51 points; lack of appropriateness of the program with 49 points; lack of immediate benefit from the program with 43 points; migration in search of work with 42 points; inconvenience of the time of the literacy program with 41 points; lack of interest in learning with 38 points; and health problems with 29 points. And this table also suggests that according to the education officials respondents: childcare and domestic duties with 81 points; need to harvest with 77 points; lack of interest in learning with 74 points; lack of immediate benefits from the program with 70 points; lack of awareness with 63 points; lack of time with 61 points; migration in search of work , and lack of appropriateness of the program with 59 points; inconvenience of the time of literacy programs with 53 points; distance of the literacy center with 52 points; and health problems with 30 points. Regarding the possible reasons for the decreasing trend of the number of adult literacy program participants of the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators; and education officials forwarded the following possible reasons:

- Because of draught and food problems; peoples move (migrate) from their living areas for survival.
- Lack of commitment by facilitators; since they are formal school teachers, there is a high work-load in the formal classes.
- Farming and harvesting time.

- Lack of immediate benefit from the program.
- Lack of awareness.
- Lack of interest to attend the literacy program.
- Lack of responsible (concerned) body that owns and runs the program. That is Adult and Non-Formal Education in general and the literacy program in particular and has no body responsible to plan, organize, coordinate, and manage.
- Less attention given to the program.
- Lack of political commitment similar to formal education.

#### **4.5.4.5 Measures to be taken to Increase the Participation of Adults in Literacy**

##### **Programs**

It has been indicated in the previous analyses of this study that the participation of adults in literacy programs in the study area was decreasing in an alarming rate. So, the measures to be taken to ameliorate this decreasing trend have to be addressed in this study. Thus, table 22 summarizes the responses corresponding to this issue.

**Table22:** The Adult Literacy Program Facilitators; and Education Officials’ Responses on Measures to be taken to Increase the Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs

Items and options	Responses											
	ALPF						EO					
	Male		Female		Total		Male		Female		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Use flexible time	11	16.18	1	1.47	12	17.65	16	23.19	-	-	16	23.19
Make the program relevant	12	17.65	3	4.41	15	22.06	14	20.29	1	1.45	15	21.74
Make the people aware of the importance (benefit) of adult literacy program	18	26.47	4	5.88	22	32.35	14	20.29	2	2.89	16	23.19
Make the literacy centers accessible to adult learners	7	10.29	1	1.47	8	11.76	10	14.49	1	1.45	11	15.94
Improve the quality of the program delivered	10	14.70	1	1.47	11	16.17	10	14.49	1	1.45	11	15.94

The number of responses is greater than the sample size; because each respondent responded more than ones for each item.

Table22 shows that the responses of ALPF on measures that should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs put in the sequence show that; make the people aware of the importance (benefit) of adult literacy program 32.35%; make the program (course) relevant 22.06%; use flexible time 17.65%; improve the quality of the program delivered; and make the literacy centers accessible to the adult learners 11.76%. And the responses of education officials on measures that should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs can be put in the sequence indicate that: use flexible time, and make people aware of the importance (benefit) of adult literacy program 23.19% each; make the program (courses) relevant 21.74%; make the literacy centers accessible to the adult learners, and improve the quality of the program delivered 15.94% each.

Regarding the measures that should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators; and education officials responded and forwarded the following:

- The program should have its own trained and employed facilitators.
- The program should be need -oriented.
- There has to be concerned (responsible) body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in general and adult literacy program in particular.
- There has to be continuous training for facilitators.
- There has to be continuous awareness creation activity.
- Attention has to be given by the government and stakeholders to the program.

- The preparation of the curriculum is regionally administered; rather it should be decentralized, that is, it should be area -oriented and situation-oriented.
- Resource has to be allocated to the program.
- There has to be employed facilitators with remunerations (payments); or the other option is using the formal school teachers with motivating incentives.
- The program has to be appropriate (relevant) to adult needs.
- The coordination and management of the program should be the duty and responsibility of the education sector.
- There should be commitment by political organs.
- There has to be coordination among stakeholders.
- Literacy should be mainstreamed.
- Activities regarding the adult and non-formal education should follow participatory approach; because top-down approach is dominating the program, i.e. the down (operational) part of the sector has no role.
- There has to be involvement of stakeholders; since it is left to the education sector only.
- The right professional (expert) should be assigned to the area in the educational structure.

#### **4.5.4.6 The Major Problems/Obstacles to the Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs**

Regarding the major problems that are obstacles (hindrance) to the participation of adults in literacy programs; a total of 16 (M= 15, F= 1) ; 59.26% of the total respondents of adult literacy program facilitators responded to this particular question and put the major problems. Accordingly;

- Lack of awareness of the literacy program facilitators.
- Lack of suitable classrooms, chairs.
- Lack of regular time attendance of the adult learners.
- Distance of the literacy centers.
- Lack of awareness about the benefit of literacy program participation.
- Lack of willingness and their attitude towards their age.
- Economic problems; they move to the markets everyday to get some money to feed their children, because they have many children.
- Lack of trained and employed facilitators.
- Poverty.
- Lack of time; since most of them are farmers they are occupied and they don't have time to attend the program regularly.
- Lack of immediate benefit from the program.
- Lack of suitability of the location of literacy centers.
- Lack of constructed literacy centers.
- Drought; they move to other areas in search of work.

