

**IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF NON-FORMAL BASIC
PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN SELECTED CENTERS
OF ADDIS ABABA, OROMIA AND SNNPR**

**A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate
Studies of Addis Ababa University**

**In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Arts
In
Curriculum Studies**

By

Firdissa Jebessa Aga

June, 2002

Addis Ababa

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge my extensive debt to Dr. Marew Zewdie, my thesis Advisor. It would not have been possible to make this thesis appear in its present form without Dr. Marew's professional guidance and assistance in reshaping the title and continuously scrutinizing my works and advising me at all critical steps.

I would like to thank *BESO/USAID for initiating and sponsoring the whole scheme of the M.Ed program. Action Aid Ethiopia is also highly instrumental in assisting me to study its innovative *ACCESS* centers.

My appreciation also goes to the staff at AAE (Head office and Dalocha), RCWDA (Ananno site), Propride Entoto and ANFEAE for their generosity and assistance in all aspects of this thesis work. I would also like to extend my appreciations to Ato Berhanu Geleto, Ato Hailu Sime, Ato Aseffa Beyene, Ato Desalegn Chalchisa, Obbo Biyena Fufa, and Obbo Merga Debelo for their professional contributions to the success of this thesis.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my wife W/o Almaz Taffese for her meticulous editing of all pieces of information in this thesis in particular and continuous encouragements and assistances throughout the course work in general. My children, Galata and Mari Firdissa, also deserve appreciations for their patience to

* Basic Educational System Overhaul

bear my pressures of forcing them to leave my study room whenever they, of course
endlessly, were anxious to chat with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....

.....ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	viii
ABSTRACT	x

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study.....

...1

1.2. Statement of the Problem.....

.....6

1.3. Significance of the Study.....	10
1.4. Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	10
1.5 Operational Definitions of Terms, Phrases or Concepts.....	11

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 NON-FORMAL EDUCATION.....	13
2.1.1 Concept and Definition of NFE.....	13
2.1.2 Rationales for Non-Formal Education.....	16
2.1.3 NFE in Ethiopia: Historical Overview.....	18
2.2 IMPLEMENTATION.....	23
2.2.1 Conceptual Descriptions.....	23

2.2.2	Barriers to Implementation.....	24
2.2.3	Guidelines to Facilitate Implementation.....	27
2.3.	IMPLEMENTING NFBE PROGRAM.....	29
2.3.1	Agents of Implementation (People and Organizations).....	29
2.3.2	Availability of Curricula Materials... ..	32
2.3.3	Meeting The Basic Learning Needs of Children.....	34
2.3.3.1	Increasing Relevance.....	35
2.3.3.2	Improving Quality.....	35
2.3.3.3	Promoting Equity.....	37
2.3.3.4	Enhancing Efficiency.....	38
2.3.4	Meeting the Demands of Parents/Community.....	39
2.4	LINKAGE OF THE NON-FORMAL AND THE FORMAL BASIC PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS.....	41
2.5	BEST IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF NFBPE.....	43
2.5.1	Improving Rural Education in Colombia through Escuela Nueva.....	44
2.5.2	Improving Schooling for Girls and Rural Children in Bangladesh.. ..	46
2.5.3.	Addressing the Needs of Child Workers in India and Kenya.....	48
2.5.4	Approaches with promise to increase Access, Persistence, and Achievement of Girls in Nepal	49
2.5.5	Common Features of the Best implementation Practices of the Non-formal Basic Education program.....	51

CHAPTER THREE: DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1	Sample Selection Procedures.....	54
3.2	Data Sources.....	57
3.3	Data Collection Methods and Instruments.....	58
3.4	Data Collection Processes/Procedures.....	59
3.5	Methods of Data Analyses.....	59

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

4.1.	BACKGROUND DESCRIPTIONS.....	60
4.2	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA	68
4.2.1	NFBPE Program Implementation Practices in Fulfilling the Learners’ Learning needs and the Demands of the parents/ Community.....	69
4.2.2	Linkage between the Implementation Practices of the Formal and Non-Formal Basic Primary Education programs.....	72
4.2.3	Significant Similarities and Differences between the NGO-and Govern- ment-Implementation Practices of the NFBPE.....	75
4.2.4	Extent of the Availability of Curricula Materials.....	78
4.2.5	Prominent Factors that facilitate or Inhibit the NFBPE Program Implementation.....	83
4.2.5.1	Factors that have Facilitated the NFBPE Program Implementation.....	83
4.2.5.2	NFBPE Program Implementation Problems/Inhibiting Factors.....	86
4.2.6	Recommendable/Best Implementation practices of the NFBPE Program.....	91
4.3	DISCUSSIONS.....	93

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS.....	100
5.2	CONCLUSIONS.....	103
5.3	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	106
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	110
	APPENDICES.....	115

LISTS OF TABLES

Table 1: Regions, Zones, Woredas, NFBPE Centers, and Respective Implementers.

Table 2: Summary of the Data Sources

Table 3: Respondents of the Questionnaire per Implementing Agents

Table 4: Qualification of the Respondents

Table 5: Service years of the Respondents

Table 6: Facilitators' Training

Table 7: Facilitators' Salary

Table 8: Facilitators' Teaching Load per week

Table 9: Profile of Learners in the Focus Group Discussion

Table 10: Profile of Parents/Representatives in the Focus Group Discussion

Table 11: NFBPE learners Enrolled at the beginning of the 1994 Ethiopian Academic calendar and Available until February, 2002 at the Visited NFBPE Centers

Table 12: Schedule of the NFBPE Centers visited

Table 13: Respondents' Ratings of the Extent of the NFBPE Program Implementation Practices in Fulfilling the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/Community

Table 14: Availability of Linkage between the Implementation Practices of the Formal and Non-Formal Basic Primary Education programs

Table 15: The Extent to which the Linkage between the NFBPE and Formal Education Program implementation practices promotes smooth Transference or Promotion.

Table 16: Respondents' Ratings of the Similarities and Differences between the Government and NGO-Implemented Programs.

Table 17: Similarities and differences between the Implementation practices of NGO and Government-Implemented NFBPE Programs

Table 18 A: Respondents' valuation of the extent of the Availability of Textbooks at NFBPE Centers.

Table 18 B: Respondents' valuation of the extent of the Availability of Facilitators' Guides at NFBPE Centers.

Table 18 C: Respondents' valuation of the extent of the Availability of Supplementary (source) Curricula Materials at NFBPE Centers.

Table 19: Respondents' Ratings of the Degree to which the Factors listed inhibit the Implementation Practices of the NFBPE program

LISTS OF TABLES

Table 1: Regions, Zones, Woredas, NFBPE Centers, and Respective Implementers.

