

**THE MANAGEMENT OF ALTERNATIVE BASIC EDUCATION (ABE)
PROGRAM IN AMHARA REGION: A COMPARATIVE SURVEY OF
GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS.**

BY:

TEBIKEW YENET



**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART IN ADULT
EDUCATION AND LIFE LONG LEARNING**

FEB.2009

ADDIS ABABA

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

THE MANAGEMENT OF ALTERNATIVE BASIC EDUCATION (ABE) PROGRAMS
IN AMHARA REGION: A COMPARATIVE SURVEY OF GOVERNMENT AND NON-
GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATIONS.

BY:

TEBIKEW YENET

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

Abdulkadir Hussien
CHAIR MAN, DEPT. GRAD. COMMITTEE

Adane Tesslera

ADVISOR

Tilahun Fanka

INTERNAL EXAMINER



[Signature]
SIGN.

[Signature]
SIGN.

[Signature] 03/03/09
SIGN.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My first thanks are due in the first place to Ato Adane Tesera (assistant professor), whose constructive comments were of great help for the timely completion of this study.

I would like to express my heart felt gratitude to my father Ato Yenet Bogale, to my mother W/O Simegne Ambaw, to my brother Ato Alemayehu Yenet, and to other family members and relatives who gave me financial as well as material supports while pursuing my studies in the graduate program. Similarly, my especial appreciation goes to my department which sponsored the research fund.

My deepest gratitude is also extended to Ato Alemaw Wolie, Ato Negussie Shiferaw, Ato Jemalu Jember, Ato Solomon Aklilu and other individuals who supported me during my study and data collection time.

At last, but not least, I owe my thanks to W/rt Azebe Gedie for typing the manuscript and duplicating the typed material in time.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	v
Abbreviations/ Acronyms	vi
Abstract	vii
 CHAPTER ONE	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
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 Limitation of the Study	6
1.7 Operational definitions	7
 CHAPTER 2	
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
2.1 Basic Education: Definition and Concepts	8
2.2. Why Basic Education?	9
2.3. The Concepts, Objectives and Features of Alternative	9
Basic Education (ABE)	9
2.3.1 The Concepts of ABE	9
2.3.2 The Objectives of ABE.....	10
2.3.3 The Features of ABE	11
2.4. Managing the Educational Program	11
2.4.1. Planning the Educational Program	12

2.4.1.1 The Framing Questions to Plan the ABE Programs	12
2.4.1.2. Purposes of Planning	13
2.4.1.3 Criteria for program planning	15
2.4.1.4 Features of Program planning	16
2.4.2. Organization	16
2.4.2.1. Guiding Activities /Criteria for Educational Organization.....	17
2.4.2.2 Components of Educational Organization	18
2.4.3 Staffing	19
2.4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation	22
2.4.4.1 Monitoring	22
2.4.4.2 Evaluation	23
2.5. School Leadership/ Head Teacher	26
2.4.1 Qualities of Leadership/Head Teacher	26
2.4.2 The Roles of Leadership	27
2.6. Communities' Participation in the Management of School	28

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	30
3.1 Method of the Study	30
3.2 Sample and Sampling Techniques	30
3.3 The Source of Data	32
3.4 Instruments of Data Collection	32
3.4.1 Questionnaires	32
3.4.2 Interview	32
3.4.3 Document Inventory	33
3.5 Pilot Testing.....	33
3.6 Procedures of Administration and Data Collection	33
3.7 Data Analysis	34

CHAPTER FOUR

4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	35
4.1. Characteristics of the Sample Respondents	35
4.2. Issues Related to Program Planning	38
4.3 About Program Organization	41
4.4. Curriculum Related Issues	48
4.5 Issues Related to Staffing ABE Program	52
4.6. Community Participations in School Management	58
4.7. Issues Related to Monitoring and Evaluation.....	59
4.8. Problems Raised in Managing the ABE Program	64

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	67
5.1. Summary of the Findings.....	67
5.2. Conclusions	72
5.3. Recommendations	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	76
APPENDICES	

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Respondents' Characteristics by Sex, Age, Education and Experiences	36
Table 2: Objectives of Providing the ABE Program in Priority Order.....	38
Table 3: Facilitators' Training and Officials' Program Planning	39
Table 4: Summary of the Responses Regarding the ABE Program Planning.....	40
Table 5: Provision Places, Schedules, Material Provisions and Instructional Organization.....	42
Table 6: Summary of the Respondents' Attitudes towards Program Organizations	45
Table 7: Cluster, Budget and Transfer System of the Program.....	46
Table 8: Material Provisions, Learning Hours, Class Size and Number of Shifts	49
Table 9: Responses on Recruiting, Screening Criteria and Trainings	52
Table 10: Responses on Benefits and Training Satisfaction of the Facilitators	55
Table 11: Facilitators turn over, any Support and Termination	56
Table 12: Summary Responses towards some Qualities of Head teachers	57
Table13: Summary of Community Participations in School Management	58
Table14: Summary of the Participations of CMCs and KETBs in School Management	62

ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

“ATKLT”	Amhara Timihrt KliLawi LematinaTibiber
ABE	Alternative Basic Education
ABEP	Alternative Basic Education Program
ADA	Amhara Development Association
AREDC	Amhara Regional Education Development through Cooperation.
ARSEB	Amhara Regional State Educational Bureau
BARC	Bangladesh Advanced Rural Centers
CMC	Center Management Committee
CRDA	Christian Relief and Development Association.
EFA	Education for All
EIDC	Ethio- Italian Development Cooperation
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
FCE	Facilitators for Change Ethiopia
FSCE	Forum on Street Children Ethiopia
IIZ/DVV	Institute for International Co-operation of German Adult Education Association
JRM	Joint Review Mission
KETB	Kebele Education and Training Board
MoE	Ministry of Education
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NFABE	Non-Formal Alternative Basic Education
NFE	Non Formal Education
NFPE	Non Formal Primary Education
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PSCO	Public Service College of Oromia
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
REB	Regional Education Bureau
T.T.I	Teachers’ Training Institute.
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
WCEFA	World Conference on Education for All
WEO	Woreda Education Office

ABSTRACT

The management of non-formal basic education is one of the factors that promote the successful implementation of the ABE programs. Thus, the purpose of this study was to survey the management of alternative basic education programs run by government and non governmental organizations in Amhara Regional State. To achieve the objective of this study, a comparative survey method was employed to assess the variables like planning, organization, staffing, monitoring, evaluation, community participations, and the roles of center management committee and head teachers in managing the ABE program. A total respondents of 146(75%) were involved in the study from both providers of the program. Out of this 75 respondents were from NGOs and 71 were from government. The respondents were selected through purposive, simple random and availability sampling procedures. The data gathered through questionnaires were analyzed using percentage, weighted mean, t-test and chi-square. Whereas, data gathered through interviews and document inventory were analyzed using descriptive statements. The finding revealed that both providers of the program were highly positive in the issues of ABE planning, in staffing potential facilitators (greater than 90% are T.T.I graduates) and in attracting different stakeholders to participate in all aspects of management and program scheduling. At the same time the study indicated that in both providers of the program there was facilitators turn over, shortage of on job training to the facilitators, and cluster supervisors. On the other hand, in the study it was found that NGOs run ABE institutions are better in the internal organizations/resource material provisions ($t = -3.178, \alpha < 0.05$), monitoring, evaluation, in sensitizing the community towards the program, in promoting the qualities of the head teachers, in paying better salary to the facilitators than government institutions for better success of the program. Based on the study, it was suggested that a sound training should be given primarily to the community representatives and then to the facilitators and head teachers to develop a sense of owner ship about the program and to be effective towards their tasks. To this end, NGOs and governmental organization should exert their maximum efforts to secure budget for this and other facilities to implement the program successfully. Besides, facilitators turn over due to the nature of employment (contract basis) or unequal salary payment to the facilitators, limited provision of the learning materials, monitoring, evaluation and illegal terminations of the facilitators from the ABE program should be given an urgent attention by the concerned providers of the program for its effectiveness and sustainability.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Almost all the nations throughout the world have recognized that education is the most important instrument for every aspects of development. No country has succeeded without educating the people. Education is obviously the means for developing human resource development which is believed to be valuable for the socio-economic development and poverty reduction. That is, education is the most effective means of curbing population growth, eradicating poverty and ensuring democracy, peace and sustainable development (IIZ/DVV, 2000:30). Similarly, Derebssa (2001:175) also argues that basic education provides fundamental basis for all further schooling, training or self education. It also provides the basis for developing the capacity to cope with readily growing and changing society in an information age. Thus, its universal availability and quality are central to the human resource capacity of any society. Moreover, Education is not only considered a vital for development but also it is a fundamental human right. It has been stated, “The right to education straddles the division between civil and political rights on the one hand and the economic, social and cultural rights on the other.” (UNESCO, 2002:14).

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) in Article 26 also states, “Every one has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. The primary education shall be compulsory” (UN, 2004:125). Furthermore, UNESCO (1985) in Hilderbrand (1996:1) stated:

The right to learn is not a cultural luxury to be saved for some further dates .It is not the next step to be taken once basic needs have been satisfied. The right to lean is an indispensable tool for the survival of humanity. If people have to enjoy better health and to avoid war, they must learn to live in peace, and learn to understand each other.

Thus, basic education is a fundamental human right and the foundation of life long learning which in turn contributes to solve personal as well as societal problems for the intended

people's and country's growth and development. Given this fundamental imperative, a lot of countries including Ethiopia have taken the initiatives towards achieving Universal Primary Education (UPE) since 1948. However, countries passed decades without realizing UPE, or with little progress of basic education for this length of time would be a serious fail to these countries' development (Philips, 1975(a):5)

Similarly, Phillips (1975(a):i) also pointed out that basic education is the fundamental building block for the right to education but the level of living for millions of people in developing countries is yet pitifully low. Having not been engaged in basic primary education, these people are still undernourished, uneducated, unemployed and looking for other basic needs of life. He further argues that the main concern of basic education is "the only education experience and that the findings of educational psychologists point to the earlier rather than the later years of childhood as being the key time for learning and personality development, and it is also the level which has the role of covering the whole population as their human right" (p:4) From this one can infer that providing basic education to school age children seems a must and a human right so as to acquire basic knowledge, attitude and skills at this period which later help them to develop all rounded personality.

Ethiopia, being a member state of the United Nations, in the year 1990 the country committed itself to the Education for All initiatives, and in 2000 to the Dakar Framework for Action that stresses on achieving the goals of Education for All by the year 2015. Moreover, the country strives to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) which includes the achievement of Universal Primary Education (UPE). Although the country has given much emphasis to UPE, the government has realized that Ethiopia cannot achieve UPE by 2015 by providing education through the formal schooling alone. Thus, ABE is designed and implemented to address such purposes (MoE, 2006(a):2)

ABE has an important role to play in Ethiopia because the formal schooling alone cannot adequately address the educational needs of the whole out-of-school children in the country. Ethiopia currently recognizes that the only way to achieve UPE by the year 2015 as agreed to in the Education For all (EFA) goals is to use both formal primary schooling and alternative provision in a non-formal setting (MoE: 2006(a):3). To support this, Tekeste

(1996:46) explains “non-formal education is understood and used as the most important strategic option available to the MoE in its effort to spread literacy and basic education. It is possible to spread basic education effectively and cheaply through out the country.”

However, the provision of ABE program by government and non government organizations lacks coordination and systemization that the majority of the target group does not get the intended program (MoE, 2006(a): ii). Adding to this, the research findings of Biruke(2006)and Berhanu (2000)indicated that the non-formal alternative basic education program lacks coordination in planning, leading, organization ,monitoring and evaluation. In line with this, Tekeste (1990:40) also argues that the Ethiopian Education system is in need of an urgent investigation on the problems of managing the education at various levels of its provision .From this we can deduce that the management process of ABE should be given due attention and seen in parallel with the entire structure of the formal basic education in the way to benefit the local society. That is, ABE has to be planned, organized, staffed, monitored and evaluated for an effective use of scarce resources and to achieve the intended objectives of the institution. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the management of the learning programs of ABE run by government and non-government organizations in Amara Regional State.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Basic education seems the right way to escape from poverty particularly for developing counties like ours. It is factual that an individual who has been in school for some years is more productive than the one who is illiterate. In this regard, Mingat (2003:175) noted that a large percentage of children does not complete their basic education and the country could be at risk of missing the productive citizens, and the economy could also fundamentally under problem due to lack of literate individuals who would be potential for further development of the society. In this regard, the performance of basic education revealed that though some achievements have been made in Ethiopia, the country is still categorized among the poor performance (UNESCO, 2007:38).

Similarly, MoE (2005) in ESDP III stated that though there is significant progress made in increased access and coverage in basic primary education, we have to go faster in this area

so as to achieve the goal of Universal Primary Education (UPE) by the year 2015. To achieve this, the introduction of alternative basic education was a new government intervention to address basic education for out of school children. In so doing, an appropriate organizational structure is important for an effective management of the program, and to provide technical support for the program at different levels and stages of implementation (Dougals, 2004:33). It has also been realized that social organizations should exist to satisfy the objectives and goals for which they are established. School systems as social organization are established for the purpose of cultivating the youth through education. Schools are centers for social development and their major function is instruction (Gray, 1985:11). The efficient and effective instructional process can be achieved through better management of the learning programs. In relation to this, Thoms (1996:1) stated, "schools are effective and efficient if they are managed well but researches and our life experience shows that resources are not used effectively as we might." Besides, MoE (2005:55) in ESDP III indicated that quality instruction and learning achievements are enhanced through efficient school leadership and management. However, studies have shown significant problems in relation to supervision, planning and implementation capacity, particularly at Woreda and school/center level.

In this regard, though the ABE program in almost all the regions seem to lack coordination in strategy and management, in Amhara, particularly there is poor organizational capacity in supporting schools and the facilitators in centers were not fully prepared for undertaking their duties (JRM, 2006(b):31-32). Similarly, it was also stated in 'ATKLT' (2006:72-73) proceedings that the alternative basic education in the region has got the challenges like turnover of the facilitators, poor provision of the learning materials to some centers, employing untrained facilitators, using traditional approach of teaching, little support of head teachers to the facilitators, very low participation of CMCs and KETB to the program, poor physical organizations, communities low sense of ownership for the program and follow up of the program by experts. From this it is implied that in the region there are problems like staffing of facilitators, internal organizations of the centers, monitoring and evaluation, which could enhance the internal efficiency and effectiveness of the program. That is, increasing the retention and completion rate of the children, and reduces employees' turnover for the intended program. To this end, the management of these programs at various

levels of implementation seems to deserve investigation. Thus, an attempt has been made to investigate the status of the management of the ABE program run by the GOs and NGOs and look for the answers for the following basic questions:

1. How are the planning, organization and staffing of ABE programs done by GOs and NGOs?
2. How are the ABE program monitored and evaluated under both providers of the program?
3. Who are the participants in planning, organization, staffing, monitoring and evaluation of the ABE program in GOs and NGOs?
4. What are the major constraints that challenge the management of ABE programs in GOs and NGOs?
5. What similarities and differences are found in the management of ABE program between GOs and NGOs?
6. What are the major strengths and weaknesses in the management of ABE programs under both institutions (GOs and NGOs)?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

1.3.1 General Objective

The objective of this study is to investigate the status of the management of Non- Formal Alternative Basic Education programs of government and nongovernmental organizations in Amhara Regional State.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study are:

- To examine the management of the learning programs in relation to the process of planning, organization, staffing, monitoring and evaluation of the program between GOs and NGOs;
- To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the managements of ABE programs under GOs and NGOs;
- To identify the challenges that affect the managements ABE programs; and
- To assess who are the participants in the managerial aspects of government and non-government run ABE programs.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Ethiopia has been running the new education and Training policy since 1994. The policy aims at cultivating potential individuals who can support themselves and develop their own country through understanding of the problems that affect the achievements of its goals and objectives. On the top of this, the policy requires an effective and efficient utilization of alternative means for providing basic education. In this regard, the study will have the following significances:

- ❖ Helps in creating awareness about the management of ABE learning programs;
- ❖ Suggests solutions for the major challenges of the management of ABE programs;
- ❖ Helps the providers of the program to share experiences one from the other.
- ❖ Serves as a feedback to draw a suitable strategy towards the management of ABE programs; and
- ❖ Serves as a basis for other researchers who would like to make in depth study in the area.

1.5 Delimitations of the Study

Since Amhara Regional State is a wider region having eleven zones, it was unrealistic and impractical to conduct the study under all program centers. Thus, to make the study more manageable and feasible, the study was delimited to three zones, that is, East Gojjam, Bahir Dar Liyu Zone and South Gondar Zones.

Similarly, the study was delimited to examine the current status of how the ABE program is managed. The study focuses on the assessment of how the processes of planning, organization, staffing, monitoring and evaluation aspects of the program management are carried out. It only examines the management practices in government and non-government run ABE centers. However, the study did not include the outcomes or impact of the program and it did not also attempt to look into the quality of instruction the centers provide. In short, the scope of the study was delimited to process evaluation of the program, specially the managerial aspects.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

Though there are a number of challenges during the study, the following were the major ones:

- Financial constraints limited the investigator so as not to consider more sample study areas for indepth study.
- Lack of transportation for such remote ABE centers took a lot of time to distribute and collect the data. In spite of these problems, the study was carefully managed and completed.

1.7. Operational definitions

- ❖ *Alternative Basic Education (ABE)* is a non-formal education system which is designed to provide basic primary education for all. This basic education program has a three-year cycle and is equivalent to the formal basic education (Grade 1-4) (ESDP-II, 2002:16)
- ❖ *Universal primary Education(UPE)*- Full enrollment of all children in the primary school age group i.e., 100 percent net enrollment ratio(UNESCO,2001:75)
- ❖ *Non-formal education*:- is any organized and systematic educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide selected types of learning to particularly sub-groups of the population, adults as well as children(Coombs and Ahmad, 1974:11)
- ❖ NGOs are a non-profit entities that provide service to the member or client groups and they include grass roots organizations such as community groups, religion organizations,cooperativesandprivatedevelopmentorganizations(Webb and et.al.,1995:8)
- ❖ Programs are the major areas of study such as subject areas, and other separately identifiable activities, home-school links, records of activities ,records of achievements ,administration ,etc(Levacic,R .1995:72)
- ❖ Facilitators are people who may be trained or untrained in the teaching of non-formal alternative basic education.
- ❖ Officials in this study are people who are regarded as coordinators, head teachers, educational experts/leaders and supervisors.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Basic Education: Definition and Concepts

Basic education is the fundamental component of the formal education. According to Thompson (2001(a):11) basic education is the first level of the formal education in the educational pyramid. It is the stage where basic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and internalization and exhibition of values are achieved so as to change learners own lives.

Similarly, Phillips (1975(b):1) put the definition of basic education as having two meanings: i) The bottom part of the educational structure which is adequate to support the parts above it, and ii) something that exists in a form to meet adequate functional needs. He further argues that basic education is "... a minimum social requirement, like the number of calories needed to secure freedom from hunger...It arises because full basic education in the first sense is not get feasible in a number of developing countries"(p:126). The advancement of basic education towards the world's illiterate masses is one of the main hopes of stopping the large population growth and low productivity which threaten the future economy of the world (Phillips, 1975(a)). The issue of basic education should be seen as a long-term investment and a short-term response to the people's aspirations and needs. It is obvious that people with out at least basic education are less likely to bring personal development and they are less invited in the participations to wards societal matters for better growth and development. These people are also lacking aptitude for employment, and for further education and training (Phillips, 19759(a)).

Thus, a nation which fails to invest in basic education for citizens could not develop its human resources for the intended development targets. If a nation is to make a lasting development reforms in all sectors, it would improve the level of literacy among its people. That is, without a sizeable level of literacy, a country could not ensure sustainability in its economic, social and political life.

2.2 Why Basic Education?

Basic education encompasses all activities that provide individuals with a certain minimum of education considered indispensable and possible for the society. Basic education is crucial

in improving the standards of everyone through promotion and enrichment of communal life. That is, it helps individuals to participate in activities of community to acquire the attitudes, competence and behaviors necessary for taking initiative and responsibility which will allow them to play active roles within the society to make the best use of the resources, and thus to increase its economic prosperity and its well-being in every field (Botti, et al., 1978:8).