Regarding the major problems that are obstacles to the participation of adults in literacy programs in their literacy program center the adult literacy program facilitators interviewed responded and forwarded the following major problems;

- Drought.
- Lack of drinking water.
- Lack of ownership of the program, i.e. the program has no its own facilitators, coordinator; and the formal school teachers lack commitment due to work-load in the formal school.
- Farming and harvesting time.
- Lack of immediate benefit from the program.
- Lack of continuous follow-up by the responsible organ.
- Lack of constructed literacy centers for the purpose of literacy program only.
- It is not used as a bridge to formal school.
- Lack of commitment by education office experts and officials.
- Lack of textbooks provided to the program; they are taught using the formal school textbooks.

#### **4.5.4.6.1 The Five Major Problems**

Regarding the five major problems which have impacts on the participation of adults in literacy programs; a total of 22 (M= 17, F= 5); 81.48% of the total respondents of adult literacy program facilitators responded to this particular question and put the five major problems in rank order. Accordingly:

1. Lack of time;
2. Lack of awareness;

3. Distance of the literacy center; and absence of responsible body for the issue including trained and employed facilitators specifically assigned to the program;
4. Lack of appropriateness of the program or lack of relevance of the curriculum; and
5. Lack of interest in learning; health problems; inaccessibility of the literacy center; and attitudes towards their age.

Regarding this issue; a total of 16 (M=14, F= 2); 72.73% of the total respondents of education officials responded to this particular question and put the five major problems in rank order. Accordingly:

1. Lack of awareness;
2. Lack of time;
3. Lack of resource including budget allocated to the program;
4. Absence of responsible body for the issue including trained and employed facilitators specifically assigned to the program; and lack of appropriateness or relevance of the program; and
5. Migration in search of work.

#### **4.5.4.6.2 Possible Solutions to the Major Problems/Obstacles to Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs**

Regarding the possible solutions to the major problems that are obstacle (hindrance) to participation of adults in literacy programs; a total of 20 (M=18, F= 2); 74.07% of the total respondents of adult literacy program facilitators responded to this particular question and forwarded possible solutions. Accordingly:

- Providing continuous training for facilitators.
- Construction of attractive (convenient) classrooms with the necessary facilities.
- Making the adult literacy centers accessible to the adult learners.
- There has to be continuous awareness creation activities.
- Use flexible time based on the need of the learners.
- There has to be trained and employed facilitator.
- There has to be coordination of stakeholders.
- There has to be concerned organ for the program.

Regarding the possible solutions to the major problems in literacy program center that are obstacle to the participation of adults in literacy programs in their literacy program center the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators forwarded the following possible solutions:

- The program should have an organ (facilitator and coordinator) directly concerned (responsible) to the issue.
- There has to be area-oriented and situation-based time schedule to run the program.
- There has to be continuous training for facilitators.
- There has to be continuous follow-up to make the program bridge to formal school.
- There has to be continuous follow-up or supervision by the education office experts and officials.
- Publishing textbooks to the program for each level.

- Providing certificates for adult learners after they completed the levels of the program.
- Making (constructing) the adult literacy program centers accessible to the adult learners.
- There has to be continuous awareness creation so that adult literacy program is mainstreamed.

Regarding the solutions to the five major problems which have impacts on participation of adults in literacy programs; a total of 20 (M= 16, F= 4); 74.07% of the total respondents of adult literacy program facilitators responded to this particular question and forwarded (suggested) the following possible solutions:

- There has to be a concerned body (organ) to the literacy program.
- There has to be continuous awareness creation activities.
- Trained literacy program facilitators should be employed.
- Arranging flexible time depending on the interest and feeling of the adult participants.
- Make the program relevant.
- Resource has to be allocated to the program.
- There has to be coordination of the stakeholders.
- Make the literacy centers accessible to the adult learners.

Regarding this issue; a total of 17 (M= 15, F= 2); 77.27% of the total respondents of education officials responded to this particular question and forwarded (suggested) the following possible solutions:

- There has to be continuous awareness creation activities.

- There has to be a sustainable coordination sectorally.
- There has to be political commitment of political leaders.
- Government and society should work together to make the program effective.
- Using favorable situations; such as flexible time based on the need of adult learners.
- Necessary resources including budget should be allocated to the program.
- There has to be trained and paid facilitators for the program; and the payment should be attractive.
- There must be a concerned body for the program.
- There has to be strong follow-up or supervision of the program.
- Making the literacy centers accessible to the adult learners (mobile literacy centers for pastoralist areas).
- Making the program appropriate or relevant (making the program learner need-based).
- Learning time should be short and flexible.

## **CHAPTER FIVE: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **5.1 Summary**

The purpose of the study was to identify factors affecting participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia Region; and forward possible solutions to the problems based on the findings. To this end, 70 respondents were used as sources of data. Purposive (judgmental), availability and random sampling techniques were used in this study. Instruments of data collection were questionnaires (open-ended and closed-ended items), semi-structured interviews, and observation checklist. Data were analyzed using frequency count and percentage. The analysis led to the following major findings:

1. The study revealed that the level of interest of adults to participate in literacy programs was not low; it was either medium (34.62%) or high (34.62%).
2. It was found out that adults were motivated to participate in literacy programs mainly; to learn to read and write (43.13%); and to gain knowledge and skills (41.17%).
3. The study indicated that the trend of participation of adults in literacy programs was decreasing from time to time; and the trend showed dramatic decreasing; and in many centers the literacy program was already dysfunctional.
4. The study indicated that 73.08% of ALPF respondents believed that the participation rate of women in literacy programs was low.