Table 2: Summary of the Data Sources

Table 3: Respondents of the Questionnaire per Implementing Agents

Table 4: Qualification of the Respondents

Table 5: Service years of the Respondents

Table 6: Facilitators' Training

Table 7: Facilitators' Salary

Table 8: Facilitators' Teaching Load per week

Table 9: Profile of Learners in the Focus Group Discussion

Table 10: Profile of Parents/Representatives in the Focus Group Discussion

Table 11: NFBPE learners Enrolled at the beginning of the 1994 Ethiopian Academic calendar and Available until February, 2002 at the Visited NFBPE Centers

Table 12: Schedule of the NFBPE Centers visited

Table 13: Respondents' Ratings of the Extent of the NFBPE Program Implementation Practices in Fulfilling the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/Community

Table 14: Availability of Linkage between the Implementation Practices of the Formal and Non-Formal Basic Primary Education programs

Table 15: The Extent to which the Linkage between the NFBPE and Formal Education Program implementation practices promotes smooth Transference or Promotion.

Table 16: Respondents' Ratings of the Similarities and Differences between the Government and NGO-Implemented Programs.

Table 17: Similarities and differences between the Implementation practices of NGO and Government-Implemented NFBPE Programs

Table 18 A: Respondents' valuation of the extent of the Availability of Textbooks at NFBPE Centers.

Table 18 B: Respondents' valuation of the extent of the Availability of Facilitators' Guides at NFBPE Centers.

Table 18 C: Respondents' valuation of the extent of the Availability of Supplementary (source) Curricula Materials at NFBPE Centers.

Table 19: Respondents' Ratings of the Degree to which the Factors listed inhibit the Implementation Practices of the NFBPE program

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: NGOs' NFBPE Programs in Different Regions of the Country

APPENDICE B 1-2: Reliability calculations for the Pilot testing of the close-ended parts of the Questionnaire

APPENDIX: C Respondents' Ratings of the Extent of the NFBPE Program Implementation Practices In Fulfilling the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/Community

APPENDIX D: Quantity of Curricula Materials available at NFBPE Centers Observed

APPENDIX E: Respondents' Ratings of the Degree to which the Factors listed Inhibit the Implementation Practices of the NFBPE program

APPENDICES F 1-9: Data Collection Tools

ABBREVIATIONS USED

AAE- Action Aid Ethiopia

A.A.U- Addis Ababa University

ABE- Adult Basic Education

ACCESS- Appropriate Cost-Effective Centers of Education within the School System

ADAA- African Development Aid Association

AFD- Action For Development

ANFEAE- Adult and Non-Formal Education Association in Ethiopia

APDA- Afar Pastoralist Development Association

CDI- Center for Development Initiatives

CRDA- Christian Relief Development Association

BENE- Basic Education Network Ethiopia

DF- Dakar Frame work

EDA- Emmanuel Development Association

EFA- Education For All

EMIS- Education Management Information Systems

EMRDA- Ethiopian Muslim's Relief and Development Association

ESAA- Education Statistics Annual Abstract

ESDP- Education Sector Development Program

ESSSR- Ethiopia Social Sector Study Report

ETP- Education and Training Policy

FAL- Functional Adult Literacy

FAWE- Forum for African Women Educationists

FEC- Formal Education Curricula

FDRE- Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia

FSCE- Forum for Street Children in Ethiopia

GANBCWDA- Gibe-Awash-Nile Basins' Children and Women Development Association

Govt- Government

GPSDO- Guraghe People's Self-help Development Organization

HDN- Human Development Net work

HPDO- Help for Persons with Disabilities Organization

IIZ/DVV- Institute for International Development of the German Adult Education Association

KCADO- Kind Hearts Child and Development Organization

KCYDS- Kangaroo Child and Youth Development Society

MOE- Ministry of Education

NFBPE- Non-Formal Basic Primary Education

NFE- Non-Formal Education

NGO- Non- Government Organization

ORDA- Organization for Relief and Development in Amhara

OSC- Out of School Children

PCAE- Pastoralist Concern Association Ethiopia

PHRDP- Policy and Human Resource Development Project

RCWDA- Rift Valley Children and Women Development Association

REB- Regional Education Bureau

SCh. N. - Save the Children Norway

SCh. UK- Save the Children United Kingdom

SCh. USA- Save the Children United States of America

SNNPR- Southern Nations, Nationalities People's Region

Stdd- Standard Deviation

TGE- Transitional Government of Ethiopia

TTIs- Teacher Training Institutes

VCH- Voluntary Council for the Handicapped

WCEFA- World Conference on Education for All

ABSTRACT

Basic education is a foundation of all the development endeavors and a fundamental right of every member of a society. Providing basic education for all children-the principal assets and future bases of a country-is the wisest investment. Cognizant of this fact, Ethiopia is committed to expand basic education through formal as well as non-formal provisions. The formal system has for long been thought of as a panacea for all ills. Tinkering and repairing here and there with it, nonetheless, could not solve the persistent problems related to access, quality, equity, and efficiency.

The NFBPE program has, thus, become part of the educational planning and implementation in different regions of the country. This study was targeted to investigate its implementation practices at nine centers of Addis Ababa, Oromia and SNNPR. To this end, a questionnaire, focus group discussion and interview guide questions, and observation checklists were used to gather data from different level stakeholders.

The data were quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed and discussed. The results disclosed that the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs had satisfactorily fulfilled the learning needs of those who enrolled and the demands of their parents in terms of enabling the learners get basic learning contents. Particularly, NGO-implemented programs were cost-effective and flexible to respond to the economic, social and cultural demands of the learners and parents. Recruiting facilitators by and from the community and assigning them to teach there also developed confidence of parents to send to and keep their children in the centers. These were among the facilitating factors and consequently, the best implementation practices of the NFBPE program that have been recommended for the comparable formal education implementation practices.

The coverage of the NFBPE program being implemented, however, was very low. It did not reach all those who, for various reasons, could not attend formal schools. Similarly, the available linkages between the formal and the non-formal basic primary education program implementations were inconsistent to facilitate smooth promotion/

transference of learners from one to the other. This was due to stringent requirements of the formal schools and lack of clear-cut implementation guidelines that ensure mutual understandings of all concerned stakeholders. Less flexible schedules and no-or low-salary and trainings for facilitators, and shortage of curricula materials, severely at government-implemented NFBPE programs substantially inhibited the implementation practices of the Program.

Therefore, it is recommended that government should issue and sensitize clear and specific NFBPE implementation guidelines that can be instrumental for expanding coverage, enhancing smooth transference of learners, developing local and program-specific curricula materials, and utilizing NGO initiatives to implement NFBPE programs.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter deals with the background; statement of the problem; significance, scope and limitations of the study; and operational definitions of terms, phrases or concepts used.