Basic education as a human right is often considered the only means of increasing the peoples' opportunities to exercise their right to education. This in turn helps people to practice democratic rights and develop active tolerance (in providing the knowledge and judgment that promote tolerance and understanding among peoples) (Ibid: 9). In relation to this, WCEFA (1990) in Yates and Bradly (2000:7) explained that the learning tools-literacy, oral expression and numberacy, and the basic learning contents (knowledge, skills, values and attitudes) are required by every one to be able to survive, to develop their full capacities, to live and work in dignity, to participate fully in development, to improve their quality of life and to continue learning. Thus, basic education seems the minimum requirement for people to improve the social, economic and political aspects of their life and community.

2.3 The Concepts, Objectives and Features of Alternative Basic Education (ABE)

2.3.1 The Concepts of ABE

Alternative basic education is an alternative approach to formal education to provide basic education to un-enrolled and dropout children in remote rural and access denied areas. In line with this, MoE (2005) in ESDP III stated that ABE is the program designed as an emergency step to achieve the objective of universal primary education by the year 2015 and it also helps to address the necessary knowledge and skills particularly to the hard-to-reach children in rural areas.

In this regard, Thompson (2001(b):11) noted that alternative basic educational program is provided on the basis of the assumption that all children and adults can learn basic primary education if provided with the right educational environment. Alternative basic education as an alternative approach to formal education deals with learning which is characterized by

flexibility, diversity, and transparency in relation to the degree of openness –open access, open learning and a lot of opportunities to release the creative potentials of learners.

2.3.2 The Objectives of ABE

The non-formal basic education program is believed to address basic education for out-of-school children and adults including girls, working people, street boys and girls, nomads, etc to get basic knowledge, and functional skills which could help to bring personal and societal development. Specifically, John Hillard (1973) in Berhanu (2000:11) has given the following detail descriptions about the objectives of alternative basic education:

- I. Non-formal education is the education designed to reach large number of people where they live and work. Its objective is to impart knowledge, skills and recreation without removing people from their normal environment and responsibilities.*
- II. Non-formal education can be highly diverse in organization, funding and management. It can emphasize local initiative, self-help and innovation on the part of large number of people and their local institution.*
- III. It is the education designed to play its own way through increased employment, productivity and social participation.*
- IV. The objective of non-formal education is to make learning national life-long learning experiences compatible with the interest of the individuals and communities for all economic levels of the society.*
- V. Non-formal education can be valid, high quality education imparting life-skills and knowledge.*

Thus, the non-formal basic education is given in wider scope with its own mode of delivery, methodology, curriculum, management keeping a firm link with a formal school system in order to achieve its intended objective.

2.3.3 The Features of ABE

The ABE program is designed as an important strategy and being implemented for out of schoolchildren and adults who were denied access to basic primary education for various reasons .In so doing, the program is provided in the way it focuses on specific learning

objectives, learning needs, target population, organizational and curricular flexibility, and relevancy to the cultural and contextual realities (Befekadu, 2006) He further summarized the features of ABE programs as follows:

- ❖ It is flexible in structure and content so as to respond to their changing needs;
- ❖ The school setting enables parents to have close monitoring over physical and moral security of children;
- ❖ It is helpful to realize the social, economic and political hindrances of the rural communities and in turn a means for community control;
- ❖ It is delivered with non-antagonistic of cultural environment;
- ❖ Its location to the learners' village; and
- ❖ It is cost effective to implement (PP: 11-12).

2.4 Managing the Educational Program

The term management as stated in Atchison and Hill (1978) in Ayalew Shibeshi (1991:1) refers to “--- a common set of activities that are designed to promote and direct purposeful work.” In relation to this, Guruge (1977:27) also states that management is a social process which is designed to ensure the cooperation, participation, intervention and involvement of others in the effective achievement of the given objectives. Management as a social process lays its major emphasis on the interaction of people-people inside and outside the formal institutions, and people below and above one's operational position. Similarly, management according to Adesina (1990:7) is “The organization and mobilization of all human and material resources in a particular system for the achievement of identified objectives in the system.” From this we can deduce that school management is an important tool which drives human and non-human resources to accomplish the delegated tasks for the intended objectives.

2.4.1. Planning the Educational Program

The management system in an organization begins with planning. Since planning is an initial step in the area of management that people plan to succeed but a lot of them fail to plan (Ishumi, 1984:21). He also noted that planning is “a process that is clearly associated with

efforts to anticipate and influence positive results in change, in tune with rationally defined objectives.” To do this, the planner is expected to be technically an expert at a critical point between the past behind him-the ideas, judgments and ideology with the existing policy, and the future in front of him- questions of implementation, predicting of effects and observation of impacts (Ibid).

In the same way, Adesina (1990:8) pointed out that planning is “A way of projecting our intentions, that is, a method of deciding what we want to accomplish.” Planning focuses on the concepts of the future, problems seeking imaginations, choices, designing and thinking carefully before doing it. It is, therefore, very important in directing us to allocate the scarce resources to the right activity if the planner is careful of gathering the necessary data that are used for planning before one can simply appreciate the value of the forecast. That is, planning guides us to determine the nature of the staffing, budgeting and other resources to be distributed to an organization based on its prior needs. However, plans which prospect at sometime may not be practical and manageable if the political, socio-cultural and economic context is irrelevant to the situation. Thus, the planner should sometimes be flexible in planning programs as the objectives of the school system are the reflections of the objective of the whole society which have probably been produced by the people at the top or the political decision makers (Andesina, 1990:9)

2.4.1.1 The Framing Questions to Plan the ABE Learning Programs

The alternative basic education program is more feasible if the following basic questions are answered by the program planners.

- ❖ What should be the priority objectives and functions of the educational system?
- ❖ What are the best alternatives of pursuing various objectives and functions? This is considering of alternative educational technologies, their relative costs, time requirements, practical feasibility etc.
- ❖ How much the nations or community’s resources should be devoted to the education at the expense of other things? For example, how much the human and non-human resource does the educational program absorb?
- ❖ Who should pay the educational costs?

- ❖ What is the strategic focus within which the program will be implemented? Besides to other sectors, the out-of-school children learning program in most cases would be within the education sector, for instance, as part of overarching basic education strategic objectives.
- ❖ What are the skills that learners need to master? The design of an effective learning program begins with an understanding of skill objectives in the sector in which the program is being implemented. Once such skills have been identified, the program designers can develop instruction designs that help the students to practice the skills within the context they are expected to be applied.
- ❖ How can expertise from different sectors be utilized to design an effective program? When designing the alternative learning program to basic formal education, people from different sectors should be involved to work closely in planning, implementing and evaluating the proposed program.
- ❖ Are the available learning materials of sufficient quality? The out-of-school children-learning programs fail to consider the importance of investing in quality teaching and learning materials, but most effective programs depend on well-designed materials that teachers/facilitators and learners use in the instructional setting.
- ❖ Is there sufficient capacity to implement the program? It deals with the human resources to implement the out-of-school children-learning programs.
- ❖ How achievements are monitored and/or evaluated? We have to aware of how to facilitate classroom teachers, administrators, heads /principals, unit leaders, etc to care of the teaching learning processes (Ishumi, 1984:25; Coombs 1970:34)

2.4.1.2. Purposes of Planning

Leaderships have a primary responsibility for planning so as to achieve effective levels of performance. According to Kindard (1988:95-96) planning has the following purposes:

- I. **Planning promotes professional growth:** - The planning skill promotes the growth of school principal's/head teachers' profession and status. This talent helps him/her to allocate scarce resources where they are needed most.

- ii. **Planning provides the framework for the organization:** - Most plans set the intended results and identify the activities necessary to accomplish them. That is, when people plan, they determine what tasks are going to be done, who should do them, and how people do them in organizational hierarchy to accomplish their plans.
- iii. **Planning aids in delegating authority:-** Since the planner is supposed to have better technical and managerial skills that the plans forces him/her to determine in advance who will be accountable for various tasks.
- iv. **Planning helps to motivate people:** - Planning is done to achieve an intended objective of an institution and this can be feasible through people's hard work accompanied by rewards based on performance standards.
- v. **Planning aids communication flow:-**an open communication system in an institution could solve employees work related problems but this is not true in most institutions. Thus, good plans should provide a framework and give people the information they need and want. Plans that specify employees' exact areas of accountability convey messages more meaningfully than directed to the entire groups.
- vi. **Planning helps to monitor work:** - The tasks shouldn't be done with the sole wills of the employees but it has been done so as to achieve the organizational objectives. To do this, monitoring is important to test what is done and how properly it is done for not seeing mistakes again and to minimize costs- while the tasks are going on as well as after it has been completed.
- Vii. **Planning builds confidence:** - A good planning process that invites all levels of management to be involved builds confidence in an institution. It also indicates the management has a direction, the decision-making is under control and the whole institution is striving to achieve the same objectives.
- viii. **Planning helps to shape the future:** - Planning directs people what they are going to do and accomplish vis-à-vis the stated institutional objectives

2.4.1.3 Criteria for Program Planning

It is evident that school development plan should not be carried out with the sole priorities and interests of the school principals. Instead, the head has to attract school staffs, community representatives and others to develop good planning considering the priorities

and perceptions of the schools' strengths, weakness and future needs. To do this, school development planners should recognize criteria such as planning for specific and observable outcomes, planning with in time scales, planning with cost effective and priorities for better resource management and school improvement (Thomas and Marthin, 1996:146).

Planning by itself is not completed though the written plan is produced. The difficult part is to implement it. The strategic planning further helps to keep the course through making adjustment as both the internal and external situations changes. The strategic planning process should take in to account all aspects of the schools activity such as the context, vision, aim and objectives, curriculum, staffing, pupils, community, physical resource, finances, implementation, monitoring and evaluating (Preedy et.al., 1997:196). In relation to this, it is also noted that a good plan and planning process have the following criteria:

- ❖ The school has allocated clear roles and responsibilities for drawing up, implementing and review the plan.
- ❖ It considers the schools development over at least three years.
- ❖ It includes the schools strengths and weaknesses, aims and present values.
- ❖ There is a clear vision of where the school should be in the future.
- ❖ It takes in to account the future context, including pupils' number, likely resource available and relevant legislation.
- ❖ It includes the financial implications, including the current budget and financial projection for the next years.
- ❖ There is appropriate consultation with staff governors and other interested parties.
- ❖ Achievements can be / is measured against pre-determined criteria.
- ❖ The budget setting process is closely aligned to those priorities confined in the plan.
- ❖ It includes the whole of a school's activity (Preedy et.al., 1997: 203-204).

Similarly, Guruge, (1977:5) stated that planning the program consists of the following activities. These are: I) Determining what to do, when and how to do it. ii) Defining objectives and determining operations to achieve maximum effectiveness through a process of setting targets. iii) Gathering and analyzing information. iv) Developing alternatives v) Preparing and communicating plans and decisions.

2.4.1.4 Features of Program planning

It is obvious that for better development and change of a certain school, it should be started with good program planning. Here are some features of a good program planning:

- i. **Participation:** is important for decision making group such as a school where the effectiveness of the decision is closely related with the willingness of others to implement it. Planning should be participatory and includes staff people, supporting and servicing such activities. In other terms, participation is crucial in increasing professional accountability, and it is also used as an alternative to the principals' concentration of power. That is, greater involvement in participation leading greater ownership and commitment to decision making, policy development and other change process (Newton and Tarrant, 1992:92)
- ii. **Consultation:** it refers to seeking of information or advice from others with in or out side the organization/institution for an effective decision-making process. This should also be reflected in ABE program planners to share ideas with similar schools/centers or formal schools with regard to every aspects of planning (ibid: 95)
- iii. **Flexibility:** it is true that no one can surely predict the future. Thus, plans should be flexible. People must adjust smoothly and quickly to changing conditions with out serious losing of their effectiveness (Kindard, 1988:97)
- iv. **Objectivity:** planning should start with objective thinking. It should be realistic, logical and factual. Planning should be directed towards achieving organizational goals /objectives than personal objectives (Ibid)

2.4.2. Organization

Organization is the next stage after planning is over in the management process. As pointed out in Guruge (1977:13) organization is "arranging a complex tasks into manageable units and defining the formal relationships among the people who are assigned with various tasks" This is to mean that whenever the manager/head wants to run the plan, he/she has to establish an efficient framework in relation to the items of work, personnel and lines of communication, and authority among them. In this regard, Adesina (1990:11) explains that in an institution, the head decides what jobs would have to be filled, and the duties and responsibility given to each one. People in an institution are not expected to run activities in

isolation rather with a line of communication and means of coordination. Coordination is an important part of organization, that is, the head organizes the activities for a system. Thus, effective organization requires the head's wisdom, maturity and objectivity, and the most important guiding principle assigning the activities to the people on the bases of their qualification, experience and interests.

Better organization in a certain institution is also valuable for an efficient assembling of the human and material resource to achieve an intended objective of the institution. To bring this, knowing the organizational approach is very important. Regarding this, Mondy and Noe (1990:142) pointed out the following approaches to organize the institutional /organizational activities:

- i) *Knowing the objectives of the institution/organization*
- ii) *Breaking down the tasks to be done into component activities*
- iii) *Grouping activities into practical/related units*
- iv) *Assigning qualified personal to the required position.*
- v) *Delegating the required authority to the assigned personnel.*

2.4.2.1. Guiding Activities /Criteria for Educational Organization

According to Guruaage (1977:5), educational organization has the following guide lines. These are: i) Obtaining necessary facilities, equipment and staff to accomplish the plans. ii) Grouping component jobs in to an orderly organizational structure iii) Establishing the structures of authority and coordinating techniques iv) Formulating and defining methods and procedures v) Selecting, training and informing staff, and obtaining the necessary resources

2.4.2.2 Components of Educational Organization

The organization of the school is a systematic arrangement developed to accomplish its objectives. Stuart in Jenson et.al. (1967:67) stated that an elementary school has two basic components of the organizational structure. These are organization for administrative purpose and organization for instructional purpose.

I) Administrative Organization

The administrative organization deals with the operational management of children and staff, building maintenance, business responsibilities, etc (Ibid). Since the introduction of decentralized education system, the regions and their lower bodies play the major roles in administering the daily activities of the non formal and formal educational programs. Alternative basic education as a non formal educational program could be linked with such administrative phases (Mamo et.al., 1998:38).

The staff personnel administration is recognized as the most important functions of the school management by lots of principals /head teachers. The way the staff is organized and the extent to which staff members identify the total school programs will help the quality of the school. Hence, the principals should devote a maximum effort towards a sound staff organizational structure (Jenson et.al., 1967:180).

II) Instructional Organization

It deals with the organization of the school curriculum. The non-formal alternative basic education provides basic primary education mainly for- out- of school children. The program is offered for the lower primary level, that is, levels 1-3. Moreover, the program is given to the children in condensed and integrated manners of the formal basic education so as to achieve cumulative competencies in terms of literacy, numeracy and basic life skills that are equivalent to the potential of the children at the end of grade 4 in the formal basic schools. The NFABE program focuses on the subjects like language (local and English), mathematics, environmental education (natural and social sciences) (Mamo et .al, 1998:24). Besides, Physical education, music and arts are also given integratively with the above subjects (Ahmed, 1996 in Mammo et.al. ,1998:34). In relation to this, Reinhartz (1997:107) summarized that the basic elementary school curriculum includes language, mathematics, social studies, physical education and arts. These all programs should be given integratively so as to develop the whole personalities of the children. However, physical education and fine arts should not be taught by class room teachers but subject specialists. In other words, it is obvious that no teacher or facilitator is equally competent with all subjects that the program runners should consider of the self-contained teachers /facilitators how they

challenge subjects that seek special skills or talents so as to keep the quality and relevance of the program.

2.4.3 Staffing

Staffing is believed as the process of matching the right employee to the right position in a certain institution /organization. That is, staffing should not be to “fill in” but to “fit in” a vacant position of an institution. In relation to this, Okumbe (1998:235) states that teachers /facilitators / are probably the most important human resource that the country has. This is because the human capital development depends on the quality and effectiveness of teachers. As it was stated in (PSCO, 2004:57) the staffing process involves human resource planning, recruitment, selection, performance appraisal, training and development, induction and /or orientation, transfer and terminations. The following are the major components of staffing:

Human Resource planning (HRP):- refers to the process of estimating the size and making up the future working force. In other terms, it helps to acquire the right number of and kind of employees that are needed for a certain institution (Donnelly, 1992:457)

Recruitment: - is the activity of developing a pool of qualified candidates from which the institution/ organization may choose the most appropriate employees. It is also an attempt to identify and attract potential candidates to meet the requirements of the institution, for example, qualification, experience, personality etc. The organization should give equal employment opportunities for all invited people regardless of gender, religion, ethnic, race or other social, political or economic inequalities. Moreover, the institution must ensure the recruitment practices conform to the law (PSCO,2004: 58).

- ❖ **Selection:** - is the process of evaluating and deciding on the best qualified candidates out of the pool applicants developed in recruitment process for openly based on their abilities, skills and characteristics (PSCO, 2004:58). The selection process is made using interviews and written tests such as aptitude test, achievement test, personality tests and others (Okumbe, 1998:236). A good place to start in making a selection decision is job analysis (job description and job specifications) which helps to get facts about the job .If human resource managers are to make a good match between the job and candidates; they should use the job description and job specification before they decide on the application.

- Job description:-is a statement that gives information about job title, duties, working conditions, resources used, etc.
- Job specification:-refers to the employees qualifications needed to run the jobs, for instance, education, experience vision communication skills, etc. (PSCO: 2004:60; Donnelly, 1992:458).

❖ **Induction /orientation**

After the hiring decisions have been made, the final phase of the selection process is induction or orientation. Orientation is the process of introducing new employees to their new work environment. It mainly involves:

- Making introduction of the new employee to other staffs.
- Discussing specific job duties and responsibilities
- Explaining the institution rules and regulations, and objectives
- Introducing the line and staff relation ships in the institution (PSCO, 2004:60 and Okumbe, 1998:236)

Thus, induction/ orientation has a lot of purposes for an employee in giving confidence and making an employee to start the job immediately.

❖ **Training and development:** Training and development consists of activities that inform employees about policies, job skills and their future advancement. Training is designed to improve a person's skills to do the current job and it should be based on the institutional and employees needs. To support this implementation document of the ABE program states that facilitators should be given a one month training and practice before they start teaching (AREB, 2003:8). Where as development focuses on the process of educating and developing senior employees in order to have the knowledge and skills needed to manage in future positions. Development, therefore, helps the people to use his/her full potential for better success of the institution (Donnelly, 1992:468).

❖ **Performance appraisal:** It refers to the process of determining the extent to which an employee is performing a given job effectively. It also helps to evaluate how the employee is successful in his present job. Thus, principals /head teachers should formulate performance plans and standards, supervisory staff to ensure valid tasks

has been accurately identified and valid performance standards are established with appropriate inputs. The main objective of performance appraisal is to find out potential workers in an institution. (PSCO, 2004:64 and Okumbe, 1998:237)

- ❖ **Transferring:** is moving a person from one job, institutional level or location to another where maximum potentials can be utilized by the institution. It includes:
 - **Promotion:** - it is the process of promoting an employee based on his skills, responsibilities and status (PSCO, 2004:64).
 - **Demotion:-** Is shifting a person to a lower-level position in the hierarchy less pay and less responsibility due to the inefficiency or in competency to meet the assigned tasks (Okumbe : 1998:237).
 - **Lateral transfer:** - is the movement of employees from one institution to another at similar levels (Pay and responsibility) within the institution to fill temporary vacancies to rectify wrong placement and to staff a new operation with the experienced person (PSCO, 2004:65).
- ❖ **Separation /Termination:** is the process where by the employee exits from his/her assigned job due to a number of reasons such as retirement, death, dismissal etc. Educational managers should have clearly stated rules on each kind of separation (Okumbe, 1998:259).

In short, the main purpose of staffing in schools is to improve morale, decrease turnover, increase efficiency and improve the performance of a certain institution's staff through a systematic process of performing planning, feedback and review based on evaluation of results achieved against specific objectives, measurable and consistently applied standards. From the above instances, we can deduce that though lots of ABE programs are run by Para-professionals, they should pass through every aspect of the staffing processes in order to achieve the organizational goals /objectives.