5. Regarding the Andragogical factors the study revealed that:
- There was a great problem on delivering induction training for adult literacy program facilitators; i.e. 84.61% of ALPF respondents indicated that there was no any induction training delivered to the facilitators.
  - There was no much problem on the delivery of the textbooks to adult literacy program participants; i.e. 51.85% of ALPF respondents indicated that there was delivery of textbooks to adult literacy program participants; and also 50% of ALPF respondents indicated that the textbook to participant ratio is 1:1, and 42.85% (28.85% + 14.28%) indicated the ratio is 1:2 to 1:3.
  - The duration for the delivery of the literacy program was about 3 months; as it is indicated by 36% of the ALPF respondents.
  - There was delivery of tests or examinations to literacy program participants as it was indicated by 76.92% of the ALPF respondents; and the test or examination is delivered at any time in the program duration as it was indicated by 95% of the ALPF respondents.
  - 77.78% of the ALPF respondents asserted that; the adult literacy program participants were provided with certificates after they completed the literacy programs.
  - The great majority (92%) of the ALPF respondents stated that the adult literacy program participants were not attending the literacy program regularly.
  - It is indicated by 96% of the adult literacy program facilitators who responded to the questionnaire; and all of the interviewed ALPF; the male and female

- adult literacy program participants use the same classes in attending the literacy programs.
- The negative aspects of using the same classes for male and female adult learners include the following: difficulty to teach about family planning and reproductive issues; females were afraid to express their ideas when they were with males, the female learners were afraid to participate in the classrooms, and this could lead to low participation of female in teaching-learning and attending the classes.
  - It has been indicated by 50% of EO respondents that the relevance of the curriculum was low; and 31.82% indicated that the relevance of the curriculum is average. So, 81.82% (50% + 31.82%) of the respondents indicated that the relevance of the curriculum is either average or low. And only 33.33% of the interviewed EO indicated that the curriculum is relevant; and 66.67% (33.33% + 33.33%) indicated that either the relevance of the curriculum is low or not sure of the relevance.
  - 66.67% of ALPF indicated that the age-range of the majority of the adult literacy program participants was 30-45 years; and 50% of the interviewed ALPF indicated all-age groups including children of age below 18 years were participating in literacy programs; and 33.33% indicated age-limits of 15-40 years were participating.

6. Regarding the Administrative factors:

- It has been indicated by 57.69% of ALPF respondents and all of the interviewed ALPF that the time (the day, hour, and month) in which the literacy program is delivered is convenient for literacy program participants.
- It is indicated by 56% of the ALPF respondents that the location of the literacy centers are not suitable for adult literacy program participants; and the interviewed adult literacy program facilitators indicated that the location of the literacy centers are suitable for adult literacy program participants.
- It has been indicated by 70.37% of adult literacy program facilitators; 50% of ALPF and 50% of EO indicated that there is no any supervision or follow-up to literacy program centers by education officials. And on the other hand, 72.73% of EO; 50% of ALPF, and 50% of EO interviewed indicated that there is supervision or follow-up to literacy program centers by education officials. However, the observation by the researcher indicated that there is no supervision specific to literacy program centers.
- Regarding the frequency of follow-up or supervision 75% of ALPF indicated that there was no fixed time; they come to the supervision at any time they wanted.
- The study indicated that 62.50% of ALPF respondents asserted that community was participating by contributing labor in the construction of literacy centers.
- 73.34% of the EO respondents indicated that the responsible organ or body for Adult and Non-Formal Education exists in the education structure in the "focal person" status. And the researcher identified that the status of the organ is "performer" according to the BPR.

- It was revealed that 68.19% of the EO respondents asserted that there were selection criteria for adult literacy program facilitators.
- 46.67% of EO respondents indicated that the selection criterion for adult literacy program facilitators was set by the Regional Education Bureau.

7. Regarding the Motivational factors:

- It was revealed that the majority (69.57%) of EO stated that there was no payment for adult literacy program facilitators.
- The study showed that the major motivating factor for ALPF were: getting certificates for their free services (for the service rendered); getting awards for their effective works; and giving priority to compete for regular teaching profession, basically for primary education teachers.

## 5.2 Conclusions

Based on the major findings of the study; the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Adults were aware of the negative impacts of illiteracy, and they were motivated to participate in literacy programs mainly to learn to read and write and to acquire knowledge and skills necessary to overcome their own social, cultural and economic problems.
2. The participation of adults in literacy programs showed a dramatic decreasing trend. If right measures are not going to be taken the program would cease completely.
3. The findings of the study indicated that the participation rate of women in literacy programs was decreasing in an alarming rate. Unless women adults are encouraged to participate in adult literacy program, the problem of illiteracy would not be overcome in community.