1.1. Background of the Study

Education is a cornerstone of economic and social development. It has become “an indispensable key to” and “sine qua non for” personal and social improvement. It affects how well individuals, communities, nations, and the world fare and can provide opportunities for all starting from basic education, which is its foundation. Basic education is, thus, a requirement and a fundamental right of every member of a society irrespective of his/her age, gender, race, religion, economic or political status, family background, geographical location and special needs (WCEFA, 1990; UNESCO/DF, 2000; World Bank, 1999; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991; MOE/ICDR, 1999).

After eons when humanity had educated its young without formal schooling, the right to basic education has been stated in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26 (1)* as: “Everyone has the right to education....” (World Bank, 1999; UNESCO, 2000; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991; UN, 1991). Since then, the nations of the world have entered in to commitment to fulfill the right of all children to quality education in schools or

alternative programs at whatever level of education is considered ‘basic’ (UNESCO/ DF, 2000).

Ethiopia has also long been engaged in implementing the commitment. As an instance, the text of an official notice relating to the necessity for all persons to acquire “fundamental education”, which appeared in the Amharic newspaper in November 1955 was a part of the subsequent worldwide actions to materialize the commitment (MOE and Fine Arts, 1961).

The 1956 Lima meeting of Ministers of Education; the 1960, the 1961, the 1962, the 1963 Conferences in Karachi, Addis Ababa, Tokyo, and Santiago respectively, were some of the world wide endeavors to implement the commitment. Similarly, the 1965 World Congress of Ministry of Education in Teheran; the first to fifth International Conferences on Adult Education convened in 1949, 1960, 1972, 1985, and 1997 in Elisnore, Denmark; in Montreal, Canada; in Tokyo, Japan; in Paris, France; and in Humburg respectively have widened the vision for meeting the basic learning needs (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991; WCEFA, 1990; UNESCO, 2000).

The World Conference on Education for All hosted at Jomtien, in 1990 also represents a historic initiative to bring about international commitment to a new and broader vision of basic education that emphasizes greater access, equity and achievement in learning. It reset the goal of universal primary education in Africa by 1980 to the year 2000 (WCEFA, 1990; UNESCO, 2000). Ten years later, in April 2000, the World Education Forum took place in Dakar, Senegal to review what had been achieved so far and to make recommendations for

the future that could shade light, illuminating the road ahead (UNESCO/DF, 2000; IIZ/DVV, 2000. No.7).

Consequently, bolder policies and more innovative activities have been pursued to accelerate primary enrollments particularly in the poorest countries with special focus on basic primary education for children, mainly girls (World Bank, 1999).

The centrality of basic primary education is widely recognized for it has two main purposes: to produce a literate and numerate population that can deal with problems encountered at home and at work and to serve as a foundation on which further education is built. Joint efforts have, thus, brought some progresses that “three quarters of children in developing countries attend school compared to just half 30 years ago”. This is an extraordinary progress more so than in any prior periods in human history (World Bank, 1999:vii, viii, 11; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:1).

But there have been unfinished agendas that remain serious challenges. Females, minorities, the handicapped, the poor and other disadvantaged groups are still disproportionately excluded. There has also been persisted imbalance between the enrollment increases and population growth, notably in Sub-Saharan Africa. The proportion of 6-11 years old in school declined from 59 percent in 1980 to 51 percent in 1992. Only two-thirds of the children who started the first five-year of primary school were there five years later. The out-of- school population aged between 6 and 11 was projected to rise from 39 to 56 million (an increase of 44 percent) through the 1990s (World Bank, 1999:3, 12; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:37, 145, 167).

Historically, the number of out-of-school children in developing countries was 160 million in 1980; between 114 and 145 million in 1985; about 130 in 1990 (World Bank, 1995:2 and 36). Currently in the world, there are 113 million out-of-school children, of which the majority (60%) are girls (UNESCO, 2001: 5). Unless appropriate educational opportunities are opened to them, these will eventually join the ranks of adult illiterates (who currently are 875 million). World Bank (1995:2) has also indicated that “If the current high population rates in Africa, South Asia, the Middle East and North Africa continue, the number of 6-11 years old children not in school will increase to 162 million by 2015.”

Ethiopia, which still has the lowest primary school enrollment ratio in the world (MOE, 1999:1), is a typical victim of the afore-mentioned problems. MOE/ESAA (2001: 4) has indicated that, of the estimated 12,904,379 primary school age population, only 7,401,473 (i.e., 57.4 %) were enrolled in regular and evening programs of the primary education in 1993 E.C. A number of in-school factors (i.e. unavailability or inaccessibility of schools owing to distance, poor quality and inefficiency, school process, etc.) and out-of-school factors (i.e. direct costs and opportunity costs) have contributed to the above conditions.

Equally, there is little point in expanding access unless there is reasonable quality. Those who could attend get only a few years and retain little or nothing. Even many who complete basic education are illiterate. School attendance without learning is meaningless and development opportunities are lost when a large fraction of the school age population has no access to quality schooling. Attention to quality and effective institutions, of course, is not new, but making quality the prominent concern of the education strategy is (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991; World Bank, 1999; Tietjen, 1991).

These all single out that tinkering and repairing here and there with the formal system of education are totally inadequate to bring quality basic education to those who, for various reasons, are now without it. Concerted efforts, to exploit options are thus required. “Futurists” predict a world where learners would be able to go beyond the classroom and obtain information in a variety of forms (text, data, sound, video) from all in the world at any time of the day or night, at rapidly diminishing cost. This may be a reality only for the “fortunate” world. In poor countries like Ethiopia, it cannot be dreamt, let alone to be a reality. To be a reality, “education planning and implementation...need to take into account the social, cultural, religious, economic and political context in which they take place” (World Bank, 1999:3 and 40). That is why the planning and implementation of local-specific non-formal basic education programs have come to be a timely demand.

Non-formal education, which is a cost-effective way to reach those who have not benefited from the formal education provisions, comprises any organized and semi organized educational activities for school dropouts, for illiterate rural and urban adults, for youth, and by and large for all age cohort, and both sexes (UNESCO, 2001: 6; Bishop, 1989:131; Mani, 1984:53). For poorer countries like Ethiopia, it can be the means of achieving most of their educational objectives at a price they can afford.

In Ethiopia, the early NFE attempts had taken the form of literacy. The general system, however, was very small at the base and permitted a privileged few to reach the top and exercise new skills at national level. More over, it used to rely on the formal system, which even could not accommodate more than 20% of the primary school age children (MOE, 1979:2; 1989:13).

After 1974, popular literacy actions were taken. Some critics, however, argue that the process of curricula development did not involve the grassroots level beneficiaries. It was said to be a prescription of objectives, contents and by and large, wholesale adoption (MOE/ESS,1994; MOE/ICDR,1999).

Since 1991, emphasis has been given to resolve the problems of centralism and top-down prescriptions, particularly in basic education curricula development and implementation. Non-formal education, which has been envisaged to be provided beginning and parallel to basic education and at all levels of formal education, is expected to “be concrete in its contents, focusing on enabling the learners develop problem-solving attitudes and abilities” (TGE/ETP, 1994).