2.4.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

2.4.4.1 Monitoring

Monitoring is a regular oversight of the implementation of the program which looks to establish the degree to which input deliveries, work schedules, other required actions and

targeted outputs are going on according to the plan. This is particularly true when the program is to be introduced in remote and more disadvantaged rural areas. The main purpose of monitoring is to improve efficiency and adjust the work plan. With regard to ABE programs monitoring focuses mainly on total coverage, dropout rates, enrollment, attendance and transfer to formal schools etc. In this context, monitoring system is necessary so that school principals and other stakeholders can identify problems, and take an immediate and a timely action to solve them (Lyons and Collins, 1979:50; Mammo et. al, 1998:41). From this we can understand that monitoring is useful for gathering information for tracking progress according to previously agreed on plans and schedules. Differences between the actual and planned implementation are identified and corrective actions are taken. This in turn allows the heads to adjust strategies, if necessary, during implementation rather than to continue with less effective activities.

As it is stated in EIDC (2005) monitoring is a management tool that focuses on “the progress and improvement of project or program. It is a continuous process of assessing project implementations and aims at providing an on-going review and continuous feedback on changes in a number of key indicators or issues” (p. 29). Similarly, Newton and Tarrant (1992) pointed out that monitoring is a process of keeping an eye on a situation as it continues, develops or changes over time. The nature of monitoring in a certain institution/ organization may indicate a motivation to look for or not to look for change occurring. Conducting monitoring on every variables of the program is less significant rather we should focus on specific areas which are supposed to lead crisis or failure situation of the institution (p. 180).

Methods /approaches of monitoring are different and tend to overlap with evaluation methods but typically might include the following:

- **Dipstick approaches:** - these are monitoring approaches carried out in series over random or pre-planned time intervals.
- **Review meetings:**-participants get to discuss what has happened, what is going well, problems that seek tackling and future planning.

- **Informed consultation:-** regularly those involved in the change process are asked about how they see and feel things are going and results are recorded.
- **Performance indicators:** - progress is compared periodically with a set of stated objectives or performance indicators that are agreed in advance to be indicative of success (Tarrant and Newton, 1992:180). Similar to evaluation, monitoring will involve people from inside as well as outside of an organization. Teachers, parents, heads and pupils are people from the inside, and consultants, inspectors, advisors, other school visitors, etc are people who could be invited from outside of the organizations. Such an open invitation of people for monitoring is helpful for an organization to move forward and achieve its organizational objective (Ibid: 181). Thus, periodical monitoring of the progress of the activity at the implementation stage is necessary to run a more comprehensive evaluation of a particular activity from time to time.

2.4.4.2 Evaluation

Evaluation is “a systematic assessment of a planned, ongoing or completed intervention to determine its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability” (EIDC, 2005:3). Thus, evaluation is an instrument for improving educational activity. That is, it helps either to permit periodic adjustment to be made or to improve the program as a whole. This can be done when there is an attempt to determine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and impacts of activities in the light of specified objectives. According to Burton and Brueckner (1955) in Jenson et. al. (1967:355), evaluation is a process of making value judgment on the basis of relevant information that can be gathered about any significant aspect of the educational program.

An effective evaluation system should fulfill different functions: Keep the quality and efficiency of the whole program; give information and insight for maximizing learning outcomes and impacts; provide evidence and data to decision makers and planners; help learners, teachers (facilitators) and others involved at the grassroots level to assess learning outcomes, assess difficulties and improve results; and provide feedback to those who prepare the teaching /learning materials so as to improve their quality. A well-developed

evaluation system should; therefore, not only measurement oriented but also improvement or development oriented rather than acting as tumbling block and a threatening impersonalized instrument of grading or failing of pupils. Moreover, evaluation should be considered from different dimensions such as environmental setting, learning processes, immediate outcomes and long-range impact or effects (Ranaweera et. al., 1989:32).

In short, a lot of writers agree that evaluation should be a continuous process of inquiry concerned with the study, appraisal and improvement of all issues of the education program in the society. Thus, an effective program evaluation is characterized by:

- Compatibility with pre-determined purposes, goals and objectives;
- Comprehensives, good posture in planning and execution;
- Effective utilization of both objective and subjective data;
- Variety and imaginativeness in techniques for gathering evidence ;and
- Intelligent interpretation and reporting of results (Jenson et al, 1967: 355).

Why Program Evaluation?

Program evaluation deals with “accountability, program goals, resources, planning and networking, program operation, recruitment of staff and training, nature of educational events, program impacts and others.” (Cookson, 1998:305). The feasibility of a certain program is tested using monitoring and evaluation instruments. Hence, program evaluation has the following purposes:

- i. **Accountability:** - Evaluations are needed for accountability purpose - to find out whether program heads are using limited resources in the ways planned and bringing about the intended results.
- ii. **Learning lessons for future applications:** - Evaluation can be conducted for the lessons they provide to government and non-government organizations. An evaluation may look at programs to learn what fosters it to a larger scale or sustainability.
- iii. **Reduces uncertainty:** - program evaluation increases credibility and support for better decisions; to increase or decrease specific strategies, components, or techniques; to continue or stop the program, to allocate resources appropriately, etc(Ibid)

- iv. **Practice – improvement-** This purpose includes its use to promote efficiency and reduce wastages. Evaluation can identify problems that explain why certain activities are not performed as expected. The evaluation process may also improve performance by clarifying objectives, improving communication between all concerned parties, highlighting obstacles, and it may lead to accelerated implementation (Deshler, 1984 in Cookson, 1998:306).
- v. **Making choices among activities:-** It is important to clarify at the outset whether the primary purpose of the evaluation is to improve program performance or to make an overall judgment about program effectiveness (Ibid)

Bases for Program Evaluation

Here are some considerations that should be kept in mind for making judgments about the program:

- ❖ Considering the philosophy of education-It deals with what the school and the community believe about education, its importance, its direction and its immediate values in the lives of children;
- ❖ Relating evaluation towards the purposes and objectives of education in the organization. These are usually explained in terms of behavioral goals, changes and expectations of growth and development in children;
- ❖ Evaluation should be made in terms of the reality of the consumer and the kind of the learners for which the educational program is being developed;
- ❖ Considering the needs of community in the evaluation process; and
- ❖ Taking into account the nature of national and overall goals of education. No community lives independent of other part of the society. That is, the product of our schools becomes part of the large society. (Jenson et. al., 1967: 356)

According to Harlen (1978) for program evaluation a group of decision makers such as consumers (parents and pupils), professional educators (class teachers and head teachers), administrators and society in general are involved. However, the decision areas should be identified earlier for better evaluation (p: 116). Though different stakeholders are involved in the evaluation of the program, the role of the school principal is highly significant in the evaluation of the program and staff. With regard to program evaluation, the head should be

conscious of what is going on in and out of the school. At the maximum efforts he/she has to obtain first hand knowledge about the program through extensive classroom contacts and visits; meeting with staff members, parents and others; surveying different sources of information; initiation of studies and inventories and all other means at his/her command that will yield valid and reliable information. The head should have a true perception what is included in evaluation and a clear differentiation should be made between criticism, opinion, rumor and valid observations- these all play a part in what comes under the concept of evaluation (Jenson et al., 1967: 356)

2.5. School Leadership/ Head Teacher

The term leadership has different interpretation by different scholars. As Okumbe (1998) pointed out leadership is “The process where by one person influences others to do something of their own volition, neither because it is required nor because of the fear of the consequences of non-compliance” (P.186). It is, therefore, a process of motivating and helping people to work morally towards the intended objectives. In this regard, Adesina (1990) defines leadership as “The ability to get things done with the support and cooperation of other people within the institution or organization.” He further states that leadership is not enforcing the subordinates to do something rather motivating them to ensure the objectives or goals of the institutions/ organization (p. 147).

2.5.1 Qualities of Leadership/Head Teacher

Researchers and practitioners have not yet reached at the conclusive agreement with the qualifications of the basic elementary school leadership/head teacher. However, researchers have showed that the best principal is the one who possesses a high level of academic achievement in college or university training, a high level of interpersonal skills, a strong motive of service, willingness to commit duties and relatively few years of classroom teaching experiences (Gross and Herriott in Jarvis, 1969:4).

A leadership has both tangible and intangible qualities. Tangible qualities include acquired skills, demonstrated or demonstrable techniques and other cognitive qualifications-academic background and attainments. A Leader also possesses in tangible qualities such as

considerations for others, motivation, good intentions, faith, respect for subordinates, confidence, and so on (Adesina, 1990:149).

2.5.2 The Roles of Leadership

According to Adesina (1990), the leadership of a certain institution has a number of responsibilities. These are:-

- a) **Motivation:** - in the school system, we want to ensure that each people from the leader to the gate man is making his/her maximum effort to achieve the organizational goals. This can be done through motivating, providing immediate attainable goals, the means/methods and giving feedbacks to the staff by the principal.
- b) **Understanding the ability of staff:** - in the school, there are people under different areas of specializations that the principal/head teacher gets to know the characteristics and abilities of men and women under him/her for better adjustment of the program.
- c) **Job classification:** - it is clear that whether the new or senior employees are expected to know what their specific tasks are. The principals/head teachers, therefore, should delegate tasks with their appropriate job specification than delegating activities randomly to teachers /facilitators or to non-teaching staff if we want to see the expected outcomes from a certain program.
- d) **Staff orientation:** - it is true that new employees are not familiar with the school system that the principal should provide the necessary orientation and advice about the organization before the employee brings unnecessary wastage in the institution (pp: 151-153).

Similarly, Beare et. al. (1989) in Levacic, R. (1995:109) stated the following roles of the school leadership:

- *Ensuring that resources are acquired and allocated in a manner with goals ,needs, priorities and plans;*
- *Supervising teachers and their development;*
- *Supporting teachers through maintaining an orderly school community;*
- *Quality control through monitoring and evaluation of teaching and learning;*

- *Co-ordinating; and*
- *Trouble shouting.*

2.6. Communities' Participation in the Management of School

It is obvious that access, equity and quality have not been fully achieved through the sole responsibilities of the government in such developing countries. According to Bagin and Gallagher (2001), the school as an institution that brings changing social order can not adapt it-self to change or make necessary improvement without the active participation of the community. In case, there must be great involvement in support and management of the school and this also help them to know their school very well. Because of this, they will raise questions, obtain information, express their opinion, consider proposals and take position on critical issues. They also become part of the decision making process that keep up with social change and bring about educational change (VII).

With reference to the above instance, Jenson et. al. (1967:358) indicated that the school is a social system in the community having value origination and locus. Thus, it is the people connected with the social system who posses value, have roles and move in relation to a given area. The feature of the school relates itself to many publics in the community such as pupils, parents, teachers, merchants and others. Better community relation promotes a two - ways understanding, that is, the school should understand the community and the community should understand the school. The relations are based upon what the school is, what it does, how it does, and what it needs to do the job. In other words, the relation depends on the functions and conduct of the school, the understanding and interrelation ships and the level of rapport that exists.

As it is also stated in the ESDP-111 communities and KETBs /CMCs are playing an important role in education from contributing resources to managing schools. Communities are mobilizing resources for buying basic equipment and materials, employing contract teachers, and building schools and expanding classrooms. KETBs /CMCs are also active in raising awareness about the importance of education and in motivating parents to send children to schools in order to increase access and decrease dropouts. Though the roles of CMCs in management, preparing annual plans, building teacher's house and others are significant, they are still in need of further capacity building to enable them have quality school support. Similarly, kebele education and training board with the help of CMCs have

become instrumental in reducing dropouts and repetition rates and to bring better discipline in the schools (MoE, 2005:21).

In short, it is evident that the involvements of CMCs and KETBs in the management of school is yet high and have following responsibilities:

- Planning the future growth of the school with school community;
- Monitoring teachers/facilitators and students attendance;
- Monitoring the teaching learning process;
- Raising awareness of parents to send girls and boys to school;
- Solving disciplinary cases caused by teachers /facilitators and students;
- Adjusting school calendar to match with the needs of children's labor for harvesting;
- Supervising any kind of construction in the school;
- Planning and implementing the monitoring and evaluation tasks with others;
- Acting as a source of information about the program;
- Changing into realities the decisions made on monitoring and evaluation; and
- They bridge information between the community and the school (MoE, 2005:72; Merega Debella, 1999:28). Thus, the CMCs and KETB are highly the concerned bodies for the sustainability and feasibility of the ABE program that an appropriate training and introduction on specific tasks should be given to them.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1 Method of the Study

The purpose of this study was to make a comparative survey of ABE learning programs run by government and non-government organizations. To do this, a comparative survey method was employed as the study attempts to reflect the existing realities of the management of ABE learning programs in the study areas. The appropriateness of this method is discussed in Best and Kahn (1989) in Biruke (2006:8). Moreover, this method was used to describe the salient points about the opinions, perceptions and suggestions of facilitators, providers and head teachers on the management of ABE program.

3.2 Sample and Sampling Techniques

As it was referred in CRDA Directory (2008), the alternative basic education is provided by GOs in all zones (11) of the Amhara Regional State. Similarly, the ABE program is given by NGOs through out the regions except Awi Zone. Thus, Awi Zone was not included in the population. Even so, for the purpose of this study, purposive sampling technique was used. In case, South Gondar, Bahir Dar Liyu Zone and East Gojjam Zones in which NGOs are working were selected purposively on the basis of:

- The costs for ABE program run by NGOs in these zones are fully covered by NGOs them selves.
- Being the early established programs (more than three years) in the regions and this is helpful to get valuable information for the study.
- Being accessible to information for the researcher. In purposive or judgment sampling, the researcher decides who can provide better information to achieve the objective of the study (Kumar, 1999:162)

Regarding non- governmental organizations, Amhara Development Association (ADA) at 'Laygaint', Forum on Street Children Ethiopia (FSCE) at Bahir Dar town and Facilitator for Change Ethiopia (FCE) at Debre Markos are organizations running the programs in sample zones (see the back ground summary of NGOs in Appendix 'G').

Again, so as to make the study more manageable, 'Laygayent' woreda from South Gondar was selected randomly and 'Basoleben', 'Gouzamen' and 'Debre Markos' town from East Gojjam, and Bahir Dar town from Bahir Dar Liyu zone were taken through availability sampling from NGOs run ABE programs.

Similarly, 'Laygayent', 'Gouzamen' and 'BahirDarZuria' were selected purposively from South Gondar, East Gojjam and Bahir Dar Liyu Zones respectively for comparison in similar settings for government run ABE programs. In line with this, eight (80%) ABE centers out of ten from 'Laygaint', eight (73%) ABE centers out of eleven, that is, three from 'Basoleben', three from 'Gouzamen' were taken through simple random methods, and two (100%) ABE centers from 'Debre Markos' town and six (100%) out of six from 'Bahir Dar' town were selected through availability sampling from NGOs run ABE centers. Thus, a total of 22 ABE centers out of 27 ABE centers were considered from NGOs run ABE centers.

In both providers of the program, there is nearly the same number of population regarding ABE centers which were constructed more than three years ago. Hence, the sample size for government run ABE centers was proportional to the sample size of NGOs run ABE centers. In this regard, eight ABE centers from 'Laygaint', six ABE centers from 'Bahir Dar Zuria' and eight centers from 'Gouzamen' woreda were selected through simple random method from government run ABE centers. Hence, a total of 22 ABE centers out of 30 ABE centers were selected from government run ABE centers (the detail sampling of ABE centers can be seen in Appendix 'F').

Concerning the respondents, there is a total population of 12 ABE leaders/ experts at each provider of the program. That is, 2 informants from each zone and another 2 respondents from each woreda/project site. Then, from this total population 9 ABE program leaders/experts were selected through simple random method from each GOs and NGOs run ABE institutions. Again, three informants were selected from the Zone and Woreda/project site (out of 4 populations) through simple random method from each provider of the program. Thus, a total of 18 sample respondents were considered from both providers of the program.

Similarly, a total of 44 head teachers from both providers- 22 each from government and NGOs run ABE program centers were considered for the study through availability sampling methods.

Besides, 88 facilitators were taken from 44 ABE centers of both providers. That is, two facilitators from each sample center were considered through availability sampling. To sum up, a total of 150 respondents, that is, 75 respondents from each provider of the program were taken for this study. In other words, 18 program leaders/experts, 44 head teachers and 88 facilitators.

3.3 Source of Data

The primary data were collected using questionnaires and interview from different sample zones, woredas of the selected zones and ABE centers. That is, the data were gathered from educational experts, coordinators, head teachers and facilitators of government and NGOs providers of the program. Furthermore, documents like minutes, strategic plans, syllabus, reports and profiles at the program centers were surveyed to see issues related to the study.

3.4 Instruments of Data Collection

Instruments like questionnaires, interview and document inventory were employed. The assumption is that the combination of more than one instruments results in better evidence.

3.4.1 Questionnaires

Both close and open-ended types of questionnaires were designed to gather relevant data for the study. The questionnaires which were supposed to be distributed to educational experts, coordinators, head teachers and facilitators were first prepared in English and then it was translated into Amharic by special translators, and given to them to minimize and overcome the language barriers to understand the items contained in the questionnaires.

3.4.2 Interview

A semi-structured interview on all managerial skills and others was conducted with six ABE program leaders, three from each organization and one from each woreda/project site. An interview was also conducted with twenty four head teachers, twelve from each organization and four from each woreda/project site. The respondents were selected purposively as they were believed to provide maximum insight and understanding towards the issues under the

study .So as to handle the interview a tape recorder was used for some interviewees who were voluntary and a field note was used for the rest of respondents.

3.4.3 Document Inventory

The available documents such as syllabus, reports, minutes, attendances, strategic plans and profiles were made inventory at the ABE centers to gain an understanding of the phenomenon under the study.

3.5 Pilot Testing

The main purpose of pilot testing is to identify ambiguities, misunderstanding and other inadequacies of the instruments. A total of twenty one questionnaires were administered to GOs and NGOs respondents for this purpose. Of these, eleven questionnaires were distributed to GO respondents, that is, three educational experts, five facilitators and three head teachers at Dangella Woreda, Awi Zone. At the same time, ten respondents from NGOs, that is, four head teachers, four facilitators and two coordinators/experts at Bahir Dar town were participated for pilot test. Thus, the reliability of the instrument, particularly the multiple responses and the rating scale items were computed using the Cronbach's Alpha model and was found 0.827. The result was computed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 13 (for detail out put see Appendix 'H'). For the open-ended items the investigator received comments from the respondents, and discarded some items from planning (2), organization (3) and monitoring (1) sections of the questionnaires so as to generate the expected information from the respondents. Similarly, the questionnaires were given to the advisor and experts in the field to judge the content validity.

3.6 Procedures of Administration and Data Collection

After the necessary correction were made on the basis of the feedbacks of the pilot test, the questionnaires were distributed to all sampled respondents finding the convenient time for them so as to maximize the quality of response and degree of return.

Official contacts were made with every zone education offices to get permission and support for research work, and then woreda educational leaders and head teachers of ABE centers were informed about the objective of the study. The researcher had an assistant for each woreda for the timely distribution and collection of data. The researcher also made a close

study .So as to handle the interview a tape recorder was used for some interviewees who were voluntary and a field note was used for the rest of respondents.

3.4.3 Document Inventory

The available documents such as syllabus, reports, minutes, attendances, strategic plans and profiles were made inventory at the ABE centers to gain an understanding of the phenomenon under the study.

3.5 Pilot Testing

The main purpose of pilot testing is to identify ambiguities, misunderstanding and other inadequacies of the instruments. A total of twenty one questionnaires were administered to GOs and NGOs respondents for this purpose. Of these, eleven questionnaires were distributed to GO respondents, that is, three educational experts, five facilitators and three head teachers at Dangella Woreda, Awi Zone. At the same time, ten respondents from NGOs, that is, four head teachers, four facilitators and two coordinators/experts at Bahir Dar town were participated for pilot test. Thus, the reliability of the instrument, particularly the multiple responses and the rating scale items were computed using the Cronbach's Alpha model and was found 0.827. The result was computed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 13 (for detail out put see Appendix 'H'). For the open-ended items the investigator received comments from the respondents, and discarded some items from planning (2), organization (3) and monitoring (1) sections of the questionnaires so as to generate the expected information from the respondents. Similarly, the questionnaires were given to the advisor and experts in the field to judge the content validity.

3.6 Procedures of Administration and Data Collection

After the necessary correction were made on the basis of the feedbacks of the pilot test, the questionnaires were distributed to all sampled respondents finding the convenient time for them so as to maximize the quality of response and degree of return.

Official contacts were made with every zone education offices to get permission and support for research work, and then woreda educational leaders and head teachers of ABE centers were informed about the objective of the study. The researcher had an assistant for each woreda for the timely distribution and collection of data. The researcher also made a close

follow up during data collection and at the same time he also conducted an interview with sampled respondents. The data gathered through questionnaire were coded and tabulated in tables by bringing together related issues and made prepared for analysis.