4. The findings of the study indicated that there is no training on principles of adult teaching to adult literacy program facilitators. This could be one of the reasons for the decreasing trend of adult literacy program participants.
5. According to the findings of the study the same classes were being used to teach male and female adults in literacy programs. Using the same classes for male and female adults have in rural areas where still the traditions and customs favor the male, could lead to the decline of number of women actively participating in literacy programs.
6. The study revealed that relevance of the curriculum prepared for adult literacy program was low. It can be safely concluded from this that it was not developed based on needs assessment.
7. The study showed that there was no continuous and close supervision or follow-up to the adult literacy program by education officials at different levels. This could undoubtedly affect the provision of quality adult literacy program in the woredas.
8. The study revealed that there was no salary or payment for adult literacy program facilitators; and the program was left to the formal school teachers. This lack of incentive would hamper the provision of effective adult literacy program to the adult literacy participants.
9. From the findings of the study, it is possible to conclude that adult literacy program is "marginalized" in the selected woredas; priority was given to the formal education. However, it can be concluded that by educating children alone the current problem of the community could not be solved.
10. The data on adult literacy program participants reported to the education structures were very far from the actual number of participants of the program. It can be

concluded that those who provided the data were lacking skills of data collection and reporting or the data were deliberately provided to give the pretext that a lot of work was done in the area of adult literacy.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Various studies showed that literacy impacts on human capabilities, enhances productivity, broadens earning opportunities and improves personal well-being. It contributes to engendering a healthy, equitable, gender-aware and democratic environment. Literate individuals tend to earn significantly higher income and have more regular employment. Literacy is critical to accessing information and knowledge and in communicating with others. Literacy contributes to better health awareness and practices. Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made:

1. The level of interest of adults to participate in literacy programs is promising. Therefore, the concerned bodies to Adult and Non-Formal Education in general and literacy program in particular should work to sustain it.
2. The participation rate of adults in literacy programs is decreasing in alarming rate. So, the Education structure and all stakeholders should work to reverse this decreasing trend.
3. Literacy promotes women's empowerment. Literate females tend to be more mobile and participate more actively in making decisions about family and household matters. Therefore, all the concerned organs and stakeholders should work on increasing the participation of women in literacy programs.
4. Facilitators are the backbone of the literacy program. Hence, the training of facilitators is crucial to make them efficient and the program effective. So, the education structure

and stakeholders should work on provision of trainings for adult literacy program facilitators on adult learning principles and methods.

5. The findings of the study showed that the same learning rooms (classes) were being used for both male and female adult learners in literacy programs; and this has negative impacts on their participation. Therefore, using separate classes for male and female adult learners in literacy programs should be promoted and facilitated by the concerned organs.
6. The non-formal education in general and literacy program in particular requires relevant curriculum. The most important characteristics of non-formal education programmes are its greater and more direct relevance to the educational needs and aspirations of the learners. But the study indicated that there is a problem on appropriateness or relevance of the programme. Therefore, the concerned organ working on curriculum in education structure should work on making the curriculum relevant; and the program appropriate and relevant to the need of adult learners.
7. The non-formal education in general and literacy program in particular requires follow-up and monitoring. Therefore, there has to be close, appropriate and continuous follow-up and supervision to make the program effective.
8. The findings of the study indicated that there is no trained and employed adult literacy program facilitator; and it is left to the formal school teachers with the existing workload in the formal schools. Therefore, trained and employed adult literacy program facilitators should be deployed by education offices. Furthermore, the study indicated that there is a severe budget constraint for Adult and Non-Formal Education in general and adult literacy program in particular. The Global Campaign for

Education (GCE) in 2005 put as a benchmark that governments should dedicate at least 3% to 6% of their education budgets to adult literacy programmes with additional contributions being made by other relevant ministries. Therefore, the Regional Education Bureau should allocate appropriate budget by mobilizing governmental and non-governmental organizations, the private economy, individuals and the local community.

9. The findings of the study showed that there is a responsible body or organ for Adult and Non-Formal Education in educational structure, whatever its status would be. Therefore, the responsible body/s in the education structure should be functional and actively work on the issue; and the right expert or professional should be assigned to the area (ANFE). Pursuing adult literacy requires strong political will and commitment on the part of government organs to strengthen policies, increase financial investments, upscale existing programs and fast track their implementation to reach out adult illiterates, particularly female and disadvantaged learners. Therefore, there should be political commitment by government organs to make the literacy program effective.
10. The findings of the study showed that lack of awareness is one of the major problems facing (challenging) the literacy program. Therefore, there should be continuous and target-oriented awareness creation activities for both the community and the concerned bodies so that adult literacy is mainstreamed.
11. The contribution of the stakeholders is of paramount importance to make the programme effective. Therefore, stakeholders working on the programme should

coordinate their actions to integrate the resources and make the programme efficient and cost-effective.

12. One of the main objectives of literacy programme is to fill the gap of the formal education; i.e. to make it a bridge to formal education. Therefore, it should be worked by concerned bodies to make the literacy program a bridge to formal education.
13. Adults are busy; and it is inconvenient for them to participate (attend) in a distant areas from their living or working areas. Therefore, the adult literacy program centers should be accessible to adult learners.

## References

- Amutabi, Maurice et al (2005) Foundations of Adult Education in Africa, Cape Town: UNESCO.
- Best J.W. and Kahn J.V. (1993) Research in Education, 7<sup>th</sup> Ed, New Delhi: Printice-Hall of India Pvt.
- Bhola H.S. (1994) Source Book for Literacy Work: Perspective from the Grassroots, Paris: UNESCO.
- Caffarella S. and Merriam B. (1999) Learning in Adulthood, A Comprehensive Guide, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, San Francisco.
- Cashdan, Asher (1986) LITERACY Teaching and Learning Language Skills, Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Chilisa, B. and Preece J. (2005) Research Methods for Adult Educators in Africa, Cape Town: UNESCO Institute for Education.
- Courts L. Patrick (1997) Multicultural Literacies, Dialect, Discourse, and Diversity, New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.,
- Creswell, John W. (2003) Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, Second edition.
- Dvv international (2009) Adult Education and Development, International Conference – Financing Adult Education for Development, Bonn, 23-24 June 2009.
- Dvv international (2007) Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia, NEWSLETTER No. 20/21, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Fadil Jihad (2009) Practitioners' Conceptions and Dominant Traditions of Adult Literacy Curriculum in Ethiopia, Addis Ababa.
- Fordham, Paul et al (1995): Adult Literacy, A Handbook for Development Workers, an Oxfam/ VSO Publication, UK.
- Graunbard R. (1991) LITERACY, An Overview by Fourteen Experts, HILL AND WANG A division of Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York.
- Johnston, A. and Lind, A. (1990) Adult Literacy in The Third World, A review of Objectives and Strategies, SIDA, Stockholm.
- Lind, A. (2008) Literacy for all: Making a difference, Paris: UNESCO.