In conformity with the policy statements, Federal Government, regional States, and NGOs are making substantial attempts. Currently all regions, except Somalia and Afar, have designed their own NFBE instructional materials (MOE/ICDR, 1999:41; IIZ/DVV-ETH, 2000, No. 7; 2001, No. 9). Particularly, NGOs (Local and International) have taken initiatives to implement alternative education opportunities for those who have not benefited from the formal program. According to the information obtained from CRDA Data Base (October, 2001), of the 122 CRDA members engaged in direct and indirect support of education, 22 were involved in NFBE implementation. Of this, nine, ten, and one were engaged in the programs for out-of-school children, adults, and both children and adults respectively. Further inquiries have also enabled the researcher to synthesize 23 NGOs engaged in the

implementation of NFBPE programs in different parts of the country. Of these, 14 and 2 are BENE members and partners respectively (see Appendix A).

Currently, therefore, NFBPE program implementation practices are being undertaken by government and NGOs-in collaboration and /or separately. In this study, the NFBPE program implementation practices of 9 NFBPE centers (6 implemented by NGOs, and 3 by government) in Addis Ababa city administration, Oromia and SNNP regional States have been examined.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Investing in children is the most important contribution a nation can make to a better future (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991: xiii). This is because, children and learning are the future bases of any country; educating all children of a citizen is, thus, the wisest investment and the best strategy to eradicate illiteracy. Ethiopia, as most of the rest parts of the world, has constitutional, legal or policy commitments encouraging primary education free, compulsory and universal. But these commitments have not been translated into action. Tinkering and repairing here and there with the formal system of education are totally inadequate to bring education to those who, for various reasons, are not served.

Non-formal education is thus, a timely demand. It is utilitarian and cheaper than the formal system and has a curriculum that is flexible in timing, duration, place, content, method of evaluation, and identifiable profiles at each level. It is expected to respond to the interests, needs, problems and experiences of specific target group in particular and the whole society in

general. By implication, NFBPE should provide experiences for which there are practical changes and uses. Practical changes, according to Marew (2000:30) indicate the presence of next steps. Our NFBPE program implementation, thus, should specify the precise expected profiles of the learners after the completions of each phase (I, II, and III) and how the formal and the non-formal systems of basic education complement each other to bring sustainable literate environment and labor force.

Practically, however, precarious implementation practices are observed throughout the country. Maintaining locally adaptable curricula standards and comparable profiles throughout the country seem non-existent. In some regions, the first cycle primary school curricula materials are used for the out-of-school children program implementation. Others use the curricula materials prepared for Adult program. Still in other cases Minimum Learning Continuum for the same program has been designed and implemented by respective NGOs and regions. Also recently, some NGOs have initiated the development of program-specific curricula materials for out-of-school children in collaboration with respective regional States. The extent of the availability of curricula materials at the NFBPE centers, however, is an issue that needs to be dealt with.

Similarly, the link between the formal and non-formal program implementation practices in terms of promotion or transference of learners from one to the other is not uniformly institutionalized throughout the country. Even though the NFB Adult Education syllabus designed by ICDR in 1988 E.C. and re-designed in 2002, has established a consensus that a completion of three phases within three years of NFE enables the learners to join 5th grade of

the formal school, there are irregularities particularly in complementing each other, promotion or transference from the NFBPE to the Formal Education programs or vice versa. In reality, the formal and non-formal education systems should be seen as “mutually reinforcing partners, each indispensable to the other” (Bishop, 1989:141).

Standard, quality, and beneficiary involvements in NFBPE program implementation practices have hardly maintained. The draft report of FAWE (2001:ix) points out that the “... curricula followed, feathering materials used, duration of study, instructors and coordinators’ profiles, significantly vary, thus, it was found out that standard and quality of NFE programs were not maintained”. MOE/ICDR (1999:82) indicates that NFBPE curricula development in Ethiopia is not based on need assessment. The same source further indicates that tryout and evaluations are not used as a means for improvement; and beneficiaries are not involved in the curriculum development.

In general, the NFBPE program, which has been entrusted as a viable alternative to expedite the walk to equitable access to quality education, has been inundated with multitude problems. It is mostly being implemented on “ad hoc” and inconsistent bases (TGE/ESS, 1994:12). Under such precarious implementation practices, the walk to eradicate illiteracy and achieve Universal Primary Education, which MOE (2001:14) has envisaged as “a high possibility” by 2015 can hardly be succeeded. Even if it approaches to succeed, it is not without sacrificing quality and standard. This is a big concern, which needs a deep research so as to specify the exact problem areas and suggest solutions.

The prime purpose of this study, therefore, is to survey descriptively and comparatively the implementation practices of NFBPE programs both by NGOs and Government agents at nine-

selected NFBPE centers. Accordingly, it is intended to answer the following basic questions to meet its purpose.

1. How do the learners, the parents/community, government and NGO agents value the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs in fulfilling the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents or community?
2. To what extent are the non-formal and the formal basic primary education Program implementation practices linked in terms of promotion and transference of learners from one program to the other?
3. What significant similarities and differences exist between NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs?
4. To what extent are curricula materials available at NFBPE program centers?
5. What prominent factors facilitate or inhibit NFBPE program implementation practices both by NGOs and government agents?
6. What major implementation practices of the NFBPE programs can be recommended for the comparable formal program implementation?

1.3. Significance of the Study

Precarious literacy strategies and implementation practices as observed in many developing countries including Ethiopia could not solve the vicious circle of illiteracy. Consistent practices, which are based on research findings, are a timely demand. This study is an attempt to generate data for the issue under discussion. It is expected to initiate and/or encourage

collaborative efforts so as to solve the problems related to the implementation practices of the NFBPE. More specifically, this study is significant to:

1. Appraise and encourage the best implementation practices accomplished both by NGOs and government agents;
2. Initiate information for policy formulators and decision makers to re-evaluate and to update policy guidelines pertaining to NFBPE program linkages with the comparable formal one in terms of transference of learners from one to the other;
3. Suggest appropriate interventions and actions for joint efforts so as to bring solutions for observed problems;
4. Influence different stakeholders of the existing education policy and implementation strategies or practices to consider NFBPE Programs as integral component of the educational system in the country; and
5. Serve as a departure for further deep investigations in the area of NFBPE program implementation.

1.4. Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study is concerned only with the implementation practices of NFBE program for out-of-school children. Similarly, of the three inseparable factors (program, organization, and people) that must be considered in curriculum innovation, emphasis was accorded to the program aspect. Moreover, only 9 NFBPE learning centers from two regions and one city administration have been selected for the study. It would have been better if other sub-components of NFE programs, the other two curriculum innovation factors, as well as more NFBPE centers in more regions had been thoroughly studied.