3.7 Data Analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods that were relevant to each variable were employed. The data collected through questionnaires which lead themselves to quantitative analysis were computed using frequency distributions, means, weighted means and percentages whereas the data collected through interviews and document inventory were analyzed qualitatively using descriptive statements. Besides, the independent sample t-test was used to identify whether or not there is a significant mean difference between the two groups of respondents at 0.05 levels of significance. That is, it was used to compute the mean differences of the two groups of the respondents on the question items designed using a five point likert scales. For better interpretation of the analysis, the five point likert scales were further categorized in to 0.5-1.49=verylow/stronglydisagree, 1.5-2.49=low/disagree, 2.5-3.49=average/undecided, 3.5-4.49=high/agree and ≥ 4.5 =very high/strongly agree. Similarly, the one variable chi-square (goodness of fit (χ^2)) was used to determine the difference between two sets of categorical data based on the frequency counts at 0.05 levels of significance. For more precision, Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 15 was used.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This part of the thesis deals with organization, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered from governmental and NGOs run ABE program educational experts, coordinators, head teachers, and facilitators through questionnaires and interviews. A total of 150(77%) respondents were involved in filling out the questionnaires. Of these 75 are from government run ABE centers and the rest 75 are from NGOs run ABE centers.

Accordingly, 150 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents of both GOs and NGOs run ABE centers. Out of these, 146 (97.3%) were filled and returned. On the top of this, to substantiate the quality of the data, interviews were conducted with 30 respondents (15 from each provider of the program). These are program coordinators, supervisors, head teachers and educational experts drawn from both government and non government workers of the sub-sectors. Thus, the data gathered through questionnaires, interviews and document inventory were organized, analyzed and interpreted in line with the objectives of the study.

4.1. Characteristics of the Sample Respondents

Both government and NGOs respondents were asked to give their background information through questionnaires and interviews. In relation to this, the collected data were analyzed to describe the characteristics of the respondents in terms of sex, age, educational level and work experiences under both providers of the ABE program

Table 1: Respondents' Characteristics by Sex, Age, Education and Experiences

No	Items	Government				NGOs			
		Officials		Facilitators		Officials		Facilitators	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Sex								
	a) Male	14	45.2	18	45	15	48.4	17	38.6
	b) Female	17	54.8	22	55	16	51.6	27	61.4
	Total	31	100	40	100	31	100	44	100
2	Age a) ≤ 20	-	-	12	30	-	-	4	9.0
	b) 21-30	12	38.7	28	70	18	58.1	35	79.6
	c) 31-40	12	38.7	-	-	7	22.6	5	11.4
	d) Above 40	7	22.6	-	-	6	19.3	-	-
	Total	31	100	40	100	31	100	44	100
3	Educational level								
	a) 10 th complete	-	-	1	2.5	-	-	1	2.3
	b) 12 th complete	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	6.8
	c) T.T.I. graduates	22	71	39	97.5	22	71.0	40	90.9
	d) Diploma	7	22.6	-	-	4	12.9	-	-
	e) First degree	2	6.4	-	-	3	9.7	-	-
	f) Second degree	-	-	-	-	2	6.4	-	-
	Total	31	100	40	100	31	100	44	100
4.	Work experience								
	a) ≤ 3 years	20	64.5	34	85	21	67.7	39	88.6
	b) 4-10 years	9	29.0	6	15	10	32.3	5	11.4
	c) > 10 years	2	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total	31	100	40	100	31	100	44	100

N.B: F=number of respondents

It is believed that the sex of facilitators influences the teaching-learning process particularly at lower level. This is to mean that female facilitators have more interactive behaviors than male facilitators as they are considered having maternal approach to the children. In relation to this, it is stated in the Alternative Basic Education Strategy that female facilitators are good at creating conducive environment for girls to attend the program as well as to develop a sense of gender equity (AREB, 2003:4). In Table'1' (item '1') it has been evident that the number of female facilitators (55%) and (61.4%) in government and non-government run ABE centers respectively is greater than the corresponding male facilitators. Thus, the finding supports the above statement. This is also true in the case of government and non-government officials of the program.

Regarding age, (item '2') the majority of the population falls under the age range from 21-30 years. For instance, 70% of the facilitators from the government centers and 79.6% of the facilitators from NGOs centers are from 21-30 years. The respondents in this age group and below are really young and potential that they are believed to be responsible towards their missions in such more remote areas of the program centers.

The quality of employees has really an influence towards the achievement of the objectives of a certain institution. In this regard, 97.5% of the facilitators from government and 90.9% of the facilitators from NGOs'centers are T.T.I graduates for ABE program. Thus, the program is run by better facilitators in both providers of the program as that of the formal basic school teachers. In relation to this, the respondents during the interview replied that these days the educational trend is changing from access to quality education that there is a practice to make the minimum qualification for ABE facilitators to be certificate and there is even a discussion to terminate the contract of the already employed non- certified facilitators for quality sake.

A lot of people agree that an experienced person in a certain working environment is more effective than a new professional employee. In this regard, the majority 34 (85%) of facilitators from government ABE program centers and 39 (89.6%) of the facilitators from NGOs have the working experience less than four years. The working experience of the rest facilitators is from 4 to 10 years, that is, 15% and 11.4% from government and non government institutions respectively. This implies that lots of the facilitators from both providers of the program have limited experience that they would suffer a lot to understand about the various issues and problems concerning the ABE program.

4.2. Issues Related to Program Planning

This part of the paper discusses the objectives and planning related issues to the ABE program.

Table 2: Objectives of Providing the ABE Program in Priority Order

No	Objectives	Responses in Rank Order			
		Gov't (N=71)	Rank	NGOs (N= 75)	Rank
		Frequency		Frequency	
1	To provide basic education for out of school children with special emphasis of girls	36	1	34	1
2	To make basic education accessible to the marginalized areas	8	3	27	2
3	To give chances for dropout children to re-enter school	25	2	10	3
4	To give basic life skills for out-of school children	2	4	4	4

As indicated in Table 2 above, the responses for item '1' shows that, the program was designed to provide basic education for out- of- school children with special emphasis to girls was given top priority by both government and non-government providers of the program as replied by the majority of the respondents.

The program was designed to address basic education to marginalized areas was given second priority for NGOs providers and third for government providers of the program. Similarly, the items which say to give chances for dropout children to re-enter school and to provide basic life skills for out of school children were given second and fourth priority for government providers of the program, and third and fourth for NGOs providers of the program. From this, it is possible to conclude that except items '2' and '3', the rest of items were given similar priority order by both providers of the program.

On the other hand, the majority (76%) of the respondents during the interview from both providers of the program mentioned the following specific reasons for the delivery of the program.

- Flexibility nature of the program for house servants, animal keepers and other labour workers;
- Being accessible to access denied areas and cost effectiveness;
- It creates a good opportunity for children to learn their rights at early stage; and
- It addresses equity of education.

Table 3: Facilitators' Training and Officials' Program Planning

No	Item	Respondents						X ²
		Government respondents		NGO respondents		Total	%	
		F	%	F	%			
1	Have you been given any training towards lesson plan preparation?							61.7
	a)Yes	36	90	42	95.5	78	92.9	
	b) No	4	10	2	4.5	6	7.1	
	Total	40	100	44	100	84	100	
2	Have you got any prior training on ABE program planning?							18.6
	a) Yes	22	71	26	83.9	48	74.4	
	b) No	9	29	5	16.1	14	25.6	
	Total	31	100	31	100	62	100	

N.B: Df=1,*significant at (table value for χ^2 is =3.841 and $\alpha < 0.05$)

The above table indicates that 36 (90%) of the facilitators from GOs and 42 (95.5%) facilitators from NGOs run ABE program centers stated that prior training about lesson plan preparation was given before they began teaching. Whereas 4 (10%) and 2 (4.5%) of the facilitators from GOs and NGOs institutions respectively explained that they were not given any prior training about lesson plan preparation. Furthermore, the chi-square result indicates that there is statistically significant difference between the percentage of the responses of government and non government respondents regarding the training on lesson plan preparation. This implies that the majority of the facilitators from both providers of the program attended the given training for better preparation of lesson plan. It is also obvious that planning guides us what to do, how to do, when to do, where to do something and soon that the majority of facilitators from both providers got the necessary training. Besides, the document inventory highly supported this at FSCE run ABE centers. In these centers, facilitators were given a repeated training by program coordinators and subject specialists from Bahir Dar University on lesson plan preparation. Thus, there are training hand outs, lesson plan formats and a well prepared and a well filed series of lesson plans in the centers.

It is obvious that a proper planning is an initial step for implementation; which would address the needs, changes necessary and resources needed for implementing the intended program. Thus, planning focuses on interdependent factors like the people, the program and

the organization for the successful running of the intended program (Derebssa, 2002:40). According to the above table, 22 (71%) of the respondents from the government and 26 (83.9) of the respondents from non-government officials were given prior training about program planning. In contrast, 9 (29%) of the officials from government institutions and 5 (16.1%) of the same respondents from NGOs institutions were not given any training on program planning. Regarding this, the chi-square result shows that there is a statistically significant difference between the expected and observed frequency the respondents' responses towards the training on program planning. This implies that the majority of the officials from both providers of the program got the necessary training on program planning. This is also supported by document inventory that in most ABE program centers of both providers, action plans were divided in to quarters of the year and are implemented in to practice.

Table 4: Summary of the Responses Regarding the ABE Program Planning

No	Dimensions of planning	Government Respondents			NGOs Respondents				
		N	X	SD	N	X	SD	t-Obt	p-value
1	Plans reflect agreed priorities a) facilitators b) Officials	40	4.23	0.660	44	4.32	0.708	-0.624	0.534
		31	4.16	0.735	31	4.19	0.601	-0.189	0.851
2	In planning the program, objectives are well identified a) facilitators b) officials	40	4.33	0.573	44	4.14	0.134	1.319	0.191
		31	4.42	0.672	33	4.03	0.983	1.810	0.075
3	There are well established procedures of planning a) facilitators b) officials	40	3.63	0.897	44	3.48	1.191	0.646	0.520
		31	3.81	1.078	31	3.45	1.028	1.327	0.190
4	Our planning process encourages working relationships a) facilitators b) officials	40	4.38	0.540	44	4.48	0.505	-0.554	0.374
		31	4.23	1.023	31	3.81	1.014	1.621	0.110
5	Program planning is done through inviting different stakeholders a) facilitators b) officials	40	3.94	0.929	44	4.09	0.960	-0.644	0.521
		31	4.13	0.806	31	4.13	0.806	-0.876	0.384
6	Information is gathered systematically as part of the planning process a) facilitators b) officials	40	4.05	0.997	44	4.20	0.734	-0.673	0.503
		31	4.00	1.033	31	3.74	0.930	3.87	0.305
7	Planning about the program is done before the ABE program is started a) facilitators b) officials	40	4.08	1.207	44	4.57	0.505	-2.180*	0.034
		31	4.19	1.046	31	4.35	0.661	-0.76	0.471

N.B: t_{-obt} = calculated value for t -test

Df = 60 for facilitators

(* significant at alpha level < 0.05)

Df = 82 for officials

Any employee under a certain institution is expected to have some basic concepts about planning aspects as every activity of the program begins with the planning. In the above Table '4', the computed t-test values show that there is no statistically significant difference between the mean values of the responses of government and non government respondents for items '1'-'5'. This implies that the respondents under both providers of the program were agreed on the dimensions of planning. Where as, the t-test value for item '7' indicates that there is statistically significance difference between the mean results of the facilitators' responses regarding "planning about the program is done before the program is started" in government and non-government institutions. In this study, the finding shows that the respondents were highly agreed on "program planning is done earlier in non governmental institutions than governmental institutions" for better management of the ABE program. In general, thorough investigations of the mean values for almost all items under both institutions show that the respondents were agreed towards the items listed in the above table.

Similarly, the officials were asked through open-ended question about "Who is/are involved in program planning?" The respondents from both providers of the program listed the following stakeholders in program planning. That is, head teachers, cluster supervisors, facilitators, CMCs and KETB were the participants in program planning under government run ABE centers where as head teachers, program coordinators, facilitators, cluster providers, CMCs and KETB were also the participants under non government providers of the program. From this it can be implied that inviting the concerned bodies in program planning helps the participants to know their roles and responsibilities, and they would be accountable for the activities they designed in the plans. Thus, both program providers are better in attracting different groups of the people for program planning.

4.3 About Program Organization

Organization, which is the second step to planning the program, is believed to integrate the activities, human resources and the physical facilities in an institution for better success of the intended program (Mbamba, A. 1992:75). Hence, under these part different issues of organization were discussed.

Table 5: Provision Places, Schedules, Material Provisions and Instructional Organization.

No	Items	Respondents			
		Government		NGOs	
		F(71)	%	F(75)	%
1	ABE program is given in				
	a. formal schools	-	-	-	-
	b. mobile tents	-	-	-	-
	c. under the shade of the tree	3	4.2	-	-
	d. rooms constructed for this purpose	46	64.8	75	100
	e. c and d (respondents' combination)	22	31.0	-	-
	Total	71	100	75	100
2	Who sets the learning schedules?				
	a. KETB	1	1.4	2	2.7
	b. facilitators	-	-	-	-
	c. Head teacher	1	1.4	5	6.7
	d. CMCs	4	5.6	5	6.7
	e. Students' parents (respondents additional answer)	1	1.4	1	1.3
	f. b, c, d and e (respondents' combination)	10	14.1	58	78.3
	g. b, c and d (respondents' combinations)	54	76.1	4	5.3
	Total	71	100	75	100
3	Who provides learning materials (pen, pencil and note books to children?				
	a)Government	-	-	-	-
	b)parents	66	93	8	10.3
	c)NGOs	-	-	5	6.7
	d)Both parents and NGOs(respondents' combination)	5	7	62	82.6
	Total	71	100	75	100
4	Which instruct Instructional organization is implemented for ABE program?				
	a) Self-contained	69	97.2	63	84
	b) departmentalization	-	-	-	-
	c) both	2	2.8	12	16
	Total	71	100	75	100

As it is indicated in ABE guide line, the physical structure of ABE centers vary from place to place ranging from the shade of tree to locally made learning rooms (MOE: 2004). As shown in the above table, 46(64.8%),22(31%)and3(4.2%), of the respondents replied that the ABE program is given in rooms constructed for this purpose, in both under the shade of tree and in rooms constructed for this purpose and under the shade of tree in government providers of the program respectively. On the opposite, 75(100%) reported that the ABE program is totally given in rooms constructed for this purpose in NGOs run ABE centers. This shows that the learning environment is better for NGOs providers of the program as compared to the children who attend the program under the shade of the tree as the children

are exposed for cold weather and strong sunlight which hinder their leaning interest. In relation to this, of the NGOs run ABE centers, FSCE run centers are less comfortable with the learning environment for children as the rooms were constructed in small kebele office campus. Besides, such limited learning environment was observed under FCE run ABE centers at Debre Markos town. On the other hand, ADA run ABE centers have got large school area (more than 2.0 hectares) that the children feel freedom to play each other in the school campus.

Regarding ABE learning schedules, the majority 54 (76.1%) of the respondents confirmed that the time table was set by facilitators, head teachers and CMCs together under government run ABE centers. Similarly, 10 (14.10%) of the respondents expressed that the facilitators, head teacher, CMCs, and students' parents together were involved in designing the ABE program schedules. On the other hand, 58 (78.3%) of the participants said that the ABE program schedules were set by facilitators, head teacher, CMCs and parents together for NGOs run ABE centers. Besides, head teacher and CMCs which represent 5 (6.7%) each were involved in decision making process about program schedules under NGOs run centers. In this regard, both program providers were better in inviting different stakeholders to participate in making the time table for the program.

As it is indicated in the Table'5', the majority of the respondents (93%) from government institutions explained that the learning materials are supported by parents. Similarly, 5 (7%) of the respondents from the same providers of the program stated that these materials are provided by parents and NGOs together. On the opposite, 62 (82.6%), 8 (10.7%) and 5 (6.7%) of the respondents from NGOs stated that the learning materials are given by parents and NGOs, NGOs themselves and parents respectively. Regarding this, the interview results confirmed that the children under FCE run ABE centers are given pens, pencils and note books in every quarter of the years. Thus, in this and other ABE centers of NGOs, the children are much benefited with such resources than the learners under government run ABE program centers.

The self-contained class room enables the teacher /facilitator to know more about each child, that is, weaknesses and strengths that he/she can change the methods and the activities in the

way they could understand. Besides, it helps the facilitators to plan units and lessons that integrate the curriculum effectively (Reinhartz, 1997:106). As it is indicated in the above table, the majority 69 (97.2%) of the respondents from government and 63 (84%) of the respondents from the NGOs confirmed that the instructional organization implemented for ABE program is self-contained. The respondents reasoned out that the self-contained teacher could stay with the children for a long period of time that he/she could understand the behaviors and the academic levels of the children so that the facilitator would vary the teaching-learning approaches in the way it would be convenient for the learners. The second reason was self-contained approach makes the facilitator to be accountable for his/her children how far they are effective in their learning.

On the contrary, item '14' 2 (2.8%) and 12 (16%) of the respondents from government and NGOs respectively responded that both self-contained and departmentalization approaches are used. Regarding this, information gathered from the interviewees suggests that in almost all NGOs run ABE centers a modified self-contained approach is given especially to the subjects like English and Mathematics as all facilitators are not equally potential with these subjects.

In general, regarding the internal organization of the program at the center level, the researcher made document inventory and site observations that in the case of government run ABE centers there are income and expense record documents, minute record agenda, attendance sheets, syllabus, strategic plans, series of lesson plans, but there is limited text books and almost no reading rooms for the children. On the other hand, in the case of NGOs run ABE centers all of the above facilities are available but shortage of text books for level-3 children of ADA run ABE centers was observed. Besides, FCE and FSCE run ABE centers are enriched with different reading materials, tape recorder to teach some recorded music and English listening skills, furniture, stationeries, and hard papers for preparation of teaching aids. Similarly, science kits and first aid materials were observed in the case of FSCE run ABE centers. This shows that NGOs providers of the program are better in the internal organizations than government.

Table 6: Summary of the Respondents' Attitudes towards Program Organizations.

No	Aspects of Organization	GOs			NGOs				
		N	X	SD	N	X	SD	T.obt	p-value
1	Method and procedures are specified to coordinate the program								
	a) facilitators	40	3.95	0.714	44	3.55	1.405	1.685	0.097
	b) officials	31	4.13	0.898	31	3.52	1.122	2.500*	0.015
2	Staffs are clear about their and others responsibilities								
	a) facilitators	40	4.13	0.822	44	4.14	0.878	-0.610	0.951
	b) Officials	31	4.26	0.631	31	4.23	0.805	0.176	0.861
3	Material resources are facilitated to organize the program								
	a) facilitators	40	2.93	1.385	44	3.89	1.385	3.178*	0.020
	b) officials	31	2.84	1.267	31	4.35	1.142	4.949*	0.000
4	Informal contacts with colleague (with other institutions are motivated)								
	a) facilitators	40	4.10	0.955	44	4.23	0.961	-0.608	0.545
	b) officials	31	3.84	0.969	31	4.35	0.839	2.242*	0.029
5	There is better information communication in the institution from top to bottom and vice-versa.								
	a) facilitators	40	3.43	1.059	44	3.91	1.217	-1.949	0.055
	b) officials	31	3.84	1.128	31	4.19	0.873	-1.385	0.171

Df= 82 for facilitators, Df= 60 for officials, significant at $\alpha < 0.05$

As shown in Table '6', the t-value result shows that there is no statistically significance difference in the mean value of the responses of government and non government facilitators towards item "1" in both institutions. Whereas, there is statistically significance difference in the mean value of the responses of the government and non government officials regarding item '1.' Thus, the finding indicates that officials confirmed that "methods and procedures are better specified" in government institutions than NGOs.

Regarding item '2' and item '5' of the same table, the t-test results do not show the significance differences in the mean values of the responses of facilitators and officials in respective providers of the program. This shows that the respondents from both institutions were agreed towards item '2' and '5'.

Concerning item '3' in Table '6', the computed t-test results indicate that there is statistically significance differences between the responses of government and non government respondents regarding facilitating the learning inputs for ABE program (i.e., $t = -3.178$; $\alpha < 0.05$). This implies that non governmental institutions are better in facilitating the material resources to the ABE centers than governmental institutions.