- MOE (2005) Education Sector Development Program III (ESDP III), Addis Ababa.
- MOE (2008) National Adult Education Strategy, Addis Ababa.
- Mulugeta Menkir (2002) The Implementation of Adult Literacy Program in East Gojjam Zone (Amhara Region), Addis Ababa.
- Oduaran, Akpovire et al (1995) RETROSPECT AND RENEWAL: THE STATE OF ADULT EDUCATION RESEARCH IN AFRICA, Proceedings of the African Regional Seminar on Adult Education Research for Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria, 3-7 December 1995.
- OEB (2009) BARNOOTA, Barruulee Festivaalii Barnootaa fi Leenjii Oromiyaa sababeeffachuun maxxanfame, Finfinnee.
- OEB (2009): Non-Formal Education Programs Strategy; Finfinnee.
- OEB (2009): Non-Formal Education Programs Strategy Implementation Guideline, Finfine.
- OECBB (2004) EDUCATION STATISTICS ANNUAL ABSTRACT (2003/04).
- Patrick L. Courts (1997) Multicultural Literacies, Dialect, Discourse, and Diversity, Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., New York.
- Rogers A. (2004) Non-Formal Education, Flexible Schooling or Participatory Education, Hong Kong, China.
- Shimron J. (1996) LITERACY AND EDUCATION, Essays in Memory of Dina Feitelson, Haifa University, HAMPTON PRESS, INC. CRESSKILL, NEW JERSEY.
- Street V. Brian et al (1999) Literacy: An International Handbook, Westview Press.
- UNESCO (1976) Recommendation on the development of adult education, Nairobi: Kenya.

### **Unpublished Sources**

Dessu Wirtu (2007) Adult Education in Ethiopia: Strengths and Weaknesses, Paper presented on the workshop organized by Department of Curriculum Development, OEB.

OEB (2009) Raawwii Karoora Bara 2001 fi Kallattii Karoora Hojii Bara 2002, Adaamaa.

TGE (1994) The New Education and Training Policy, Addis Ababa.

### **Web Sources**

Ethiopia – Literacy <http://countrystudies.us/ethiopia/73.htm> Accessed on 8/31/2001.

Literacy: Retrieved from, Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (Adult

Literacy/EDUCATION/UNESCO <http://www.unesco.org/en/efa-international-coordination/the-efa-movement/efa-goals/adult>

Accessed on 7/19/2009.

Peter Audi Oluoch (2001) Low Participation in Adult Literacy Classes <http://www.iiz-dvv.de/index.php?article-id=222&clang=1> Accessed on 9/14/2001.

World Conference on EFA, Jomtien, 1990/ EDUCATION/UNESCO

<http://www.unesco.org/en/efa-international-coordination/the-efa-movement/jomtien-1990/> Accessed on 7/19/2009.

# Appendices

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS**  
**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**Part I**

**Questionnaire to be completed by literacy program facilitators (teachers)**

**General Information:**

This questionnaire is prepared with the purpose to study the factors affecting the participation of adults in literacy Programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State. Hence, after reading each question carefully respondents are expected to provide their genuine and reliable response to each item.

**Notice:**

- Respondents should not write their names.
- Respondents are expected to write their responses and indicate their response using an 'X' mark in the space provided corresponding to each question.
- For open-ended questions respondents are requested to give short and precise response in the space provided.
- The responses of the respondents are used only for research consumption (your responses are kept confidential).

1. Profile of the respondent:

- Educational Background \_\_\_\_\_
  - Grade 8 complete \_\_\_\_\_
  - Grade 10 complete \_\_\_\_\_
  - Grade 12 complete \_\_\_\_\_
  - 12<sup>+TTI</sup> \_\_\_\_\_
  - Diploma \_\_\_\_\_
  - Any other \_\_\_\_\_
- Sex: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_
- Age \_\_\_\_\_

- Marital Status:
  - Single \_\_\_\_\_
  - Married \_\_\_\_\_
  - Divorced \_\_\_\_\_

Year of service in teaching adults \_\_\_\_\_

2. What motivates adults to attend literacy programs? (More than one answer is possible).

1. to learn to read and write \_\_\_\_\_
2. to gain knowledge and skills \_\_\_\_\_
3. to help children with school work \_\_\_\_\_
4. If any please specify

---



---



---

3. Do you believe that the time (the day, hour, and month) convenient for literacy participants?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

3.1 If your answer to question No. 3 is "No", what is the reason?

---



---



---



---

4. Is the location of the literacy centers suitable for participants (learners)?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

5. How do you rate the learners' interest in the literacy programs?

1. Very high \_\_\_\_\_
2. High \_\_\_\_\_
3. Average (medium) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Low \_\_\_\_\_
5. Very low \_\_\_\_\_

6. To your opinion, is literacy a right or an obligation?

1. Right \_\_\_\_\_
2. Obligation \_\_\_\_\_
3. I don't know \_\_\_\_\_

7. Is the number of adults participating in literacy programs increasing or decreasing in your particular center when you compare the last three years?