By the same token, it would have been more comprehensive if analytical comparisons of the contents, objectives and proposed methods of the curricula materials of the NGO and government-implemented NFBPE programs had been thoroughly made.

Moreover, even though the researcher believes that a comparison of the NFBPE and formal primary school learning achievements would initiate reliable data for the study, resource constraints have limited him to do so. The researcher also believes that trend analyses of the enrollment, dropout and transference of learners from NFBPE centers to formal schools for some years could generate data for interpretation. Poor documentation and unavailability of the required data at the centers, nonetheless, limited him to analyze only the number of learners enrolled at the beginning of the 1994 Ethiopian academic year and available until February 2002. By and large, however, unreserved efforts have been made to collect, analyze, interpret the data and report the findings objectively.

1.5. Operational Definitions of Terms, Phrases or Concepts

The following terms, Phrases or concepts are contextually defined as have been used in this thesis.

1. **Basic Education:** refers to education intended to meet basic learning needs of children. In this context, it is equivalent to the first cycle of the primary education (1-4) in Ethiopia.
2. **Basic learning needs:** refer to the knowledge, basic life skills, attitudes and values necessary for the children to survive, to improve the quality of their lives, and to continue learning.

3. **Basic Education Net Work (BEN) Ethiopia:** Established in 1998, it serves as a forum for NGOs working in basic education to exchange and share ideas and information, expertise and experiences and act collectively for the realization of the goal of basic education for all in Ethiopia.
4. **Demands of the Parents/Community:** include minimized direct and indirect cost, reduced home-school distance, reduced dropout rate, relief from fears for their daughters' harassments and concerns for their small children, and feelings of ownership of the NFBPE centers.
5. **Government agents** include workers at REB, Zonal Education Departments, Woreda education offices, and NFBE centers.
6. **Literacy:** refers to the ability to read and write with comprehension, as well as to make simple arithmetical calculations (numeracy).
7. **NFBPE Program Implementation practices:** include fulfilling beneficiaries needs and demands, scheduling, coordination, facilitations, learning locations, collaborations, areas of study, monitoring, promotion or transference of learners, supply of curricula materials, and budgetary issues of the NFBPE.
8. **Non-Formal Education:** is an alternative supplementary and complementary system of the organized and semi-organized education that operates outside the regular routines of the formal education system aimed at serving children who, for various reasons, could not attend formal schools.
9. **Supplementary (Source) Curricula materials:** are syllabi, Flowchart, Workbook and Minimum Learning Competency.
10. **Woreda-** Administrative Division lower than Zone, which is next to Region.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the accumulated and recorded facts about NFBPE from conceptual point of view and implementation practices.

2.1 NON-FORMAL EDUCATION

2.1.1 Concept and Definition of NFE

Because of the fundamental characteristics of human being, learning of some type is always going on in some contexts-the unorganized (informal) or the organized (the formal and the non-formal) learning (Coffield, 2000:12; Skager and Dave, 1977:117; World Bank: 1998: 78). The intent of this sub-section is to describe some conceptual frame works of the non-formal education sub-sector.

Non-formal education, which “has only recently gained popular currency”, is loaded with different shades of meanings that vary according to the context and one’s philosophical views of the role of education in general (Courtney and Kutsch, 1978:1; Bock and Papagiannis, 1983:14). Within the variations, however, there are peculiar characteristics of this sub-sector, inter alia: flexibility and adaptability in terms of organization, schedule, and duration; versatility, intensive instruction using innovative student-centered methods, and utilitarian (MOE, 2000: 4; Prakasha et al, 1986).

For purposes of further conceptualization of these characteristics as used in this paper, we start from the following definition of NFE by Bishop (1989:131):

Non-formal education refers to all the organized and semi-organized educational and training activities that operate outside the regular structure and routines of the formal educational system, aimed at serving a great variety of learning needs of different sub-groups of the population, both young and old.

In the same vein, UNESCO (2000:45), taking from Coombs (1973), has defined non-formal education as “...any organized educational activity outside the established formal system-whether operating separately or as an important feature of some broader activity-that is intended to serve identifiable learning clienteles and learning objectives”. Similarly, Tilahun (1997) has viewed non-formal education as education and training provided outside the formal system whatever its purpose, target groups, content and providers.

As stated in *A Glossary of Educational Methods*, prepared by the Center for International Education at the University of Massachusetts, we get a broader definition of Non-formal education as:

...need oriented, ...utilitarian ... and cheaper than the formal systems. Often it is tied to some productive activity ...and is characterized by ... peer learning... and flexibility. Students...generally enroll non-formal courses because they are interested in what can be learned - not for it counts for a degree... And non-formal education does not engender elitist feelings among its students (Bock and Papagiannis, 1983:14).

This implies that non-formal education takes place within the context of immediate and meaningful action, work and use. What is learned is put to use. It is thus, education with the

outlet for the learning; it provides experiences for which there is practical use (Bishop, 1989:133). Learning and doing, doing and learning are so interrelated that it is hard to differentiate them. This recognition has been the result of the shift of focus during the 1970s from education to deliberative learning (UNESCO, 2000: 46; Coffield, 2000: 12-13).

For Mani (1984:54) non-formal education is “an alternative system of education outside the formal system, based on the learners’ needs and interests, for the illiterates, drop-outs, pushed-outs and left-outs/non-starters...”. Courtney and Kutsch (1978: 30); and MOE/ICDR (1999: 6,7) have also supported the view that non-formal education is “an alternative” or “a substitute” (not supplementary) to formal education.

But UNESCO (2001: 6); Bishop (1989:31); and ESSSR (1998:60) argue that non-formal education should not be seen as an alternative education system nor a shortcut to the rapid education of a population. They view it as school equivalency program providing a second chance or catch-up learning opportunities to those who missed formal schooling or failed to be attracted by the formal system. It is therefore, said that non-formal education programs play an important complementary and supplementary role.

Coombs, Prosser, and Ahmed (1973) in Courtney and Kutsch (1978:14) have differentiated the role of NFE in industrialized countries, which is preparatory, complementary (extra-curricular) or a "follow-up" to schooling, and the role of NFE in developing/poor countries, which is "heir to the mammoth 'unfinished business' of the primary and secondary school". MOE/ICDR (1999: 10) supports the view that NFE complements and supplements inadequate previous education services.

UNESCO (2000:49) has synthesized the NFE conceptions in such away that supplementary alternative programs can help meet the basic learning needs of children with limited or no access to formal schooling, provided that they share the same standards of learning applied to schools, and are adequately supported.

Hilliard's (1973) broad yet succinct description, can sum up the concepts of non-formal basic education as:

- valid, high quality education for imparting 'life' skills and knowledge;
- education designed to reach large numbers of people where they live and work, without removing them from their normal environments and responsibilities;
- highly diverse in organization, funding and management, emphasizing local initiative, self-help, and innovation on the part of large numbers of people and their local institutions;
- education designed to pay its own way through increased employment, productivity, and social participation;
- having objective that makes learning a national, lifelong learning experience, compatible with the interests of individuals and communities, for all economic levels of a society (Bishop, 1989:131-133).