With reference to motivation for informal contacts with colleagues /others (item 4), the t-test value shows that there is no statistically significance difference between the responses of facilitators in both institutions. But, the t-test result shows that there is statistically significance difference between the responses of the officials government and non government institutions towards item '4'. Thus, the NGOs run ABE center officials were more motivated for experience sharing with others than GOs run ABE center officials.

Regarding the vertical organization of the program, the researcher investigated that the region is at better effort to mainstream the ABE program in the organizational structure from region to woreda level. That is, experts in relation to ABE program are assigned at each level of the vertical organizations

Table 7: Cluster, Budget and Transfer System of the Program.

No	Items	Respondents				X^2
		Government		NGOs		
		F(71)	%	F (75%)	%	
1	Is there cluster system nearby your program center?					138.1
	a) yes	70	98.6	74	98.7	
	b) No	1	1.4	1	1.3	
	Total	71	100	75	100	
2	Is there sufficient budget for ABE program?					1.75
	a)Yes	20	28.2	61	81.3	
	b) No	51	71.8	14	18.7	
	Total	71	100	75	100	
3	Is there any transfer problem of children from ABE program to formal school and Vice-versa?					105.3
	a) Yes	65	91.5	70	93.3	
	b) No	6	8.5	5	6.7	
	Total	71	100	75	100	

Table '7' (item, '1') shows that almost all, that is, 70 (98.6%) of the respondents from GOs and 74 (98.7%) of the respondents from NGOs replied that the ABE centers are clustered

with the near by formal basic schools. The chi- square test result also shows that there is statistically significant difference between the respondents' responses of government and non government organizations at $\alpha < 0.05$ where the calculated value is ($\chi^2=131.1$, $Df=1$). The school cluster system is invaluable for facilitators to share experience with formal school teachers as well as to get the necessary training from the cluster supervisor. Thus, the finding supports that the majority of the program centers under both institutions are benefited from such cluster system.

Concerning the budget allocation for the ABE program (item '2'), 20 (28.2%) of the respondents from government side and 61 (81.3%) of the respondents from non-government side reported that the budget was allocated for ABE program. On the other hand, 51 (71.8%) and 14 (18.7%) of the respondents from government institutions and NGOs respectively replied that the budget was not allocated to the ABE program. However, the chi-square test value indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of government and non government respondents towards budget allocation for ABE program. Comparatively speaking, the frequency counts and percentage values show that NGOs run ABE centers were better budgeted than government run ABE centers. If the ABE centers are facilitated to generate their own income, they could fill the gaps due to budget shortage from the providers. In this regard, the ADA run ABE centers are generating more than 3,500 birr/year from the sell of grass and farm products that they are financing every cost for the program from this income than waiting for the providers. Whereas, a lot of respondents in the interview from GOs side reported that though the ABE program was designed to address an equivalent mission as that of the formal basic education, the appropriate budget was not allocated to ABE programs while doing for formal basic education program. For this, the program experts reasoned out that there is no budget or let the community help it. From this, it is possible to say that the concerned people are not still treating the two programs equally.

The third item in Table '7' depicts that the children in the ABE program have faced transfer problems from ABE centers to formal basic education and vice-versa. In line with this, 65 (91.5%) of the respondents from government and 70 (93.3%) of the respondents from NGOs side responded that the program has got transfer problems. The chi-square result also indicates that there is statistically significance difference between the responses of

government and non government respondents regarding the transfer of children from ABE to formal and vice-versa($\chi^2=105.3, df=1, \alpha<0.05$). This shows that there are transfer problems of the children from ABE centers to formal basic schools or vice-versa. Regarding this, the interviewees explained that this was happened due to the absence of clear transferring criteria, for instance, if a level 2 student(who attended the whole lessons of grade 2 and half of grade 3) from ABE program wants to join formal basic education, which formal school grade level does he join? Grade 2 or grade 3? Such confusions really disturbed the transfer system. Besides to the above reasons, the respondents in the interview said that the quality of the program also affects the transfer. If a child who completed level three from ABE program is not competent enough to the entrance exam of grade 5, the formal school does not receive the child. On the other hand, 11 (15.5%) and 6 (13.3%) of the respondents from government and non-governmental organization responded as there is no transfer problems of children. This could be either the children did not raise the question of transfer or they were competent enough to join the intended grade level at formal basic education and vice-versa.

Concerning program organization, the respondents were also asked through open ended question about "Who is/are involved in program organization?" In relation to this, cluster supervisors, facilitators, the community, CMCs, KETB, NGOs and woreda education officials were the participants under government run ABE centers where as NGOs, woreda education officials, cluster supervisors, the community, CMCs, KETB and the facilitators were the participants who were involved in the organization of NGOs run ABE program. The finding shows that similar groups of the people are involved in program organization. This in turn helps them to do things cooperatively and competitively for the successful implementation of the program.

4.4. Curriculum Related Issues

The curriculum designed for ABE is supposed to satisfy the needs of the learners in particular and the society at large. In case, there is a centrally developed curriculum by Amhara Education Bureau and NGOs. The curriculum incorporated core subjects such as Amharic, English, Mathematics and environmental science. Regarding this, UNESCO (2001:51) in Amarech (2007) stated that the contents in the curriculum need to be easy, not heavily loaded, ability and need based to the children. However, the majority(75%) of the

respondents from both providers of the program listed some bad and good qualities of the curriculum. Some of the weaknesses of the curriculum are:

- It does not consider the age of the children or their level of understanding;
- It does not help using radio lesson;
- It has large volume and it is difficult to cover with the intended time;
- Editing problems in the texts;
- There is repetition of contents;
- Some pictures in the text are not clear and difficult to understand; and
- In the text difficult words are used/there is a problem of word selection in the text.

On the opposite, the curriculum of ABE has the following strengths:

- It is more of contextual/environmental;
- It has student centered approach/students participatory;
- It helps children to master basic education skills;
- It focuses on problem solving approaches;
- It is given in vernacular language (mother tongue);and
- It encourages a lot usage of teaching aids.

Table 8: Material Provisions, Learning Hours, Class Size and Number of Shifts

No	Items	Government respondents		NGO respondents		
		F	%	F	%	X ²
1	Are the learning materials sufficiently provided?					
	a) Yes	18	45	37	84.1	8.04
	b) No	22	55	7	15.9	
	Total	40	100	44	100	
2	The daily learning hours for the program					
	a) 3 hrs	5	12.5	10	22.7	34.7
	b) 4 hrs	35	87.5	34	77.3	
	Total	44	100	100	100	
3	The average class size in the program centers					
	a) <51	18	45	20	45.5	0.76
	b) > 50	22	55	24	54.5	
	Total	40	100	44	100	
4	Number of shifts per day in each program center					
	a) one	18	45	19	43.2	1.12
	b) two	22	55	24	57.8	
	Total	40	100	44	100	

A look at the distribution of the data in the Table '11', item '1' indicates that 18 (45%) of the respondents from government and 37 (84.1%) of the respondents from NGOs institutions

expressed that the learning materials to the centers were sufficiently provided. Where as, 22 (55%) of the facilitators from government ABE centers and 7 (15.9%) of the facilitators from NGOs run ABE centers responded that the learning materials were not adequately provided. The computed chi-square result also reveals that there is statistically significance difference between the observed frequencies and the expected ones towards the provision of the learning materials under both institutions. According to the facilitators from GOs institutions, the reason for shortage of the learning materials was shortage of the budget as we were told by higher officials while allocating the budget for basic primary education which is an equivalent program with ABE. Similarly, the shortage of the learning materials for level-3 children of ADA run ABE centers was a delay in publications as the Regional Education Bureau took the initiative for it. However, it can be deduced that NGOs run ABE programs centers were better provided with the learning materials than GOs run ABE programs centers.

The implementation manual No.9 of ABE program stated that the program takes three years, an average of 210-220days each year or 3-4 daily learning hours for five days in a week (ANRSEB, 2005:2).Regarding the daily learning hours of the ABE program (item '2'), 12.5% of the facilitators from government and 22.7% of the facilitators from NGOs side stated that the teaching-learning process is going on for 3 hours per day. In contrast, 87.5% of the respondents from government and 77.3% of the respondents from NGOs sides reported that the ABE program is run for 4 hours per day. In this respect, the chi-square result also supports that there is statistically significance difference between the percentages of the respondents' responses regarding the learning hours. The finding shows that lots of the ABE centers are using 4 hours per day to run the program. Where as, the interview results and document inventory showed that the program centers run by FSCE; the teaching-learning process is run for 3 hours per day for five days so as to make the program flexible with the needs of the learners. That is, most of the learners in these project areas are house workers, daily labourers, etc. Though the program is run for 3 hrs per day in this project area, week ends and July month are left for tutorials and additional classes to complete the program in the specified time. But other providers of the program seem to adopt the conventional learning hours and the flexibility nature of the program becomes questionable in many centers the researcher conducted the study.

With regard to the class size (item '3'), 45% of the respondents from GOs and 45.5 % of the respondents from the NGOs stated that the average number of children in each class is less than 51. On the other hand, 55 % of the facilitators from GOs and 54.5% of the facilitators from the NGOs run centers confirmed that the average number of children per class is greater than 50. However, the computed chi-square value shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the government and non government respondents regarding item '3'. On the other hand, interview results and document inventory with the exception of FCE run ABE centers (45-55 children per class) showed that in most ABE program centers there are from 55 to 70 children in each class. This is really becomes a big challenge for facilitators to follow up the children's performance to whom a lot of help and follow up are expected for the learners under this program and the finding of the study also contradicts with the figure (50 children per class) stated in the implementation strategy of ABE in the study area (ARSEB, 2003:9)

In the above table (item '4'), 45% of the respondents from GOs and 43.2 % of the respondents from NGOs side responded that the number of shifts per day is one. Where as 55 % of the respondents from GOs and 57.8% of the respondents from NGOs run ABE centers reported that the number of shifts per day is two. The computed chi-square value also shows that there is no statistically significance difference towards the number of shifts to run the program between the responses of the two institutions. This implies that the program is given in both shifts under both providers of the program. Though it is possible to provide the program in both shifts in accordance with the needs of the learners and community, during the interview the facilitators strongly complained to teach the children by the same facilitators in both shifts having additional activities such as report writing, teaching aid preparations, lesson plan preparation, inspiring parents to send children to school, giving tutorials and soon.

4.5. Issues Related to Staffing ABE Program

A good institution is expected to achieve its intended objectives when it is staffed with potential employees. To support this, teachers/facilitators are probably the most important human resource that the country has because human capital development depends on the qualities and effectiveness of the teachers (Okumbe, 1998:235). Thus, facilitators are expected to pass at least some basic staffing processes.

Table 9: Responses on Recruiting, Screening Criteria and Trainings

No	Items	Respondents			
		Gov/t		NGOs	
1	Who recruits and screens facilitators?	F	%	F	%
	a) Woreda capacity building officials.	-	-	-	-
	b) Woreda non-formal education experts	-	-	-	-
	c) CMCs	10	14.1	---	-
	d) Zonal education department officials	--	--	-	-
	e) Woreda education office (respondents' additional answer)	8	11.3	6	8
	f) Project office (respondents' additional answer)	--	--	--	--
	g) 'c' and 'e' (respondents' combination)	53	74.6	59	78.7
	h) 'c' and 'f' (respondents' combination)	--	--	10	13.3
	Total	71	100	75	100
2	What are the criteria for recruiting and screening of facilitators?				
	A) Educational back ground	15	21.1	--	--
	B) Working experience	--	--	--	--
	C) Being born in the program area	--	--	--	--
	D) Employment test	--	--	--	--
	E) A, C and D (the respondents' combination)	--	--	25	33.3
	F) A and C (the respondents' combination)	56	78.9	50	66.7
	Total	71	100	75	100
3	The kind of training given to the facilitators.				
	A) Initial / induction training				
	a) ≤ 5 days	20	64.5	27	50.9
	b) Above 5 days	11	35.5	26	49.1
	Total	31	100	53	100
	B) On the job training				
	a) ≤ 5 days	25	71.4	43	71.7
	b) Above 5 days	10	28.6	17	28.3
	Total	35	100	60	100
4	Major training areas for the program				
	A) The nature of ABE program	-	-	-	-
	B) Subjects taught	2	2.8	--	--
	C) Lesson plan preparations	--	--	--	--
	D) Continuous assessment	--	--	--	--
	E) Classroom organization, management and first aid services (respondents additional answer)	--	--	--	--
	F) a, b, c and d (respondents' combination)	69	97.2	6	8%
	G) a, b, c, d and e (respondents' combination)	--	--	69	92%
	Total	71	100	75	100

In the above table, item '1' and 74.6%, 14.1% and 11.3% of the respondents from government side reported that the facilitators were recruited and screened by both CMCs and woreda education office, center management committee and woreda education office respectively. On the opposite, 78.7%, 18% and 13.3%, the respondents from NGOs side confirmed that the facilitators were recruited and screened by CMCs and woreda education office together, education office, and CMCs and project office in group respectively. From this we can suggest that the majority of government and non-government providers of the program recruited and screened the facilitators through inviting the people from CMCs and Woreda education office. According to the interview results of FSCE run ABE officials, the facilitators were recruited and screened by CMCs, project educational officer and project management committees together. Therefore, the facilitators were recruited for ABE program by more than one stakeholder under both providers of the program.

Regarding the criteria for employment, item '2' above, the respondents from the government institutions stated that the criteria for recruiting and screening of the facilitators were educational back ground (21.1%), and being born in the program area and the educational back ground together (78.9%). In contrast, the respondents from the NGOs reflected that the criteria for employing the facilitators were educational back ground, being born in the program area and employment test (33.3%), and educational background and being born in the program area together (66.7%). Though the majority of program providers used more than one criterion for employing the facilitators, the inclusion of employment test and oral interviews besides to other criteria used in FSCE project center is more appreciable than other providers. Using more criteria help to attract potential facilitators who in turn contribute for better quality and management of the program.

According to the responses gathered from the different respondents in different zones surprisingly there is no uniformity in the payment of a monthly salary for facilitators in study region among all providers of the program. For instance, in South Gondar, government run ABE facilitators get 626 birr/month, ADA run ABE facilitators get 600 birr/month, Bahir-Dar Zuria, government run ABE facilitators get 400 birr /month, FSCE run ABE facilitators get from 640 birr (for beginners) to 1035 (for senior facilitators) and in East Gojjam Zones, government run ABE facilitators who works in rural woredas get 626 birr /month and those

who teaches at Debre Markos Zuria 300 birr/month, and FCE run ABE facilitators get 626 birr/month. From this we can understand that among the NGOs providers of the program FSCE is paying the highest salary considering their working experience in the program centers and this really motivated the facilitators to work the whole days of the week. But the government is still behind to pay the minimum salary for facilitators while paying for the teachers of formal basic education as they are responsible to run an equivalent program which is similar to the conventional ones.

It is true that giving an initial /induction training to the newly employed candidate is very important to give confidence and to know his/her job description for what he/she is employed. Regarding this, 64.5% and 50.9% of the respondents from government and non governmental institutions respectively stated that they were given an initial training for less than or equal to 5 days. Similarly, 35.5% of the respondents from government and 49.1% of the respondents from NGOs confirmed that they were given an initial training for more than 5 days. Though the finding showed that the NGOs providers of the program are better in giving an initial training for more days than government providers of the program, the number of days on which the trainings were given was still below what was stated in the literature. Regarding on job-training, 71.4% and 71.3% of the respondents from government and NGOs respectively stated that they were given on job training for less than or equal to 5 days. The finding from the above data indicates that for ABE program with a lot of incompletes the number of days given for on-job training is limited in both institutions.

Concerning the training areas (item, 4), a lot of the respondents (97.2%) from the government institutions confirmed that the trainings given were on subjects taught, lesson plan preparations, continuous assessment, and the nature of ABE program. Where as the majority of the respondents (92%) from the NGOs stated that the training areas were the nature of ABE program, subjects taught, lesson plan preparations, continuous assessment and class room management & organizations. Besides to these, during the interview conducted with the officials, the researcher was informed that the training was given on report writing, first aid services, personal hygiene and on the concept of action research for facilitators under FSCE run ABE centers.

Table 10: Responses on Benefits and Training Satisfaction of the Facilitators

No	Items	Respondents				X ²
		Gov't		NGOs		
1	Are there any special benefits besides to a monthly salary?	F	%	F	%	108.7
	A) yes	--	--	10	13.3	
	B) No	71	100	65	86.7	
	Total	71	100	75	100	
2	Do you think the training was enough?					3.95
	a) Yes	14	19.7	47	67.0	
	b) No	57	80.3	28	33.0	
	Total	71	100	75	100	

Facilitators are highly encouraged if little benefits are added to their monthly salary as it is not sufficient to cover this days inflated living costs. In relation to this, from Table '10' (item '1'), 100% of the respondents from government side and 86.7% the respondents from the NGOs side reported that no additional benefits were given to them. But 13.3% the respondents from NGOs reported that additional benefits were given to the facilitators. A chi- square test result also shows that there is statistically significant difference in the respondents' responses under both institutions towards the benefits given. This implies that, benefits were not given to the employees under both providers of the program which could motivate facilitators towards their tasks. However, in the case of FSCE program providers as the researcher gathered the responses in the interview from officials, benefits are given to the facilitators. The benefits given are medication and provident fund for senior facilitators (facilitators who worked for more than two years).

Concerning training satisfaction, (item '2'), 19.7% and 67% of the respondents from government and NGOs respectively explained that the given training was satisfactory to run the program effectively. Where as, 80.3% of the respondents from government side and 33% of the respondents from NGOs sides replied that the given training was not satisfactory to run the program effectively. The computed chi-square result shows that there is statistically significant difference towards the responses for item '6' in the above table under government

and NGOs respondents. This implies that the respondents under NGOs run ABE centers were more satisfied with the given training than GOs respondents.

Table 11: Facilitators turn over, any Support and Termination

No	Items	Responses in Rank order			
		Government		NGOs	
		F (71)	Rank	F(75)	Rank
1	The reasons for facilitators turn-over				
	1) not be evaluated through coherent & transparent procedures	-	-	-	-
	2) They haven't been run to gain needed skills & knowledge	10	3	24	2
	3) Poor treatment by personnel.	-	-	-	-
	4) Looking for better salary.	28	1	10	3
	5. In adequate provision of teaching-learning resources	6	4	6	4
	6) Being contract employees & looking for permanent employment.	22	2	30	1
	Total	66	-	70	-
2	What supports are provided to the newly employed facilitators?	F (31)	%	F (31)	%
	1) Giving light teaching load	-	-	-	-
	2) assigned a mentor to help him/her	3	9.7	-	-
	3) Providing additional training	-	-	2	6.5
	4) Making more in depth observations and coaching on them	-	-	-	-
	5) 2 and 4 (respondents' combination)	28	90.3	4	-
	6) 2,3 and 4(respondents' combination)	-	-	25	93.5
	Total	31	100	31	100
3	Is there any legal termination for employees from your institution?	F(40)	%	F (44)	%
	a) Yes	16	40	16	36.4
	b) No	24	60	28	63.6
	Total	40	100	44	100

It is true that in most institutions employees turn over is observed for a number of reasons. The employees in government run ABE centers leave for three top reasons. As seen from Table '11', the first reason is looking for better salary, the second is looking for permanent employment as they are contracts and the third one is having not been supported to gain the needed skills and knowledge. Whereas, in the case of NGOs run ABE institutions the facilitators leave the institutions for three major reasons such as looking for permanent employment, having not been assisted to gain needed skills and knowledge, and looking for

better salary respectively. From this we can understand that the reasons for the turning over of the employees in both providers of the program are totally different.

It is undeniable that a newly employed worker has got some confusions or inconsistency towards his/her job that a series of support is expected from the employer side. Regarding this, the respondents from government side replied that a newly employed worker is run with assigned mentor (9.7%), and with both assigned mentor, and in depth observation and coaching (90.3%). In contrast, 6.5% of respondents from NGOs responded that the newly employed worker is supported with additional training, and the rest 93.5% of the respondents from the same organization said that the new employees were assisted by mentor, additional training and in depth observation and coaching. From this it is possible to conclude that NGOs providers of the program are better in giving the necessary supports to the newly employed facilitators.