1. Increasing \_\_\_\_\_
2. Decreasing \_\_\_\_\_
3. No change \_\_\_\_\_

8. If your response to No. 7 is 'decreasing', what could be the possible reasons for this trend? Put them in rank order (Very high =5, High=4, Average=3, Low=2, Very low=1).

Assumed problems or factors	Ranks				
	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of time					
Lack of interest in learning					
Lack of appropriateness of the program					
Lack of immediate benefit from the program					
Distance of the literacy center					
Health problems					
Migration in search of work					
Need to harvest					
Lack of awareness					
Inconvenience of the time of literacy programs					
Child care and domestic duties					

9. What measures should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs? (More than one answer is possible)

1. use flexible time \_\_\_\_\_
2. make the program relevant \_\_\_\_\_
3. make people aware the importance (benefit) of adult literacy program \_\_\_\_\_
4. improve the quality of the program delivered \_\_\_\_\_
5. make the literacy centers accessible to the adult learners \_\_\_\_\_
6. If any

---

---

10. How do you rate (evaluate) the participation of women in adult literacy programs in the center you are teaching (facilitating)?

1. Very low \_\_\_\_\_
2. Low \_\_\_\_\_
3. Average (medium) \_\_\_\_\_
4. High \_\_\_\_\_
5. Very high \_\_\_\_\_

11. Have you got induction training on methods and principles of teaching adults?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

11.1 If your answer to No. 11 is "Yes", for how long?

1. for 1-5 days \_\_\_\_\_
2. for 6-10 days \_\_\_\_\_
3. for 11-15 days \_\_\_\_\_
4. for 16-30 days \_\_\_\_\_
5. for 1-3 months \_\_\_\_\_
6. more than 3 months \_\_\_\_\_

12. Is there any follow-up or supervision to the adult literacy centers by Woreda education officials?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

13. If your response to No. 12 is 'Yes', how often?

1. Monthly \_\_\_\_\_
2. Quarterly \_\_\_\_\_
3. As they wish \_\_\_\_\_
4. Other, please specify

---

---

14. Do the adult literacy participants attend the program regularly?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

15. In which of the following age-limits are the majority of the adult learners (participants) in your literacy center be grouped?

1. 15-29 years \_\_\_\_\_
2. 30-45 years \_\_\_\_\_
3. Above 45 years old \_\_\_\_\_
4. Other, please specify

---

---

16. For how long is the literacy program conducted in your center?

1. about 3 months \_\_\_\_\_
2. 4-5 months \_\_\_\_\_
3. 6 months \_\_\_\_\_
4. more than 6 months \_\_\_\_\_

17. Is there a test or an examination given to literacy program participants?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

18. If your response to No. 17 is 'Yes', when?

1. at the mid of the program \_\_\_\_\_
2. at any time in the program duration \_\_\_\_\_
3. at the end of the program duration \_\_\_\_\_

19. Is there any certificate delivered or given to literacy program participants after they finish the program?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_

2. No \_\_\_\_\_

20. Does the literacy center provide textbooks to adult literacy learners?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_

2. No \_\_\_\_\_

20.1. If your answer to question No. 20 is "Yes", how do you see the textbook to participant ratio on the average?

1. 1:1 \_\_\_\_\_

2. 1:2 \_\_\_\_\_

3. 1:3 \_\_\_\_\_

4. 1:4 \_\_\_\_\_

5. If any other, please specify

---

---

21. Who does pay you a salary?

1. Government \_\_\_\_\_

2. Non-Government \_\_\_\_\_

3. the local community \_\_\_\_\_

4. If any other, please specify

---

---

22. How much is your salary per month? \_\_\_\_\_

23. Are you satisfied with your salary?

1. Highly satisfied \_\_\_\_\_

2. Satisfied \_\_\_\_\_

3. Not satisfied \_\_\_\_\_

24. If your answer to question No. 23 is "Not satisfied", what do you suggest?

---

---

---

25. Who has constructed the center for literacy program?

---

---

---

26. Does the local community participate in the construction of the literacy center?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_

2. No \_\_\_\_\_

27. If your answer to question No. 26 is "Yes", then how?

1. by contributing money \_\_\_\_\_

2. by contributing labor \_\_\_\_\_

3. If any other, please specify

---

---

28. Are you using separate classes for Male learners and Female learners?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_

2. No \_\_\_\_\_

29. If your response to question No. 28 is 'Yes', what are the positive aspects of using separate classes?

---

---

---

---

---

30. If your response to No. 28 is 'No', what are the negative aspects of using the same classes?

---

---

---

---

---

31. What is literacy for you?

---

---

---

---

32. What are the major problems in your literacy center that are obstacle (hindrance) to the participation of adults in literacy programs?

---

---

---

---

---

33. What could be the possible solutions to the problems you mentioned above (No. 32)?

---

---

---

---

---

---

34. What are five major problems which have impacts on participation of adults in literacy programs (list them in rank order, the 1<sup>st</sup> problem to be the sever one)?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

35. Suggest possible solutions to the problems that you listed under No. 34.

---

---

---

---

---

Thank You.