In general, non-formal education has been as flexible and adaptable to meet the minimum essential learning needs of children within the broad conceptual framework of a life long learning system. In this paper, it has been conceptualized as alternative supplementary and complementary educational provisions for the children who, for various reasons, are not served from the formal provisions.

2.1.2 Rationales For Non-Formal Education

In explaining the rationales that are made for paying closer attention to non-formal education, it is logical to start from the assumption that “to educate was to school, learning was equated with instruction and by the years of exposure to it”. Formal education was regarded as a panacea for all ills and credited with almost magical powers, which, of course, it didn’t have. As a result massive investments and expenditures were made on it. Yet, the results have not always matched the high expectations. Illiteracy, and inequality in education still remain; few of the children are retained in primary schools particularly in developing countries. Universal primary Education, which has become a target to all nations of the world, is still a long way off for many developing countries including Ethiopia. Consequently, a search has been made " for better alternatives than pouring more scarce resources in to a small conventional school system that has no chance of becoming universal in any reasonable period of time" (Coombs, Prosser, and Ahmed, 1973 in Courtney and Kutsch, 1978:14).

The Ethiopian Social Sector Study Report (1998:1) has also indicated: “developing countries like Ethiopia cannot meet the basic learning needs of their people through the formal education alone”. Rigid curriculum, bureaucratic administration and management, elitist nature, inefficiency in resource utilization, and high costs of running the programs in the formal system forced all concerned stakeholders to look for alternative modes of educational delivery system, namely NFE.

NFE in Ethiopia has served “...only a partial segment of school age children leaving out many to lead the sad world of illiteracy” (FAWE, 2001: 22 and 71). Therefore, it has to be

revitalized so as to play a prominent role in satisfying the learning needs of children, and the demands of the community and the requirements of the economy that TGE/ESS (1994: 12) has envisaged.

Historically, the search for effective alternatives to the traditional content and delivery of primary education became evident in the late 1960s and continued in the 1970s and 1980s, and many of the same concerns remain today (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:21). Consequently, non-formal education, which was viewed with “disdain” and “under-utilized in the past” (Bishop, 1989), has now been “viewed as one of the new favored areas of inquiry in education” (Paulston, 1972:vi; in Courtney and Kutsch, 1978: 5). It has been found relevant in addressing a number of school barriers, especially those related to the educational demand factors, nature of work, utility and expenses. Since many disadvantaged children live and work in areas where schools are non-existent or do not fit their circumstances or work times, non-formal education provision has become necessary (UNESCO, 2001:5; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:159).

The relationship between education and the world of work is also an area, which magnifies the need for non-formal education. For Harbison (1973) as cited in Courtney and Kutsch (1978:7) “linkages between formal education and employment are neither direct nor clear”. Evidently in Ethiopia, the school leavers and graduates that come out of the system are increasingly finding it difficult to cope with changing environment in spite of the high costs incurred on the system. Alternative teaching centers and methods so as to overcome the high opportunity and direct costs of schooling are, thus, recommended (TGE/ESS, 1994: 2; World Bank, 1998:104).

In short, most of the rationales for NFE that have been reviewed so far, take their starting point from the failure of formal schooling as a means to achieve both educational and non-educational ends. Precisely, frustrations with the expense, rigidity and perceived poor quality, low coverage, irrelevancy of the formal education programs, are among the reasons for increased attention to non-formal education.

2.1.3 NFE in Ethiopia: Historical Overview

Ethiopia, which is currently typified as "a predominantly illiterate country", a long way back in history, had been the second in Africa after Egypt to develop a written language (Habtamu, Habtegiorgis, and Wanna, 1999:9; NLCCC, 1989:10). Yet, it has been argued to be “only the language of a minority, and was foreign to a large segment of the population who have a different language...” (Solomon, 1968: 119). Not only the language but also the then education system was very small at the base and permitted a privileged few to reach the top and exercise new skills at national level (MOE, 1989:13). Nonetheless, it has been serving as a departure to study the historical perspectives of NFE in the country.

Different sources indicate that during the early times, the Ethiopian society traditionally passed its cultural knowledge and skills to the subsequent generation through different means that could be inferred as NFE or informal learning (FAWE, 2001: 22). Later when modern education introduced to Ethiopia in 1908, the literacy efforts used to focus mainly in giving communicative skills and the rudiments that was necessary to run the modern bureaucracy that was being established then (TGE/ESS, 1994: 1). The then formal education lacked responsiveness to actual conditions of the country and also couldn't accommodate more than

20% of the primary school age children (MOE, 1979:2). This means, the education needs of those outside the formal school system had received little attention. The then educators and policy makers saw such issues seriously. Consequently, some affirmative actions were taken, some of which have been briefed in this sub-section.

In 1952, the Ministry of Education announced that Adult Education would be "one of the project for the future". In November 1955 the Emperor's proclamation on Literacy appeared in Amharic newspaper pertaining to the necessity for all persons to acquire "fundamental education". Paragraph 3 provides that all boys and girls between ages of 7 and 18 should receive at least an elementary education (MOE and Fine Arts, 1961: 39; MOE, 1989: 13).

In 1962 a voluntary body, the National Literacy Campaign Organization, was set up. Consequently, the non-formal delivery mode of education, which was introduced in to the educational vocabulary in the late 1960s (Mamo, 1999:20), had got special attention in our country, too. In 1967, a Division for Adult Education was formed in the Ministry of Education so as to coordinate the growing non-formal delivery mode. In 1968, UNESCO opened its own pilot, work-oriented adult literacy project for Ethiopia (MOE/ICDR, 1999: 11). By 1969 NGOs working in the field claimed that there were a total of 80,000 participants. Between 1963 and 1970, one million people had become literate. At about the same time, the UNDP/UNESCO-financed project for work oriented Adult Literacy Program (WOALP) gained a total of 43,440 participants over its six-year life. It served to extend experiences, raise professional capacity to engage in literacy work, and as an introduction to the task of preparing literacy-teaching materials (MOE, 1989:13, 14). Special Mobile schools

were also developed during the Imperial period to provide basic literacy to the nomadic tribes (MOE, 2000:4; MOE and Fine Arts, 1961).

NFE was given a high priority during the Military regime. At the Ministry of Education a large department was established for the purpose (MOE, 2000:4). Direct and indirect preconditions to enhance literacy actions were taken at large. In “December 1974”, National *Work Campaign for Development Through Cooperation* was launched and mobilized nearly 60,000 young people who remained in the rural countryside until June 1976. In April 1976, the provisional Military Administrative Council announced the Program of the National Democratic Revolution of Ethiopia. This included the general pledge that "There will be an educational program that will provide free education, step by step to the broad mass, and, specifically that "All necessary measures to eliminate illiteracy will be undertaken" (MOE, 1989: 16).