In any institutions the employees may leave their working environment either being inefficient or due to their personal interest. However, legal termination/separation should be practiced in every institution so as to have better image for the would be employees. In this regard, the above table, item '3' depicts that 40% of the respondents from government and 36.4% of the respondents from NGOs reported that employees were made to leave the institution legally/ with agreement of both parties. But the majority 60% of the respondents from government and 63.4% of the respondents from NGOs replied that the employees were forced to leave the institutions illegally. The data evidenced that some facilitators were made to leave to the institutions illegally under both providers of the program.

Table 12: Summary Responses towards some Qualities of Head teachers

No	Qualities	Gov't respondents			NGOs respondents				
		N	X	SD	N	X	SD	t-obt	p-value
1	The school head teacher is flexible or reasonable	40	3.33	1.347	44	4.09	0.858	-3.74*	0.003
2	The head teacher is cooperative with his/her subordinates	40	4.20	0.687	44	4.34	0.745	-0.902	0.370
3	He/she is good at giving an immediate constructive comments /feedback to the staffs	40	3.75	1.032	44	4.43	0.625	-3.620*	0.001
4	He/she is good at inviting others in planning, organizing, decision making process, etc	40	4.08	1.141	44	4.52	0.628	-2.197*	0.032

NB: Df=82, * significant at $\alpha < 0.05$

The qualities of a principal or head teacher may affect the effectiveness and the successful implementation of ABE program. As depicted from Table '12', the mean values (for items 1-4) show that the opinions of the respondents from both institutions are positive towards the qualities of the principals or head teachers regarding managing the program. However, the t-test result on the qualities of head teachers in managing the ABE program shows that there is statistically significant between the responses of government and non-government respondents at alpha level less than 0.05 for all items except item '2' in the above table. Furthermore, the mean values of the responses for all items in non-government institutions are greater than government institutions. From the above explanations, it is possible to conclude that the qualities of head teachers have a greater function on the management of the alternative basic education program and this is more reflected in the case of non governmental institutions for items '1', '3' and '4'.

4.6 Communities' Participation in School Management

The school with out active participation of the community would not achieve its institutional objectives. Hence, the community is expected to support the school from resource provision to the management of the ABE program centers (MOE, 2005). In this regard, related issues are discussed below.

Table13: Summary of Community Participations in School Management

No	Participations	GO respondents			NGO respondents			T.obt	p-value
		N	X	SD	N	X	SD		
1	In promoting students enrollment								
	a) facilitators	40	3.18	0.781	44	3.34	1.219	-0.749	0.456
	b) officials	31	3.29	1.101	31	3.71	1.131	-1.479	0.144
2	In monitoring the quality of the program								
	a) facilitators	40	2.65	0.975	44	3.07	1.246	-1.720	0.089
	b) Officials	31	3.06	1.263	31	2.79	1.016	0.332	0.741
3	In controlling school property								
	a) facilitators	40	2.90	1.392	44	3.50	1.355	-1.998*	0.049
	b) officials	31	3.39	0.955	31	3.45	1.179	-0.237	0.814
4	In solving school disciplinary cases								
	a) facilitators	40	2.78	1.187	44	3.32	1.308	-1.995*	0.049
	b) officials	31	3.29	0.824	31	3.45	1.091	-0.657	0.514
5	In adjusting school calendar								
	a) facilitators	40	2.87	1.197	44	3.36	1.309	-1.998*	0.048
	b) officials	31	2.94	1.063	31	3.19	1.276	-0.865	0.390

NOTE: Very low=1, low=2, medium=3, high=4 and very high=5

* Significant at $\alpha < 0.05$

As seen from Table'13' (item '1' and '2') the mean values of the respondents from both institutions confirmed that the community has more than an average degree of participations "in promoting students enrollment" and "in monitoring the quality of the program" to the ABE centers. However, the computed t-test values show that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of government and non government respondent regarding item '1. Similarly, the mean values of the responses of the officials in government and non governmental organization show that the participation of the community is beyond the average for items'3', '4'and'5'in the above table. But the computed t-test values show that there is no statistically significant differences between the responses of government and nongovernmental officials regarding the participation of the community for items '3', '4'and'5'. On the other hand, the t-test value show that there is statistically significant difference between the responses of the government and non government facilitators towards the participation of the community for items '3', '4'and '5'. Hence, the findings of the study and the interview result support that the community has better participation on non government run ABE institutions than government run ABE centers.

4.7 Issues Related to Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring is a periodical follow up of a certain program to achieve its intended objectives. It also helps to take an immediate action if there are gaps between plan actions and the implemented ones. This can be feasible when the concerned people are involved in monitoring and there are an early set of objectives for that program. In this respect, the officials from both providers of the program were asked to list the participants in monitoring the program. Thus ,cluster supervisors, non formal education experts, head teachers, CMCs and KETB were the participants to monitor program for government run ABE centers, on the other hand, project coordinators ,cluster supervisors, non formal education experts, CMCs, KETB and head teachers were the stakeholders involved in monitoring the program under NGOs run ABE centers. Thus, the finding substantiates the above statements/literature.

Monitoring should not be done in haphazard way as it has its own objectives and to achieve these objectives, criteria/check lists should be designed in advance for better feedback than criticism. In relation to this the officials from both providers the program listed the following checklists for monitoring the program. The criteria used to monitor the program under government run ABE centers are:

- Continuous assessment;
- Teaching methodology;
- in puts for teaching-learning process;
- Facilitators preparedness;
- Attendance sheets;
- School-community relation ship;
- Teaching-aid usage;
- Reporting writing/ records of minutes; and
- Formation of committees.

Similarly, the criteria used to monitor the program under non government run ABE centers are:

- ❖ Class room management and organization;
- ❖ Student coverage;
- ❖ Strategic plans;
- ❖ Lesson plan and teaching aid usage;
- ❖ Teaching methodology;
- ❖ Roles and action plans of CMCs;
- ❖ Community participations;
- ❖ Attendance sheets;
- ❖ Tutorial programs;
- ❖ Continuous assessments; and
- ❖ Records of students' results.

In relation to this, both providers of the program have listed almost similar core checklists that help to monitor the program. However, what matter monitoring above all is how often monitoring has been taken place in such remote areas. The respondents from government run ABE centers stated that the program was monitored twice per month by cluster supervisor

and rarely by other experts; where as, in the case of NGOs run ABE centers the program was monitored twice per week by project coordinator, twice per month by cluster supervisor and rarely by others. Regarding this, it is stated in MoE (200:9) that the experience of BARC'S NFPE shows that the program organizer monitors the program centers twice per week. Since the program has been launched to address access and quality with such limited teaching - learning resources and with the quality of facilitators under question, a frequent monitoring and support seem mandatory for this program in order to achieve its institutional as well as national objectives. To this end, the NGOs run program centers have better degree of monitoring than government run program centers as in the case of NGOs there are project coordinators/educational officers who monitor the program at least twice per week besides to other people assigned to monitor the program. Such better monitoring access would make facilitators, CMCs, and others alert towards their roles and responsibilities in their working environment.

Evaluation, which is the advanced stage of monitoring, is useful to make value judgment on the basis of relevant information gathered vis-à-vis pre-determined purposes, goals and objectives of the educational program (Jenson, et. al, 1967). To this end, the concerned participants in and out of the institution should be invited to evaluate the program and evaluation should be carried out every quarter of the year (AREB, 2004:10). In this regard, the respondents from both providers of the program were asked about "the participants, its criteria and the degree of evaluation through the open ended questions." In this respect, woreda officials, CMCs, supervisors and the head teacher were the evaluators of the program under government run ABE centers. Where as, zone officials, cluster supervisors, woreda officials, the head teacher, project coordinators, CMCs and basic education net work groups (for FSCE) were the people involved in the evaluation of NGOs run ABE centers.

Both providers of the program have got the purposes of evaluation and depend on basic consideration or criteria of evaluations for improvement or development orientation than measurement orientation that focuses on criticism of others. Thus, the following are the criteria used by the program evaluators in government run ABE centers:

- ❖ The participation of the community;
- ❖ The effectiveness of the program;

- ❖ The sustainability of the program;
- ❖ The responsibilities of CMCs and KETB;
- ❖ The internal organization of the program; and
- ❖ The qualities of facilitators.

Similarly, the program evaluators in non government run ABE centers have used the following criteria for evaluating the program:

- Effectiveness of the program;
- Program sustainability;
- The impact of the program;
- The relevance of the program;
- The practicality and the flexibility of the program;
- The internal organization of the program;
- the participation of the community and its representatives; and
- The quality of the facilitators.

In the same way, the respondents from government providers of the program stated that the program is evaluated once per semester/twice in a year but the respondents from non government institutions explained that the program is evaluated every quarter of the year. From this it can be conclude that the degree of evaluation and other considerations given to non government run ABE centers are better than government run ABE centers.

Table14: Summary of the Participations of CMCs and KETBs in School Management

No	Participations	Gov't respondents			NGO respondents					
		N	X	SD	N	X	SD	Ave.m ean	t-obt	p- vaue
1	In planning the ABE program	31	3.03	1.110	31	3.23	1.359	3.13	-0.614	0.541
2	In organization of the program	31	3.13	0.885	31	3.42	1.177	3.28	-1.098	0.227
3	In staffing the program	31	3.03	1.169	31	3.23	1.309	3.13	-0.614	0.541
4	In monitoring and evaluation of the program	31	3.10	0.944	31	3.52	1.122	3.31	-1.593	0.116
	Weighted mean	31	3.07	1.031	31	3.35	1.241	3.21	-0.979	0.356

Note: very high = 5, high = 4, medium = 3, low = 2 and very low = 1

*Significant at $\alpha < 0.05$, two tailed)

Df=60

As indicated in Table '14', the weighted mean of the Participations of CMCs and KETB in GOs and NGOs towards items '1' to '4' is 3.07 and 3.21 respectively. The respondents from government side reported that the participation of CMCs and KETB are better regarding organization, monitoring and evaluation of the ABE program. Similarly, the respondents from the NGOs replied that the CMCs and KETB have better participation towards items '2' and '4' in the above table. In comparison, the average mean value for CMCs and KETB from NGOs shows their better participations towards the management skills (from items 1-4) than government institutions ; however, the t-test results show that there is no statistically significant difference between the responses of the government and non government respondents towards the participations of CMCs and KETB in the management of the ABE centers .In other words, the community representatives have a medium participations towards planning, organization, staffing, monitoring and evaluation of the program in GOs and NGOs run ABE centers.

On the other hand, the interview results show that the CMCs are highly cooperative towards managing the program particularly in organization and monitoring of the program under NGOs run ABE centers. For instance, in the areas of ADA run ABE centers, the CMCs are better in providing more than 2 hectares of land and fenced it, and in employing up two school guards with their own cost. In this program areas, promoting and monitoring of the children in every village is left for the members of CMCs who is living in that village. Monitoring the absence of children from the center becomes the tasks of the committee members. To this end, the members of CMCs are also sub members of the "Idir" association that if the committees are not responsible for their roles, they would be dismissed from the association as well as their social roles. Thus, this is the best practice that was observed for student coverage and other roles of CMCs.

Similarly, in areas of FCE run ABE centers children are motivated to school through a special promotion of CMCs. That is, the lists of the children are given to the members of CMCs according to their living environment /village. Then, each member of the CMCs is responsible to monitor the children to go to the school. This creates another competition among members of the CMCs and a committee member who registered high retention rate of the children in the center would be rewarded by the project.

4.8. Problems Raised in Managing the ABE Program

The respondents from both institutions were asked through questionnaires and interviews on major problems observed during the management of the ABE program.

4.8.1. Problems Raised by GOs Respondents

The majority of the respondents (greater than 60%) pointed out the following management problems about the program.

- Low attitudes of the community and considering the program center as children's stay.
- Absence of the rules and regulations for ABE program
- Less commitment of the CMCs and KETB, and looking for certain benefits for their roles and responsibilities there.
- Shortage of training for educational experts and facilitators about the ABE program.
- Limited follow-ups of the program by the concerned people.
- A conflict among the people towards area expansion for ABE program.
- Delays in employing the facilitators after the children were ready to attend the program.
- Shortage of training for cluster supervisors.
- Delays in paying the facilitators' monthly salary.
- Some times there is a conflict between CMCs, and KETB on ABE program decisions as CMCs are accountable to KETB.
- Delays in the constructions of ABE centers.

The respondents from GOs institutions forwarded the following suggestions for the above management problems of the ABE program:

- As an independent institution, it is better to have its own rules and regulation than making dependent on formal basic schools for better implementation of the program.
- A radical attitudinal change should be brought on the community, CMCs, KETB, formal school teachers and cluster supervisors about the program-the features, objectives, relevance and others through training, conference, seminars, etc even using media.

- A well scheduled and objective base monitoring seems mandatory for ABE program which has a lot of limitation for better implementation of the program.
- A formal discussion should be made with Kebele and Woreda land administrative committees to solve land shortage for program expansion.
- An equivalent budget as that of the formal basic education should be allocated to ABE centers and a fund rising activities should also be done on ABE program to curb the financial problems.
- The ABE program centers constructions should be finalized in advance and the facilitators' salary should be paid on time as there are no as such financial options in such remote areas.

4.8.2. Problems Suggested by NGOs Respondents

The following are some management problems raised by the majority (70%) of NGOs respondents about ABE program:

- A loose relationship between governmental officials with NGOs towards the implementation of the program.
- Less dedication of the community representatives regarding ABE program or looking for incentives for their roles in running the program.
- Shortage of land for area expansions for the ABE program centers (FCE and FSCE).
- Limited monitoring and follow-ups about the program from GOs officials-cluster supervisors, non-formal education experts and capacity building experts.
- Low mentality of formal school teachers about the ABE program/ undermining the program as well as the facilitators.
- The government officials being sensitive to the students' statistics than the effectiveness of the ABE program.
- Shortage of human resource assignment-for store keeper, reading room head, financial officer, etc.
- Absence of clearly set rules and regulation towards how to run the program, and the facilitators and the CMCs/KETB roles.

4.8.2.1 The Possible Suggestions forwarded by NGOs Respondents towards the above Problems:

- The NGOs in this project are assisting the tasks of the government and they are working for common goal that the government bodies should motivate them and work hand in hand for better sustainability of the program.
- In depth training about education in general and the ABE program in particular should be given to the community and its representative for the better success of the program.
- For area expansion of ABE centers, it is advisable to consider kebele houses (in town) and the dead people's land /in rural areas/ for compensation to those who lost their land during the expansion of the program centers.
- The concerned people should be told to run their responsibilities to the grass root level.
- The needed training should be given to formal school teachers and others to change their bad image towards the ABE program. Or they should be trained as ABE program has an equivalent mission to the formal basic education program.
- The head teachers should be freed from teaching as that of the formal basic school principals so as to be responsible for the additional tasks delegated to him/her.
- The ABE centers should have their own rules and regulations for the successful implementation of the program.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary of the Findings

The aim of this study was to survey the management of alternative basic education program run by government and non-government organizations in Amhara Regional State. The study employed a comparative approach to identify how the planning, organization, staffing, monitoring and evaluation processes carried on the management of alternative basic education program. To this end, the objective of the study was guided by the following basic research questions:

1. How are the planning, organization and staffing of ABE programs done by GOs and NGOs?
2. How are ABE programs monitored and evaluated by both providers of the program?
3. Who are the participants in planning, organization, staffing, monitoring and evaluation of the ABE program?
4. What similarities and differences are found in the management of ABE program between GOs and NGOs?
5. What are the major constraints that challenge the management of ABE programs?
6. What are the major strengths and weaknesses in the management of ABE program under both institutions (GOs and NGOs)?

The study areas which served as sources of data and information were drawn using different sampling techniques such as purposive, simple random and availability sampling procedures. The study was conducted in three NGOs selected purposively and another three GOs run ABE program areas nearby the NGOs which were selected purposively to compare them in similar settings. A representative sample of 146(75%) of the respondents, that is, 18 educational experts/coordinators, 44 head teachers and 84 facilitators were included in the study as a source of data from both providers of the ABE program.

In the analysis and interpretation of the comparative study, the data obtained through questionnaires were analyzed using various statistical tools like frequency, percentage, chi-square and t-test to sort out, and see the variation and similarities of the variables. Besides, the data gathered through interviews and document inventory were analyzed qualitatively.

Thus, on the basis of best practices and challenges observed on the management of the program, the findings, conclusions and recommendations were drawn to improve the situations regarding ABE program management. From the study conducted, the following major findings were presented:

1. The study revealed that the primary objective of the provision of ABE program under both institutions is to provide basic education for out of school children with a special emphasis of girls. The study also indicated that more than 54% of the facilitators from both institutions are females and greater than 90% of the facilitators are also T.T.I graduates as that of formal basic school teachers under both providers of the program. In this regard, the study indicated that the majority of the facilitators were recruited and screened by CMCs and woreda education office together under both institutions on the basis of educational background and being born in the pogrom area. However, there is a situation to use employment test besides to these criteria to employ facilitators in the case of FSCE run ABE centers.
2. Regarding planning, the study found that more than 90% of the facilitators from both institutions took the necessary training on lesson plan preparation. Similarly, the finding of the study showed that 70% of officials from GOs and 83.9% of the officials from NGOs got the training on program planning. Moreover, the study revealed that both the facilitators and officials' attitudes are more positive on all dimensions of planning. It was also found in the study that the participants under ABE program planning are head teacher, cluster supervisor, facilitators, CMCs, KETB and project coordinators (for NGOs) in both ABE program institutions.
3. The children's learning environment could affect their learning interest towards the ABE program. Thus, the study showed that 64.8% of the program in government institutions and 100% of the program in NGOs are given in rooms constructed for this purpose. In ABE program, different actors are involved in designing the learning schedules. That is, 76.1% of the respondents confirmed that the program schedule is set by facilitators, head teacher and CMCs together in the case of government institutions. Whereas 78.3% the respondents responded that the learning program in

the case NGOs was scheduled /prepared by facilitators, head teacher, CMCs and children's parents in group.

4. The kind of the instructional organization implemented for the ABE program may affect the success of the program. In this regard, 97.2% of the respondents from GOs and 84% of the respondents from NGOs confirmed that self-contained instructional method is implemented in most ABE centers. The study also indicated that methods and procedures were better specified to coordinate the program in government institutions than NGOs. But the material resources are better facilitated in NGOs run ABE centers than GOs run ABE centers. Similarly, the finding of the study again supports that informal contacts with colleagues (other similar institutions) are better inspired for facilitators and others in NGOs side than that of government.
5. The study indicated that the majority of the respondents (71.8%) from government institutions replied that an appropriate budget as that of formal basic school was not allocated for ABE program ; whereas, 81.3% of the respondents from NGOs reported that sufficient budget was allocated for ABE program.
6. The study indicated that the curriculum of ABE program in both providers covered areas which could address the minimum learning competence for children. These are Amharic, English, Mathematics and environmental science with the integration of others. In line with this, though the curriculum has a lot of strengths, the majority (80%) of the respondents from both providers of the program pointed out the following weaknesses:
 - The curriculum does not consider the children's level of understanding.
 - Editing problem.
 - Pictures in the text are not clear and difficult to understand
 - Usage of difficult words in the texts.
 - The curriculum does not encourage using radio lesson.
7. The ABE program implementation strategy stated that the daily learning hours for this program is form 3-4 hrs per day for five days in a week. Thus, the finding indicated that 87.5% of the respondents from GOs and 77.3% of the respondents from NGOs replied

- that the ABE program is given for 4 hours per day either in morning or afternoon shift as convenient to the children and parents need. However, the finding showed that 77.5% of the respondents from GOs and 72.7% of the respondents from NGOs explained that there are more than fifty children per class in most ABE centers.
8. The participations of the community give live for better existence of ABE program which has a lot of incompletes to run it effectively. In this respect, the study revealed that the community has better participations in managing the program towards controlling school property, solving school disciplinary cases and adjusting school calendar in NGOs than GOs and an average with the rest roles.
 9. The community representatives such as CMCs and KETB are influential groups of the society towards the implementation of ABE programs. Regarding this, the finding indicated that the participations of CMCs and KETB towards ABE program management are medium under both institutions. However, interview results show that the CMCs are more cooperative under NGOs run ABE centers than GOs run ABE centers.
 10. School head teachers with some essential qualities are indispensable for better coordination of the program. In this respect, the finding revealed that there is a significance difference in the qualities of head teachers in managing the program, particularly with being flexible and reasonable ($t = -3.74$ at $\alpha < 0.05$), giving immediate constructive comments ($t = -3.620$ at $\alpha < 0.05$) and inviting others in planning, organizations, decision making process ($t = -2.197$ at $\alpha < 0.05$). That is, the head teachers under NGOs run ABE centers are exercising these qualities much better than government run ABE program center head teachers.
 11. Being graduated from a certain high school or institution is not enough for facilitators to run the program effectively. Thus, an appropriate and a timely training are important for the success of the program. In line with this, the finding showed that the areas of the training given to the facilitators under government institutions seem limited than the training given to the facilitators under non governmental institutions. Both providers of the program gave limited on job training for facilitators but NGOs are better in giving an initial training than government providers of the program.