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS**

**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**Part II**

**Questionnaire to be completed by Education Officials at different levels (Woreda, Zone, and Region).**

**General Information:**

This questionnaire is prepared with the purpose to study the factors affecting participation of adults in literacy programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia Regional State.

Hence, after reading each question carefully respondents are expected to provide their genuine and reliable response to each item.

**Notice:**

- Respondents should not write their names.
- Respondents are expected to write their responses and indicate their response using an 'X' mark in the space provided corresponding to each question.
- For open-ended questions respondents are requested to give short and precise response in the space provided.
- The responses from respondents are used only for the consumption of the research (your responses are kept confidential).

**1. Profile of the respondent:**

1.1 Educational Background;

MA \_\_\_\_\_ BA (BSc) \_\_\_\_\_ Dip. \_\_\_\_\_ Certificate \_\_\_\_\_

1.2 Area of specialization \_\_\_\_\_

1.3 Work experience in years \_\_\_\_\_

1.4 Place of work:

Woreda \_\_\_\_\_ Zone \_\_\_\_\_ Region \_\_\_\_\_

1.5 Sex:

M \_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_

1.6 Age \_\_\_\_\_

1.7 Marital status:

- Single \_\_\_\_\_
- Married \_\_\_\_\_
- Divorced \_\_\_\_\_

2. Is there any responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the Educational structure of the area (Woreda, Zone, and Region)?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Not sure \_\_\_\_\_

3. If your response to No. 2 is 'Yes', what is the status of that body?

1. Department \_\_\_\_\_
2. Task force \_\_\_\_\_
3. Panel \_\_\_\_\_
4. Focal person \_\_\_\_\_
5. If any please specify

---

---

4. Is there any follow-up or supervision to the adult literacy centers (areas) by the education officials?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Not sure \_\_\_\_\_

5. If your response to No. 4 is 'Yes', how often?

1. monthly \_\_\_\_\_
2. quarterly \_\_\_\_\_
3. As they want \_\_\_\_\_

6. How do you rate the relevance of the curriculum for the adult literacy program learners?

1. Very High \_\_\_\_\_
2. High \_\_\_\_\_
3. Average \_\_\_\_\_
4. Low \_\_\_\_\_
5. Very Low \_\_\_\_\_

7. Are there any criteria for selection of adult literacy program facilitators (teachers) in the area (Woreda, Zone, and Region)?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Not sure \_\_\_\_\_

8. If your response to No. 7 is 'Yes', who set the criteria?

1. the Woreda Education Office \_\_\_\_\_
2. the Zonal Education Desk \_\_\_\_\_
3. the Regional Education Bureau \_\_\_\_\_
4. the adult literacy center \_\_\_\_\_
5. If any please specify

---

---

9. Is there any payment or salary for the facilitators of the adult literacy program?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_

10. If your response to No. 9 is 'No', is there any other alternative to motivate the facilitators of the adult literacy programs? Mention them.

---

---

---

---

11. To your opinion, is literacy a right or an obligation?

1. right \_\_\_\_\_
2. obligation \_\_\_\_\_
3. I don't know \_\_\_\_\_

12. Is the number of adults participating in literacy programs increasing or decreasing in your particular area (Woreda, Zone, and Region) when you compare the last three years?

1. increasing \_\_\_\_\_
2. decreasing \_\_\_\_\_
3. No change \_\_\_\_\_

13. If your response to No. 12 is 'decreasing', what could be the possible reasons for this trend? Put them in rank order (Very high =5, High=4, Average=3, Low=2, Very low=1).

Assumed problems or factors	Ranks				
	5	4	3	2	1
Lack of time					
Lack of interest in learning					
Lack of appropriateness of the program					
Lack of immediate benefit from the program					
Distance of the literacy center					
Health problems					
Migration in search of work					
Need to harvest					
Lack of awareness					
Inconvenience of the time of literacy programs					
Child care and domestic duties					

14. What measures should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs? (More than one answer is possible).

1. use flexible time \_\_\_\_\_
2. make the program (courses) relevant \_\_\_\_\_
3. make people aware of the importance (benefit) of adult literacy program \_\_\_\_\_
4. make the literacy centers accessible to the adult learners \_\_\_\_\_
5. Improve the quality of the program delivered \_\_\_\_\_
6. If any

---

---

---

15. Is there formulated adult education strategy in the region (is there regional adult education strategy)?

1. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
2. No \_\_\_\_\_
3. Not sure \_\_\_\_\_

16. What is literacy for you?

---

---

---

17. What are five major problems which have impacts on the participation of adults in literacy programs (list them in rank order, the 1<sup>st</sup> problem to be the sever one)?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_

18. Suggest possible solutions to the problems that you have listed under No. 17.

---

---

---

---

---

Thank You.

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS**  
**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**Interview Questions to be answered by the adult literacy program facilitators**

**General profile of respondents:**

Educational Background \_\_\_\_\_

Qualification \_\_\_\_\_

Sex \_\_\_\_\_

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

1. Is the time (the day, the hour, and the month) convenient for literacy participants?
2. Is the location of the literacy centers suitable for learners (participants)?
3. How do you rate the learners' interest in the literacy programs? (high, low)
4. Is literacy a right or an obligation?
5. Is the number of adults participating in literacy programs increasing or decreasing?
6. What are the possible reasons for the decreasing trend of the adult literacy participants?
7. What measures should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs?
8. How do you rate (evaluate) the participation of women in adult literacy programs in your particular center? (High, Low).