In October 1978, the National Revolutionary Development Campaign and Central Planning Supreme Council was established with broad objectives to eradicate hunger, poverty, disease and illiteracy from Ethiopia. Seven months later, in May 1979, the National Literacy Campaign Coordinating Committee (NLCCC) was established by the Council of Ministers and launched action with the broad goals: 1) To eradicate illiteracy, and 2) To enhance national development (MOE, 1987:1; 1989: 17; MOE/ICDR, 1999:11-12).

In 1980, the International Committee, which was established by UNESCO to evaluate candidates for UNESCO Prizes for meritorious work in Literacy, gave the International Reading Association Literacy Award to the NLCCC. Among the citations for this, was the preparation of innovative literacy materials, which was published in five nationality languages

that in three phases grew to 15 distinct vernaculars spoken by 93% (MOE, 1989; MOE/ICDR, 1999: 12). Similarly, in 1982, The Peasants' Association of Ethiopia got an international Honorable Prize award during the UNESCO literacy award ceremony for the year.

Overall, from June 1979 to April 1981, nearly 4 million people became functionally literate, reducing the illiteracy rate of the country from 93% to 65%. Attempts were made to enable the participants move very quickly to the application of the new life skills of reading, writing and calculating to the practical aspects of new knowledge (MOE/ICDR, 1999:12, MOE, 1987; 1989).

Some, however, argue that the implementation of the non-formal education program that had been practiced before the commencement of the current Education and Training Policy was not properly working and its impact remained very low (TGE/ESS, 1994: 2). It has also been argued that the process of curricula development did not involve local communities or their representatives at the grass root levels. It was said to be a prescription of objectives, contents and by-and-large, wholesale adoption. Overall, however, the literacy program implementation had moved far a head of the formal education and left magnificent imprints.

Since 1991, NFE has been envisaged to be provided beginning and integrated with basic education and at all levels of formal education. Emphasis has been given to initiate immediate and practical solutions to avert the crises (TGE/ESS, 1994: 2; TGE/ETP, 1994: 5). Local communities or their representatives have been encouraged to participate in the preparation, implementation and evaluation of their respective curricula. This is to make the content of NFE concrete focusing on enabling the learners develop problem-solving attitudes and abilities (TGE/ETP, 1994:12, 16). To mediate the implementation of these policy intents,

MOE/ICDR in collaboration with regional states have developed a syllabus for adults of age 15 and above. It was intended to serve as a blue print from which the regions could adapt their own curricula materials. Its completion warrants credentials equivalent to the completion of fourth grade level of education in the formal system. Consequently, "...almost all regions have prepared curricula materials for literacy and non-formal basic education programs that they are running" (MOE/ICDR, 1988 E.C; MOE/ICDR, 1999: 40).

Currently, the planning and implementation of NFBE programs in Ethiopia, in most cases, are collaborated with local and international NGOs. As MOE/ICDR (1999: 70) indicates, in almost all sampled regions (Afar, Amhara, Oromia, and SNNPR) by ICDR survey study, there are NGOs who run NFE programs. Most of them differentiate between classes for out-of-school children and classes for adults. The children's program in most cases lasts for 10 months per year (September to June). The subjects taught are: local language, numeracy, environmental science and English. The implementation practices, overall, are flexible and adoptable to local circumstances (IIZ/DVV-ETH, 2000, No. 9).

Such practices were originally initiated by AAE, which is a large international NGO. Six regions (SNNPR, Addis Ababa, Oromia, Amhara, Tigray and Afar) are replicating the experiences of AAE. Particularly, there are many innovative NFBPE centers in SNNPR, Addis Ababa and Oromia. In 2000/1 there were 191 and 6180 NFBPE centers in Addis Ababa and Oromia respectively (Ibid. p. 16). Even though not consistent, regional education officials of SNNPR indicated that this year there are more than 900 NFBPE centers operating in different zones of the region. As an instance, the data obtained from Siltie zone education

officials indicate that this year, there are 87 NFBPE centers (40 implemented by government agents and 47 implemented by NGOs) in the zone.

2.2. IMPLEMENTATION

2.2.1 Conceptual Descriptions

Implementation is the execution stage of an intended program/curriculum. It is “putting the show on the road” (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998: 310). Buchert (1998: 30) has defined implementation as “carrying out the reform as planned.” Similarly, Pratt (1994: 334) shortly defines implementation as the “Realization of an intended change”. It is the “open use of a program through out an entire school system” (UNESCO, 1977:22). Implementation of a new program entails social action that builds a climate of acceptance for the change. It is, thus, an interaction process between those who have created the program and those who are charged to deliver it (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998: 292).

Implementation at the learning centers involves: planning and preparation for implementation (reorganization of programs, replenishing equipment, etc.); teacher preparation (involvement re-orientation, self-study); availability of curricula materials; involvement of stakeholders including parents, community; and periodical evaluation and strengthening of the implementation program (Skager and Dave, 1977: 121). This implies that implementation is a crucial stage where planning is put in to practice (Kassahun, 1997: 55; Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998: 316). It, however, is the most difficult aspect of a program. This is because; there are numerous barriers to it. Situationally adaptable planning; supportive guidelines; visualization of the purposes of the program, nonetheless enable us to overcome the barriers. The

following sub-sections therefore pinpoint the barriers and the guidelines for overcoming the barriers and facilitating implementation.

2.2.2 Barriers to Implementation

“...when we enter the field of implementation we leave the green pastures of educational planning and enter the harsh arena of politics....” (Pratt, 1994: 321).

Implementation is “The Great Barrier Reef” (Pratt, 1980: 425). There are many twists and turns as unexpected events occur along the way in the process of implementation efforts. Several innovations and reforms fail to point the way to change, because of insufficient attention to design or implementation, deficit capacity for implementation, cost or inadequate financing, novelty of the approach or rejection by the community/beneficiaries and reluctance of teachers. For example, a large-scale educational television program launched in 1971 by the government of Cote d’Ivoire to expand primary education was canceled in 1982 because of implementation problems and criticisms of cost and quality (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:31).

Basically, many factors related to the characteristics-of the change, at the school district level, at the school level, and external to the local system-affect the implementation processes (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998: 310; Fullan, 1991).

Simplistically, tendency to separate curriculum development from its implementation; lack of political and financial commitment; loose trust among stakeholders of implementation; unavailability and issues related to curricula materials and teachers; shortage of time; and unavailability of action-oriented government policies are some of the barriers to implementation.