12. The facilitators turning over may be happened due to the internal and external factors of a given institution. Regarding this, this study indicated that the primary reason for facilitators to leave the government institutions is looking for better salary. Whereas the reason for facilitators under non governmental institutions is looking for permanent employment as they fear the project will phase out. Furthermore, though there are terminations due to such reasons, 60% the respondents from GOs and 63.6% of the respondents from NGOs confirmed that there was no legal separation between the institution and the facilitators.
13. The study also revealed that there is no consistent salary given to the facilitators. For instance, the facilitators from government institutions are paid from birr 300/month to 626/ month. On the other hand, the facilitators from nongovernmental institutions are given a monthly salary from 600 birr/month to 1035 birr / month. And all the providers of the program employed the facilitators on the contract basis.
14. The study showed that government run ABE program is monitored twice/month by cluster supervisor and rarely by others. In the case of NGOs run ABE program, the program is monitored twice/week by project coordinator, twice/month by cluster supervisors and rarely by others. Besides, the ABE program is evaluated twice/year under GOs run ABE centers and every quarters of the year in NGOs run ABE centers. The study also revealed that cluster supervisors, CMCs, KETB, non-formal education experts, head teacher are the participants to monitor the ABE program under both institutions. On the other hand, Woreda officials, CMCs, cluster supervisors and head teacher are program evaluators under GOs side ,and CMCs, Basic Education Network Group (for FSCE), project officials, head teacher, woreda officials, cluster supervisors and zone officials were program evaluators for non governmental providers of the program.

5.2 Conclusions

Depending on the major findings of the study, the following conclusions were forwarded:

The main objective of the non-formal alternative basic education program in GOs and NGOs institutions is to address basic education for-out-school children and to achieve universal primary education by the year 2005. To this end, better management of the program under both providers of the non-formal alternative basic education could help to provide basic education that is equivalent to the formal basic education. Therefore, from the findings it can be concluded that both providers of the program are better in attracting potential facilitators, in applying all related issues of planning, in incorporating similar core subjects, in using similar screening criteria for employing facilitators, in using self-contained instructional organization and in inviting similar groups of participants (except program coordinators for NGOs) for planning, organization and staffing of the program.

On the top of this, NGOs are better in the internal organizations/material provisions, in improving the qualities of head teachers, in promoting the community towards the program, in paying better salary to the facilitators, in supporting the newly employed facilitators, in monitoring and evaluation of the program. On the opposite, methods and procedures were better specified to coordinate the program in the case of GOs than NGOs.

From the study it can also be concluded that in both providers of the program there is absence of clearly stated transferring criteria for the children from ABE to formal basic school and vice versa, using of difficult curriculum, assigning more than an average children in each class, employment of facilitators on the contract basis, illegal termination of the facilitators from the working institutions and there is limited on job trainings.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the major findings and conclusions with regard to the management of alternative basic education program, the following recommendations were suggested.

1. The quantitative and the qualitative findings of the study indicated that GOs run ABE program is highly suffering from administrative and internal organizations of the program (material resources and others). Thus, the government officials and other donor agencies should give due emphasis for such facilities to ABE program in order to achieve its institutional goal as that of formal basic schools.
2. It is obvious that it is the teachers/ facilitators that have great responsibilities to cultivate the human resource for a certain country. Hence, facilitators/ teachers are in need of better pay, better working environment, benefits and others. In this direction, the facilitators were not better paid (in GOs institutions), benefited, motivated and contract employed which harms their confidence towards their profession. Therefore, to reduce such problems of the facilitators, the Regional Educational Bureau and NGOs should set a uniform salary scale and other benefits even better than the formal school teachers should be given to the facilitators as they are responsible to run the program with such a lot of incompletes. Besides, it is advisable if the facilitators' contract employment is changed in to permanent ones after they have successfully passed the probation periods in their working environment as it is stated in the labour proclamation and to keep their morale.
3. Though the curriculum of the ABE program is a condensed of a four year formal education program to be finished in three years, it is believed that the nature of the curriculum of the ABE program is to be ability based, manageable in content, contextual, etc. However, the study could not justify these things that the curriculum seems in need of some sort of review so as to satisfy the needs of the beneficiaries. Besides, the problem of transferring children from ABE program to formal basic education and vice-versa was revealed in the finding. Thus, so as to not affect the image of ABE program, the concerned bodies should recognize this severe problem and formulate universal criteria about the transferring systems in the region.

4. An awareness creation activity about the ABE program on the community remains a lot in GOs side than NGOs. Since every activity of the program depends on the good will of the communities that a great deal of promotional and sensitizing activities should be made through conferences, seminars, discussion forums using different ways even including media.
5. Regarding the human resource planning, it is possible to say that the program has some limitations. The field visits and the interview results witnessed this. For instance, in every ABE center the numbers of facilitators are limited to the numbers of grade levels in that center. What was observed in reality was that in some centers the children were without the facilitators in some classrooms. The reasons given for absentees were sickness, absent while conducting a meeting with CMCs/KETB, or they are absent to run their private business, etc. Because of these reasons, the children could not get the intended daily lesson. Thus, to minimize such problems, it is advisable to employ more facilitators who would act as a principal, a facilitator when other are absent, reading room head, etc to run the program smoothly.
6. Although the ABE program is supported with many things by the community, the issue of financing the program is beyond their economic level. Thus, for better sustainability of the program and to curb the budget limitation, the ABE centers should be facilitated through convincing the community about the importance of the program to provide a sizable land for the ABE program and make it productive to generate income from the centers as that of ADA run ABE centers.
7. It is said that an institution looks whom it leads. In case, leading the ABE centers would be a difficult task for head teachers. In this regard, the study pointed out that such situations were more reflected on head teachers who are working in the GOs institutions than NGOs. Therefore, to upgrade their leadership quality, they should be assisted with frequent trainings and informal consults by program experts.
8. The alternative basic education as an alternative approach to the formal basic education has the goal to achieve the universal primary education (UPE) by the year 2015. In this

regard, the study showed that the monitoring and evaluation activities of the program are highly limited or almost no in most remotes areas of GOs run ABE centers than NGOs. If monitoring and evaluations are made timely, they will in turn contribute for better access, quality and equity of the education. Thus, all people under all sectors such as health, education, capacity building, agriculture and churches should work hand in hand to their maximum efforts towards the sustainability as well as the achievability of the ABE program. That is, task forces who are drawn from each of the above sector should be established so as to promote/coordinate the ABE program in particular and the others in general.

BIBILOGRAPHY

- Adesina, S.(1990). **Educational Management**. Enugu, Nigeria: Fourth Dimension publishing Company Ltd.
- Amarech Kebede(2007).”**An Assessment of the Implementation of Alternative basic Education program in East Gojjam.**” Unpublished MA thesis.Addis Ababa University.
- ARSEB(2005).General Report on “The Situation of Non-Formal Education in Amhara Region” **Proceedings on the National Conference on the Situation of Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia**. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa Printing Press.
- ARSEB(2007). **Report of the Mid-Term Review of the scaling up of ABE program in Amhara Regional State**. Addis Ababa.
- Ayalew Shibeshi (1991).Approach to Organization and Management Unpublished. Addis Ababa University.
- Bagin, D. and Gallagher, D. (2001). **The School and Community Relations** (7th ed.). Ally and Bacon.
- Befekadu Zeleke (2006). **A Review of Alternative Basic Education in four selected Regions in Ethiopia: Afar, Somali, Tigray, and Oromia**. Addis Ababa: Master Printing.
- Berihanu Seboka (2000). ”An Assessment of Alternative Primary Education program in two National Regional States of Rural Ethiopia.” Unpublished MA thesis. A.A.U.

- Biruke Mitike (2006). "The Provision and Organization of Adult and Non-Formal Education by Government and Non- Governmental Organization in the city of Addis Ababa. A Comparative Approach." Unpublished MA Thesis. A.A.U.
- Botti, et. al. (1978). **Basic Education in the Sahel Countries**. Hamburg :UNESCO.
- Cookson, P. (1998). **Program Planning for the Training and Continuing Education of Adults. North American Perspectives**. Florida :Krieger publishing company.
- Coomb, H. (1970). **What is Educational Planning?** Paris: UNESO
- Coombs, H. and Ahmed,M. (1974). **Attacking Rural Poverty: How NFE can help**. Washington D.C: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.
- CRDA (2008). **30 years of Service. CRDA Members Profile**. Addis Ababa: Information Management Department.
- Derebssa Dufera (2002). "Factors Affecting the Implementation of Current Curriculum in Ethiopia Primary Schools: Implication for Quality." **Quality of Primary Education. Proceedings of the National Conference Held in Adama Ras Hotel 9-11, 2001**. Addis Ababa: Institute of Educational Research. Addis Ababa University.
- Donnelly,Jr.and et.al.(1992).Fundamentals of Management(8th ed.).Boston: CODE.
- Douglas, L. and Darnell, W. (2004). **Decentralization Education Governance in Ethiopia**. USAID, AED/BESO. n.p.
- EIDC(2005). **Self Evaluation Manual: Capacity Building and Primary Education**: Addis Ababa :ESDP Project Monitoring Unit.
- Gray,L.H.(1985).**The School as an Organization**. Great Britain , Dean houses Ltd.

- Guruge, (1977). **General Principles of Management for Educational planers and Administrators**. Paris: UNESCO.
- Harlen, W. (1978). **Evaluation and the Teacher's Role**. Hong Kong: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Hilderbrand, H. (1996). **"International Experience in the Development of Adult and Non-Formal Education. Paper presented at the workshop on Designing a Strategy for National Education"** Addis Ababa. IIZ/DVV.
- Ishumi, A. (1984). **Educational planning in Developing Countries**. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell international.
- Jarvis, O. (1969). **Elementary School Administration: Readings**. Georgia: WM.C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Jenson, T. et al. (1967). **Elementary School Administration** (2nd edition). Boston: Ally and Bacon, Inc.
- Kindard, J. (1988). **Management: USA and Canada**. D.C Health and Company.
- Kumar, R. (1999). **Research Methodology: A Step by Step Guide for Beginners**. London: Thousenaokas New Delhi.
- Levaçiê, R. (1995). **Local Management of Schools: Analysis and Practice**. Buckingham: Philadelphia Open University Press.
- Lyons, R.F. (1979). **Problems of Educational Administration in Remote Rural Areas**. Paris: UNESCO.
- Mammo Kebede, et.al. (1998). **Provision of Non-Formal Alternatives for the Expansion of Educational Services**. Addis Ababa. Berhanena Selam Printing Press.

Mbamba,A.(1992).**Book of Reading in Educational Management** .Harare: Maxongororo
Paper Converters(pvt)Ltd.

Mingat, A. (2003). **Tools for Education Policy Analysis**. Washington DC: World Bank.

MoE (1994) .**Education and Training policy**. Addis Ababa: Mega Printing Enterprise.

_____(2000).**Alternative Routes to Basic Education Part One: The Study Report**.
Addis Ababa.

_____(2002).**Educational Sector Development Program(ESDP II) :Action Plan**. Addis
Ababa: MoE.

_____(2004). "**Non-Formal Education Programs Implementation Strategy**." MOE
(unpublished)

_____(2005).**Educations Sector Development Program (ESDP III): Program Action
Plan**. Addis Ababa .Berhanena Selam Printing Enterprises.

_____(2006(a)).**National Alternative Basic Education Strategy for out of School
Children**. MOE (unpublished)

_____(2006(b)).**Education Sector Development II: Joint. Review Mission**. Addis Ababa.
United Printers Plc.

Mondy, R.W.and Noe, R.M. (1990).**Human Resource Management** (4th ed.). USA :Ally
Bacon

Muller,J.(2000). "From Jomtien to Dakar, Meeting Basic Learning Needs-of Whom?"
Adult Education and Development. Bonn:IIZ/DVV.No.55. PP.29-56

Newton, C. and Tarrant, J. (1992). **Managing Change in Schools: A practical Hand Book**.
London : Rutledge

Okumbe, A.J (1998). **Educational Management**. Nairobi University Press.

- Philips, H.M. (1975(a)). **Basic Education. A World Challenge, Measures and Innovation for Children and Youth in Developing Countries.** London: JohnWiley&Sons Ltd.
- _____ (1975(b)). **What is Meant by Basic Education. IIP Seminar Paper (19) on the planning problems in Rural Education.** Paris: UNESCO.
- Preedy, M. et. al. (1997). **Educational Management: Strategy, Quality and Resources.** Buckingham: Philadelphia Open University Press.
- PSCO (2004). **Introduction to Management** .Ziway: Unpublished.
- Ranaweera, A. et.al. (1989). **Non-conventional Approaches to Education at the Primary Level.** Hamburg: UNESCO
- Reinhartz, J. and Beach, D. (1997). **Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School: Focus on curriculum.** New Jersey: Mertill Print of Prentice Hall
- Tekeste Negash (1996). **Rethinking Education in Ethiopia.** Uppsala: Nordiska Affrika institute.
- _____ (1990). **The Crisis of Ethiopian Education: Some Implications for Nation Building.:** Sweden, Uppsala University.
- Thomas, Hywel and et.al. (1996). **Managing Resources for School Management.** New York: Rutledge.
- Thompson,E (2001(b)). **Adult Education for Development.** Kenya ,an International Non-Formal Education Consultancy.
- _____ (2001(a)). **“Successful Experiences in Non-Formal Education and Alternative Approaches to basic Education in Africa.”** Discussion paper presented at 2001 Biennal conference Arusha n.p.

UN (1948). **Universal Development of Human Rights** “[http://www. un
org/overview/rights.html](http://www.un.org/overview/rights.html)”

UNESCO (2002). **Education for All: Global Monitoring Report is the World on Track?**
Paris: Grapho Print

UNESCO (2007). **Global Monitoring Report** .Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESO (2001). **World Education Report: The Right towards Basic Education for All.**
Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Weeb,A.and et.al.(1995).**The Participation of Non Governmental Organizations in
Poverty Alleviation :ሪ ሰፊ Study of Honduras Social Investment
Found Project** Washington D.C .:World Bank.

Yates, C. and Bradley, J. (2000). **Basic Education at a Distance: World Review of
Distance Education and Open Learning.** New York: Rutledge
Falmer. Vol.2.

አማራ ክልል ት/ቢሮ (1995) አማራጭ የህፃናት መሠረታዊ የትምህርት ንግግራም ስትሪቴጂ::
ባህርዳር

አማራ ክልል ትምህርት ቢሮ (1999) 10ኛው አትክልት መድረክ ሰነድ (Proceedings):: ባህርዳር

አማራ ክልል ትምህርት ቢሮ (1997) የአማራጭ መሠረታዊ ትምህርት ንግግራም የአፈፃፀም
መማሪያ:: ቁጥር 9 ባህርዳር

መርጋ ደበላ (1999) ጥራት ላለው መደበኛ ላልሆነ ትምህርት ከማስፋፋት አኳያ ጠቃሚ
የክትትልና ግምገማ ስልቶች፣ ለወረዳ ትምህርት ጽ/ቤት ባለሞያዎች
ስልጠና የተዘጋጀ:: አዲስ አበባ፣ ABC ማተሚያ ቤት

Appendix A

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate studies

Department of Adult education and life long learning

**Questionnaires for Head teachers, Program Coordinators, Educational Experts
/Supervisors**

Dear respondents,

The aim of this study is to survey the status of the management of alternative basic education program in Amhara Region. Hence, the purpose of this questionnaire is to collect the data on the current status of how the Alternative Basic Education (ABE) is being managed in the Region. Since the responses you provide are highly valuable to meet the objectives of this research, you are kindly requested to fill the questionnaire honestly and responsibly. The information you supply through questionnaire would be kept strictly confidential, and it would be used for academic purpose **ONLY**.

Thank you in advance!

General Directions

1. Don't write your name
2. Please put a tick (✓) mark in the box provided for questions with multiple choices
/responses
3. Write your responses for open-ended questions in the space provided.
4. Chances are there to give more than **one answer** for some questions.

Part I. Personal information

1.1 Age (in years) _____

1.2 Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

1.3 Educational level

☐ Certificate ☐ Bachelor Degree

☐ Diploma ☐ Masters Degree

Other (please specify) _____

1.4 Current positions:

☐ Education expert ☐ Principal /head teacher

☐ Supervisor ☐ program coordinator

☐ Any other _____

1.5 Years of service in the current /present position/ _____

1.6 In which organization or institution are you working now?

☐ Government ☐ Non-government

Part II. Questions on planning issues of ABE program

2.1 What are the objectives of providing ABE program in your area? (Rank them from highest to least importance).

☐ To provide basic education for out-of -school children with special emphasis to girls

☐ To address basic education to marginalized areas of children

☐ To give basic life skills for out-of school children

☐ To give opportunities for children to re-enter to school

2.2 Have you received any prior training regarding ABE program planning?

☐ Yes ☐ No

2.3 The following ideas/statements are designed to assess the level of agreement of the respondents to wards planning dimensions of the program. Thus, indicate your level of agreement to each statement by putting a tick (✓) mark under the following rating scales.

No	dimensions of planning	Rating scales				
		Strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	agree	Strongly Agree
2.3.1	Plans reflect agreed priorities	1	2	3	4	5
2.3.2	In planning program objectives are well identified					
2.3.3	There are well- established procedures of planning					
2.3.4	Our planning processes encourages working relationships					
2.3.5	Program planning is done through inviting different stake holders (facilitators, CMCs, head teachers, supervisors, etc)					
2.3.6	Information is gathered systematically as part of the planning process.					
2.3.7	Planning about the program activities are done before it started					

2.4 Who is/are involved in ABE program planning?

Part III Program Organization

3.1 The alternative basic education is provided in (more than one answer is possible)

- ☐ Regular school room
☐ Mobile tent
☐ In rooms constructed for this purpose
☐ Under the shed of tree
☐ Other (please specify) _____

3.2 Who determine(s) the learning schedules? (More than one answer is possible)

- KETB(Kebele Education and Training Board) ☐
 ➤ Facilitators ☐
 ➤ Principals ☐
 ➤ Center Management committees (CMCs) ☐
 ➤ Other (please specify) _____

3.3 The following ideas/statements are designed to assess the level of agreement of the respondents towards the organizations of the program. Thus, indicate your level of agreement to each statement by putting a tick (✓) mark under the following rating scales.

No	Aspects of organization	Rating scales					
		Strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree	Remake
3.3.1	Methods and procedures are specified to coordinate the program (s)	1	2	3	4	5	
3.3.2	Staff are clear about their and others responsibilities						
3.3.3	Material resources are facilitated to organize the program						
3.3.4	Informal contacts with colleagues /with other institutions are motivated						
3.3.5	There is better information communication in the institution from top-to-bottom and back,						

3.4 Who is/ are involved in ABE program organization?

- a. _____ c. _____
b. _____ d. _____

3.5 Who provide(s) the learning materials (pen, pencil, note-books) to the learners?

(more than one answer is possible)

- ☐ Government ☐ Non governmental organization
☐ Parents ☐ Any other _____

3.6 Is there any cluster system with formal schooling system?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3.7 If No why?-----

3.8 Is there sufficient budget for better implementation of ABE program?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3.9 If No why?-----

3.10 Is there any problem of the transfer to and from ABE centers to formal primary education?

Yes ☐ No ☐

3.11 If 'Yes' what? _____

3.12 Which instructional organization is implemented for ABE program?

☐ Self-continued classroom

☐ both

☐ Departmentalization

☐ any other, please specify here _____

3.13 For your answer above (3.12) please, give your reason(s)

Part IV. Curriculum issues

4.1 As a facilitator, list at least three major good and bad qualities of the curriculum?

Good Qualities of the curriculum

a. _____ b. _____

c. _____ d. _____

Bad qualities of the curriculum

a. _____ b. _____

c. _____ d. _____

4.2 Are the learning materials sufficiently provided?

Yes ☐ No ☐

4.3 If 'No' why? _____

Part V Program staffs

5.1 Who recruits and screens the facilitators? (More than one answer is possible)

☐ Woreda capacity building officials

☐ Woreda non-formal education expert (s)

☐ Members of Center Management Committee (CMC)

☐ Zonal Educational department officers

☐ Any other, please specify here _____

5.2 What are the major criteria for recruiting, and screening the facilitators? (More than one answer is possible)

☐ Educational background ☐ being born in the program area

☐ Working experience ☐ any other, (please specify) _____

☐ Employment test/exam

5.3 Terms of teachers' employment?

A. permanent ☐

C. volunteers ☐

B. part-time workers ☐

D. Contract ☐

E. any other _____

5.4 Is there a special benefit to teachers/facilitators in addition to their monthly salary?

Yes ☐

No ☐

5.5 If 'yes' what? _____

5.6 What kind(s) Of training is (are) given to the teachers/ facilitators?

5.6.1 Initial/ induction training, duration in days _____

5.6.2 on the job training; duration in days _____

5.6.3 Summer training; for how many summers _____

5.6.4 Any different opinion _____

5.7 Who is/are giving training for the employees/facilitators?

5.8 What are the major training areas/ contents? (More than one possible answer is possible)

☐ The nature/feature of the ABE program

☐ What is taught in the program?