9. Do literacy facilitators (teachers) get pre-service training? What is the duration of the training?
10. Is there any follow-up or supervision to the adult literacy program centers by Woreda education officials? How often?
11. In which age levels do the great majority of the adult literacy participants could be grouped?
12. For how many days in a week does the literacy education is provided to participants?
13. For how long the program is provided in each day?
14. For how long does the literacy program is conducted in a year?
15. What are the major problems in your literacy program center that are obstacle to the participation of adults in literacy programs?
16. What could be the possible solutions to the problems you mentioned above (No. 15)?
17. Are you using separate classes or the same classes for Male and Female adult learners?
18. What are the positive or negative aspects of using separate or the same classes for Male and Female learners?

Thank You.

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS'**  
**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**Interview Questions to be answered by the Education Officials at different levels  
(Woreda, Zone, and Region)**

**Profile of the respondent:**

Educational Background \_\_\_\_\_

Qualification \_\_\_\_\_

Sex \_\_\_\_\_

Age \_\_\_\_\_

Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Place of work (Woreda, Zone, Region) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Is there a responsible body for Adult and Non-Formal Education in the educational structure? What is the status of that body?
2. Is any supervision or follow-up to adult literacy program centers by educational officials? How often?
3. Do you think that the curriculum for the adult literacy program relevant to the adult learners?
4. Are there any criteria for selection of adult literacy program facilitators (teachers)?  
Who is responsible to set the criteria?

5. Is there any incentive for the facilitators of the adult literacy program? What type of incentive?
6. Is the number of adults participating in literacy programs increasing or decreasing?
7. What could be the possible reasons for the decreasing trend of the number of literacy participants?
8. What measures should be taken to increase the participation of adults in literacy programs?

Thank You.

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS**  
**PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**Interview questions to be answered by adult literacy program participants**

**General profile of respondent:**

Sex: M\_\_\_ F\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Marital Status:

- Married \_\_\_\_\_
- Single \_\_\_\_\_
- Family Size \_\_\_\_\_
- Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

1. What motivates you to attend literacy program?
2. Do you have an interest to participate in literacy programs?
3. What are the problems that forbid you from attending adult literacy programs?
4. Is literacy important for you?
5. Do you attend the literacy program regularly?
6. What are the main reasons for absenteeism?
7. Are the literacy classes for Male learners and Female learners separate?

Thank You.

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH**  
**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS PROFESSIONAL**  
**DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**

**Observation Checklist** on thesis title: Factors Affecting Participation of Adults in Literacy Programs in East Shoa Zone of Oromia.

1. The trend of participation of adults in literacy programs for the last ten years:
  - Increasing \_\_\_\_\_
  - Decreasing \_\_\_\_\_
2. The environment of the literacy program centers:
  - Attractiveness of the environment \_\_\_\_\_
  - Proximity of the literacy centers \_\_\_\_\_
3. Schedules for literacy programs:
  - Morning \_\_\_\_\_
  - Afternoon \_\_\_\_\_
4. The seasons of the literacy program:
  - Harvesting time \_\_\_\_\_
  - Farming time \_\_\_\_\_
  - The whole year \_\_\_\_\_
5. The administration of the schedule, time (season):
  - Regionally \_\_\_\_\_
  - Decentralized (flexible) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Resources allocated to the literacy program:
  - Financial \_\_\_\_\_
  - Material \_\_\_\_\_
7. The organ directly responsible to the literacy or ANFE issue:
  - Kebele level \_\_\_\_\_
  - Woreda level \_\_\_\_\_
  - Zonal level \_\_\_\_\_

- Regional level \_\_\_\_\_

8. Educational background of the focal person if any:

- Qualification \_\_\_\_\_
- Area of specialization \_\_\_\_\_

9. Subjects taught in the literacy programs:

- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

10. The levels of literacy program:

- Level I \_\_\_\_\_
- Level II \_\_\_\_\_
- If any \_\_\_\_\_

11. Is the literacy program a bridge to formal paths (formal education)?

- Yes \_\_\_\_\_
- No \_\_\_\_\_

12. Formal school teachers working as a literacy program facilitators (instructors), if any:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

13. Delivery of textbooks to the literacy program participants (learners):

- Delivered \_\_\_\_\_
- Not delivered \_\_\_\_\_

14. The statistical data:

14.1 In the center:

- Number of facilitators: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of adult learners: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Which number is increasing: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_

- Which number is decreasing: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_

14.2 In the Woreda:

- Total number of centers \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of facilitators: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of adult learners: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Which number is increasing: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_
- Which number is decreasing: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_

14.3 In the Zone:

- Total number of centers \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of facilitators: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Number of adult learners: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Which number is increasing: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_
- Which number is decreasing: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_
- Total number of Woredas \_\_\_\_\_

15. Enrollment of adult learners:

15.1 In the Center:

- Plan for the year 2001 E.C.: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Achievement of the year 2001 E.C.: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_

15.2 In the Woreda:

- Plan for the year 2001 E.C.: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Achievement of the year 2001 E.C.: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_

15.3 In the Zone:

- Plan for the year 2001 E.C.: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_
- Achievement of the year 2001 E.C.: M \_\_\_\_\_ F \_\_\_\_\_ Total \_\_\_\_\_

## Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all sources of materials used for the study have been dully acknowledged.

Takele Kebede \_\_\_\_\_

Signature  \_\_\_\_\_

Date 06/07/2010