☐ On how to prepare the lesson plan

☐ On continuous assessment

Any other, please specify _____

5.9 Have you been given satisfactory training which could help you to run the program more effectively?

Yes ☐

No ☐

Other comment /opinion _____

5.10 What reason(s) do you suggest for facilitator's turn-over in your ABE centers? (Rank them from most serious problems to least serious ones)

☐ Being not be evaluated through coherent and transparent procedures.

☐ They haven't been run to gain needed skills or knowledge

☐ Poor treatment by personnel /management bodies/

☐ Looking for better salary

☐ In adequate provisions of teaching resources by the school to run the program more effectively.

Any other, please specify _____

5.11 What supports are provided to the newly employed facilitators to be satisfied in their teaching? (more than one answer is possible)

- ☐ Giving a lighter teaching load to them
- ☐ Providing an effective, involved and well-trained mentor to help them
- ☐ Providing additional training to them
- ☐ Making more-in-depth observations and coaching on them

Any other _____

Part VI Monitoring

6.1 Who is/are involved in program monitoring?

6.2 Why do you monitor the program?

6.3 Are there any parameters /indicators to monitor the program?

Yes ☐ No ☐

6.4 If 'yes' List some of them?

A. _____ C. _____

B. _____ D. _____

6.5 How often do you monitor the program at each center?

Part VII Evaluation issues

7.1 Who is/ are involved in program evaluation?

7.2 State some basic criteria/consideration for program evaluation?

7.3 How often do you evaluate your program?

7.4 Why do you evaluate the program? _____

Part VIII Communities Participation for school management

8.1 How do you rate the significance of the community representatives such as Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB), and Center Management Committee (CMC) members towards participating in school management?

No	Participations	Rating scales					Remark
		Very low	Low	medium	high	Very high	
		1	2	3	4	5	
8.1.1	In planning of the program						
8.1.2	In organization of the program						
8.1.3	In staffing the program						
8.1.4	In monitoring evaluation the program						

8.2 How do you rate the significance of community participation towards school management in terms of the following some parameters?

No	Roles	Rating scales					Remark
		V.low	low	medium	high	Very high	
8.2.1	In promoting students enrollment						
8.2.2	In monitoring the quality of the program						
8.2.3	In controlling school properties						
8.2.4	In solving school disciplinary cases						
8.2.5	In adjusting school calendar						

Part IX: Issues, concerns and recommendation

9.1 What are the major problems that you observe under ABE program management? _____

9.2 What suggestion do you recommend to solve such problems? _____

9.3 Any other comments _____

Appendix B
Addis Ababa University
School of Graduate Studies
Department of Adult Education and life long learning

Questionnaire for Facilitators

Dear respondents,

The aim of this study is to survey the status of the management of alternative basic education program in Amhara Region. Hence, the purpose of this questionnaire is to collect the data on the current status of how the Alternative Basic Education (ABE) is being managed in the Region. Since the responses you provide are highly valuable to meet the objective of this research, you are kindly requested to fill the questionnaire honestly and responsibly. The information you supply through questionnaire would be kept strictly confidential, and it would be used for academic purpose **ONLY**.

Thank you in advance!

General directions:

1. Don't write your name
2. Please put a tick (✓) mark in the box provided for questions with multiple responses.
3. Write your responses for open –ended questions in the space provided.
4. Chances are there to give more than **one answer** for some questions.

Part I. Personal information

1.1 Age (in years) _____

1.2 Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐

1.3 Educational level

☐ Certificate

☐ 12th complete

☐ 10th compete

☐ Other, please specify _____

1.4 Years of service in the current /present position? _____

1.5 In which organization or institution are you teaching now?

☐ Government

☐ Non-government

Part II. Questions on planning issues of ABE program

2.1 What are the objectives of providing ABE program in your area? (Rank them from highest to least importance).

☐ To provide basic education for out-of –school children with special emphasis to girls

☐ To address basic education to marginalized areas of children

☐ To give basic life skills for out-of school children

☐ To give opportunities for children to re-enter to school

2.2 Have you got any prior training regarding lesson planning?

Yes ☐ No ☐

2.3 The following ideas/statements are designed to assess the level of agreement of the respondents to wards planning dimensions of the program. Thus, indicate your level of agreement to each statement by putting a tick (✓) mark under the following rating scales.

No	dimensions of planning	Rating scales					
		Strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	agree	Strongly agree	Remark
2.3.1	Plans reflect agreed priorities	1	2	3	4	5	
2.3.2	In planning program objectives are well identified						
2.3.3	There are well- established procedures of planning						
2.3.4	Our planning processes encourages working relationships						
2.3.5	Program planning is done through inviting different stake holders (facilitators, CMCs, head teachers, supervisors, etc)						
2.3.6	Information is gathered systematically as part of the planning process.						
2.3.7	Planning about the program activities are done before the program started						

Part III. Issues on program organization

3.1 The alternative basic education is provided in (more than one answer is possible)

☐ Regular school rooms ☐ in rooms constructed for this purpose

☐ Mobile tents under the shade of tree

☐ Any other, please specify here _____

3.2 Who determines the learning schedules? (More than one answer is possible)

☐ KETB (Kebele Education and Training Board)

☐ Principals /head teachers

☐ Facilitators /teachers

☐ Center Management Committee (CMC)

☐ Any other, please specify here _____

3.3 The following ideas/statements are designed to assess the level of agreement of the respondents to wards the organizations of the program. Thus, indicate your level of agreement to each statement by putting a tick (✓) mark under the following rating scales.

No	Aspects of organization	Rating scales					
		Strongly disagree	disagree	Undecided	agree	Strongly agree	Remark
3.3.1	Methods and procedures are specified to coordinate the program (s)	1	2	3	4	5	
3.3.2	Staff are clear about their and others responsibilities						
3.3.3	Material resources are facilitated to organize						
3.3.4	Informal contacts with colleagues /with other institutions are motivated						
3.3.5	There is better information communication in the institution from top-to-bottom and vice versa						

3.4 Who is/are involved in ABE organizations?

3.5 Who provide(s) the learning materials (pens, pencils, note-books) to the learners of your institution? (more than one answer is possible)

☐ Government

☐ Non-governmental organization

☐ Parents

☐ any other, please specify _____

3.6 Is there any cluster system of ABE program with formal schooling system?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3.7 Is there sufficient budget for better implementation of the ABE program?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3.8 If 'No' why? _____

3.9 Is there any problem of the transfer to and from ABE centers to formal primary education?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3.10 If 'Yes' what _____

3.11 Which instructional organization is implemented for ABE program?

☐ Self-contained classroom

☐ both

☐ Departmentalization

☐ any other, please specify here

3.12 For your answer above (3.11) please, give your reason(s)

Part IV curriculum issues

4.1 As a facilitator, list at least three major good and bad qualities of the curriculum?

Good Qualities of the curriculum

a. _____ b. _____

c. _____ d. _____

Bad qualities of the curriculum

a. _____ b. _____

c. _____ d. _____

4.2 Are the learning materials sufficiently provided?

Yes ☐

No ☐

4.3 If 'No' why? _____

4.4 Give information for daily learning hours, average class size and number of shifts per day

- Daily learning hours _____
- Average class size _____
- N^o of shifts per day _____

Part V. Issues on Program staffs

5.1 Who recruits and screens the facilitators? (More than one answer is possible)

- ☐ Woreda capacity building officials
- ☐ Woreda non-formal education experts
- ☐ Members of Center Management Committee (CMCs)
- ☐ Zonal Educational department officers
- ☐ Any other, please specify here _____

5.2 What are the major criteria used for recruitment and screening? (More than one answer is possible)

- ☐ Educational background ☐ being born in the program area
- ☐ Working experience ☐ any other, please specify here _____
- ☐ Employment test/exam

5.3 Are there any special benefits given to you in addition to your monthly salary?

Yes ☐ No ☐

5.4 If 'yes' what? _____

5.5 What kind(s) Of training is (are) given to the teachers/ facilitators?

5.5.1 Initial/ induction training, duration in days _____

5.5.2 on the job training; duration in days _____

5.5.3 Summer training; for how many summers _____

5.5.4 Any different opinion _____

5.6 Who is/are giving training for the employees /facilitators?

a. _____ b. _____ c. _____

5.7. What are the major training areas/ contents? (More than one possible answer is possible)

- The nature/feature of the ABE program ☐
- What is taught in the program? ☐
- On how to prepare the lesson plan ☐
- On continuous assessment ☐
- Any other, please specify _____

5.8 Have you been given satisfactory training that could help you to run the program more effectively? Yes ☐ No ☐

5.9 What reason(s) do you suggest for facilitator's turn-over in your ABE centers? (Rank them from most serious problems to least serious ones)

- ☐ Being not be evaluated through coherent and transparent procedures.
- ☐ They haven't been run to gain needed skills or knowledge
- ☐ Poor treatment by personnel /management bodies/
- ☐ Looking for better salary
- ☐ In adequate provisions of teaching resources by the school to run the program more effectively.
- ☐ Any other, pleas specify _____

5.10 Is there any legal termination/separation of employees from your institution?

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

5.11 The following are some qualities of a school principal /head teachers. Thus, indicate your responses by putting a tick () mark under the following scales.

No	Qualities	Rating scales					Remark
		Strongly disagree	Disagree	undecided	agree	Strongly agree	
		1	2	3	4	5	
5.11.1	The school leadership is reasonable and flexible						
5.11.2	The head teacher is open-minded and cooperative with his subordinates						
5.11.3	He/she is good at giving an immediate constructive comments /feedbacks to the staffs.						
5.11.4	He/she is good at involving others in planning /decision making processes						

Part VI Communities' participation in school management

6.1 How do you rate the significance of community participation towards school management in terms of the following parameters?

No	Roles	Rating scales					
		V.low	low	medium	high	V.high	Remark
6.1.1	In promoting students enrollment						
6.1.2	In monitoring the quality of the program						
6.1.3	In controlling school properties						
6.1.4	In solving school disciplinary cases						
6.1.5	In adjusting school calendar						

Part VII Issues, concerns and recommendations

7.1 What are the major problems that you observe under program management?

7.2 What suggestions do you recommend to solve such problems?

7.3 Any other comments

Appendix C

Semi-structured interview to be conducted by Zonal/Woreda Educational Leaders (for both GOs and NGOs)

Zone _____

Woreda _____

ABE centers: GO institution _____

Responsibility-----

NGOs institution _____

1. What are the major contributions that you exert for better implementation ABE programs towards GO and NGOs run ABE centers.)
2. Are there any approaches introduced that help to manage the school-community relationships?
3. Is there any special help for economically poor children to attend the program?
- 4 .Who designed and developed the ABE programs?
- 5 Were the CMCs/KETB given appropriate training?
6. What were the training areas given to them?
7. For how often the training is given to the CMCs/KETB?
8. What are the major problems of the head teachers towards managing the ABE program?
9. What is/are the main reasons that promote children's dropout?
10. What solutions do you suggest to reduce children's dropout?
11. What are the major responsibilities of the center management committee (CMC s)?

Appendix D

Semi-structured interview to be conducted by both government and non-government run ABE head teachers

Zone: _____

Woreda : _____

ABE Centers: Government organization _____

Non Governmental organization _____

1. What supports do you get from woreda educational leaders?
2. What special approaches are used to mobilize the society towards promoting the program?
- 3 .How do you attract children from economically poor family?
4. Are the CMCs and KETB given any training?
- 5 .Are the facilitators contract or permanent employed?
6. What about the mode of payment?
7. How much is a monthly salary for reach facilitator?
8. Have you given any training on how to manage the ABE program?
9. What is the source of income to run the ABE program?
10. What is/are the main reasons that promote children's dropout?
11. What solutions do you suggest to reduce children's dropout?
12. What can you say about the facilitators and the community towards ABE program?
13. Who is/are giving the training for CSMCs ,KETB, facilitators and head teachers?
14. Do you get the necessary help from the near by formal basic school?

Appendix E

Zone: _____

Woreda: _____

ABEcenters:Governmentalorganization_____

Non-governmental organization_____

Document Inventory check list for site observations

Check lists

Responses

Available

Not available

- | | | |
|---|-------|-------|
| 1. Strategic plans/annual program plans | _____ | _____ |
| a) To what extent is it implemented? | | |
| 2. Records of income and expenditure system | _____ | _____ |
| a) Who runs it? | _____ | |
| 3. Records of minutes/meetings | ----- | ----- |
| a) On what issues are the minutes conducted? | _____ | |
| 4. Monitoring check lists | ----- | ----- |
| 5. Students assessment profiles | ----- | ----- |
| 6. Attendance sheets for children and facilitators | ----- | ----- |
| 7. Subject syllabus for: | | |
| a) For level one subjects | ----- | ----- |
| b) For level two subjects | ----- | ----- |
| c) For level three subjects | ----- | ----- |
| 8. The text books | | |
| a) Level one | ----- | ----- |
| b) Level two | ----- | ----- |
| c) Level three | ----- | ----- |
| 9. Records of series of lesson plans | ----- | ----- |
| 10. Teacher's guide | ----- | ----- |
| 11. To which grade level does teacher's guide absent? | | |

APPENDIX: F

* Sampled ABE centers under Sampled Organizations

Operational areas and ABE centers	Governmental organizations	Non-governmental organizations	Remark
		Amhara Development Association (ADA)	
Zone	South Gondar	South Gondar	
Woreda	Lay gaint	Lay gaint	
Sampled centers	ABE - Akuma - Gembojat - Wellego - Sholla - Gedem - Dellama	- Delete - Keffoye - Abegestie - Tetare - Gura - Meda Afafe - Wuha Midir - Barezaba - Addis Alem - Abo Dej	
		Forum on Street Children (FSCE)	
Zone/Woreda	Bahir Dar Zuria	Bahir Dar Liyu zone	
Sample centers	ABE -Aba gerima -Wonie Weha - Kane Aymesk -Amba -Nebar gedele	-Tegeza - Ginbot 20/K-14 -Hidar II - Sefense selam, K-05 and K=04 - Tana keble (K=16) - Belay zelege(K=17)	
		Facilitators for Change Ethiopia (FCE)	
Zone	East Gojjam	East Gojjam	
Woreda	-Gouzamen/D.Markos zuria	-Gouzamen, Basoliben and D.Markos	All project areas were considered to get enough sample population
Sample centers	ABE -Addis Amba -Yeberana - Dallegaw -Work matab -Aba gerama - Endegem	- Dello - Entalem -Kebedam(Bsoliben) -Bata (Basoliben) -Abay (Basoliben) (Gouzamen) -Mankero)Gouzamen) (Gouzamen) -K=02 (D.Markos) - K=03(D.Markos) -Workmateb - Dellanta	

N.B: K= Kebele, D. Markos= Debre Markos

*** Further Sampling of ABE Centers at Sample Sights**

Woredas/ABE sites	Population size of ABE centers		Sample size of ABE centers		Remark
	Govn't	NGOs	Govn't	NGOs	
Lay Gayent	12	10	8	8	There is scaling up of ABE centers to formal school from GOs side
Bahir Dar/Zuria	6	6	6	6	
Debre Markos/Zuria	12	11	8	8	
Sub-total	30	27	22	22	
Grand total	57		44		

Appendix'G':The Back Ground Summary of Non-Governmental Organizations.

No	Functions	Organizations		
		FCE	FSCE	ADA
1	Years of establishment	2004	2002	2005
2	Types of organization	Local NGO	Local NGO	Local NGO
3.	Sectors of activities	• ABE program • Child rights	• ABE program • Capacity building	• ABE program Women empowerment
4.	Legal status	➤ Legalized under the ministry of justice	➤ Legalized in 1992	Legalized under the ministry of justice
5	Operational area/country Region	- Amhara	- Amhara	Amhara
	Zone	- East Gojjam	- Bahir Dar Liyu zone	South Gondar
	Woreda	- Deber Markos & Peripheries	- Bahir Dar town	Lay gaint
6	Vision	-To see the disadvantage community over come the problems of their poverty and..	-To see the rights of children respected by the society	-To see the Amhara people freed from poverty and backward ness
7	Mission	-To help communities increase their efforts to overcome socio-economic problems and	- To work for the respect of children's right namely street children, sexually abused and exploited children	-To support development effort of the people by making them take part in education, health, vocational training etc.
8	Major source of income	-Donors like KNH, PCF and SCF	-External donor a genies	-Communities and Pact Ethiopia
9	Major partners in promoting	-World Education Offices and the community	-NGOS-WABI and JECCDO	-Pact Ethiopia
10	Program types	-Non-formal education -child rights	-Non-formal education -Girls empowerment	-Non-formal education -Functional adult literacy

Appendix H: The output of Reliability Test

Reliability

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	20	95.2
	Excluded(a)	1	4.8
	Total	21	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.827	.801	42

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
first reasons for running ABE	2.05	1.356	20
second reasons for running ABE	2.55	1.276	20
third reasons for running ABE	2.40	1.188	20
Have received prior training	1.30	.470	20
plan reflects agreed priorities	4.15	.671	20
objectives are well identified	4.45	.686	20
There are well established procedures	3.85	1.040	20
process encourages working relationship	4.30	.979	20
program planning is done with stakeholders	4.00	.973	20
information is systematically gathered in process	3.95	.999	20
planning is done before the program	4.25	.967	20
Provided alternative basic education	5.20	1.508	20
Who determines the learning schedule	6.65	.933	20
methods and procedures are specified	4.15	.933	20
Staff are clear for their and others responsibilities	4.40	.503	20

Material resources are facilitated	3.20	1.281	20
Informal contacts are motivated	3.95	1.050	20
there is better information communication	4.10	.912	20
Who provides learning materials	2.05	.224	20
Is there any cluster system of ABE program	1.05	.224	20
is the budget enough	1.75	.444	20
students transfer problem	1.25	.444	20
Implemented instructional organization for ABE program	1.40	.821	20
learning materials provision	1.80	.410	20
recruiting and screening of facilitators	6.00	1.338	20
Criteria for screening facilitators	6.15	.988	20
special benefits beside to salary	1.90	.308	20
Major training area	6.05	.224	20
satisfaction with given training	1.95	.224	20
First reasons for facilitator turnover	4.10	.447	20
Second reasons for facilitator turnover	5.80	.894	20
Third reasons for facilitator turnover	2.10	.447	20
Any support to newly employed facilitators	6.85	.671	20
Participation planning	3.05	1.146	20
In organizing the program	3.30	.865	20
Participation in staffing	3.30	1.129	20
Participation in monitoring and evaluation	3.15	1.089	20
in promoting students enrollment	3.55	1.050	20
in monitoring quality of the program	3.20	1.240	20
in controlling school properties	3.40	.940	20
in solving school disciplinary cases	3.30	.923	20
in adjusting school calendar	3.10	1.119	20

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Inter-Item Correlations	.088	-1.000	1.000	2.000	-1.000	.104	42

The covariance matrix is calculated and used in the analysis.

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned declare that this thesis is my original work and has never been presented for degree in other university, and that all source of materials used for this thesis have been dully acknowledged.

Name: Tebikew Genet Bopale
Sign: [Signature]
Date: Feb 12/2019

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

Name: _____
Sign: _____
Date: _____