The academic tendency toward specialization has tended to separate the study of curriculum development from the study of curriculum implementation. As a result, the belief has grown that we first develop curricula and then try effective ways to implementing it (Pratt, 1994: 45 and 322). This approach has created difficulties for it ignores the feasible approach: “design implementable curricula”. It creates the risk of

“in-group of believers and an out-group of resisters” to program implementation (Ibid. p. 330; taking from Louis and Miles, 1990:28).

Lack of political and financial commitment also hurt implementation practices of the NFBPE program. Education is an intensely political enterprise. It affects the majority of citizens in all aspects of life (World Bank, 1995: 13). Equally, when changes are adopted not on the basis of local need but on account of other factors like the availability of outside funds, sustainability of the program is not guaranteed. As a result, some of the programs that have been introduced as pilot projects with some fanfare gradually sank from sight (Tietjen, 1991:78; Louis and Miles, 1990: 27 cited in Pratt, 1994: 328,).

By the same token, if the atmosphere is “nobody trusts anybody else” and it goes all the way from bottom to top or vice versa, success in implementation is unlikely. Workers at schools/learning centers view themselves as responsible for implementation, but not for planning. Implicitly, they are forced to implement programs they are not consented about. Implementation strategies that attempt to change or manipulate teachers against their will hardly succeed. This of course, is not to propose waiting to introduce the program until we have unanimity, which practically, is to wait forever. Nonetheless, if the innovation is not actually initiated by teachers, then it must at least be understood, supported, and internalized by them (Pratt, 1994: 325-326; Tietjen, 1991).

Many of the times teachers bear highest responsibility, but get very little recognition. Fullan (1991: 127) has put that “if the change works, the individual teacher gets little of the credit, if it does not, the teacher gets most of the blame”. This is one reason why teachers are reluctant to take the risks involved in program implementation. In confirmation of this FAWE (2001:

ix) has reported that dissatisfaction of NFE program implementers (coordinators and instructors/facilitators) was observed at some sampled centers. Similarly, “lack of trained and well paid facilitators” is among the constraints facing NFE programs in Ethiopia (MOE/ICDR, 1999: 13)

Virtually, implementation takes time. Shortage of time, however, is “the single most frequently cited barrier to implementation” (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998: 310; Pratt, 1994: 335; taking from Fullan, 1982: 293). Teachers are busy people and classrooms are busy places. Curricula with heavy requirements for teacher generation of new materials do not stand a good chance of implementation, for they are time-consuming tasks for teachers.

Practically, a program, in some corners, is introduced in September and its success is measured in June. When this procedure shows no change in student learning, or perhaps a decrease, the innovation may be abandoned. The fact is that a new program is rarely completely implemented in the first year. Practically, nothing worth doing can be accomplished in a single lifetime. Commonly five cycles of implementation (e.g. five years or semesters) may be necessary before an innovation is completely in place (Pratt, 1994: 336).

Lastly, unavailability of clear goals affects program implementation. Programs with vague and uncertain goals will be implemented, if at all, vaguely and uncertainly. In Ethiopia, particularly before 1991, non-formal education program was running on “an ad hoc basis and misdirected in its goals” and also lacked clear implementation guidelines to enhance efforts by different stakeholders (TGE/ESS, 1994: 12; MOE/ICDR, 1999: ii and 26). Currently too, the unavailability of guidelines issued to facilitate NGOs’ undertakings has been documented by FAWE (2001:65). Consequently, NGOs are left to operate on their own. This has a

serious implication in maintaining standard, quality and linkages between NFE and formal education implementation practices.

2.2.3 Guidelines for Facilitating Implementation

“...in order to succeed, implementation must be a process not of command, but of negotiation ” (Pratt, 1994: 326).

Studies have recommended the approach “design implementable program” rather than “first design...then implement it” (Ibid.). Implementable programs are those that can be adapted to unintended consequences of implementation efforts. Successful implementation of a program, thus, requires perpetual fine-tuning (Ornstein and Hunkins, 1998: 316). Developing implementable program is based on needs assessment, which places the NFBPE program on a sound foundation and helps to ensure successful implementation. Consequently, the existence of significant local needs is established and the potential political support and opposition identified. Practically, failure to consult from the beginning with key players can doom a program before it has been completely implemented. Success is much more likely if all stakeholders share and implement a common philosophy. Successful programs are, thus, the product of the hard work and inspiration of all stakeholders. Government agents are therefore, expected to clearly stipulate anticipated participation of all stakeholders and empowerment, and call for careful analysis of their respective relationships and roles.

As John F.Kennedy used to say “We are here not to curse the darkness, but to light a candle” (Pratt, 1994: 334), there should be a kind of environment in which stakeholders feel sufficiently supported and safe to take risks and try out innovations; and are actively encouraged and rewarded for that even if it fails. This can more likely be done by ensuring that implementation is conducted by the stakeholders who are most involved in-and affected by-the innovation.

This leads us to mention some guidelines for curriculum implementation that have been developed by Pratt (1994).

1. Establish a climate of Trust;
2. Implement changes that meet recognized needs;
3. Consult widely;
4. Establish clear goals and limited scope;
5. Develop an “ethos of collegiality”;
6. Use personal contact;
7. Provide systematic in-service training;
8. Provide time and resources;
9. Do not try to change everyone; and
10. Do not despair.

The key players in the implementation program must be regularly consulted throughout the development and implementation practices. Consultation is judicious political practice and a requirement of a democracy (Pratt, 1994: 330; Buchert, 1998: 23). Pratt (1994: 320) has presented the findings in sex education by Kenney and Orr (1984), showing that 79 percent of parents supported sex education programs when their consent was sought, while only 34 percent gave that support when they were not consulted about the program.

Equally, engaging in and discussion of program planning and implementation with crucial players is one of the key ways in which we foster the professional development of teachers/facilitators. As Pratt (1994: 335), taking from Flay (1985); Rugg, O'Reilly, and Galavotti (1990); and Sabatier (1989), indicates, "...the greatest influence on people's behavior are the words and actions of their peers". All pertinent stakeholders, thus, should be invited to talk through the fine details of implementing the program, and to respond to the doubts of those who are considering adopting the innovation. By and large, talking with beneficiaries and grass-root program implementers, visiting classrooms, or viewing the program in action, will be more effective than collecting monthly or so reports on the merits or demerits of the program implementation.

2.3 IMPLEMENTING NFBPE PROGRAM

In implementing any educational innovation, there are three inseparable factors, namely: people (change forces), curriculum (Program), and organization/institution (Marew, 2000; Fullan, 1991; Ornstien and Hunkins, 1998). For the sake of simplicity as per the purpose of the study, however, these factors have been briefly discussed under two sub-sections in this paper: Agents of Implementation and Availability of Curricula Materials. These are believed to have direct acquaintance with the basic learning needs of children and the demands of parents/community, which in turn constitute a common and universal human responsibility, requiring local, regional, national and international solidarity and co-operation.

2.3.1. Agents of Implementation (People and Organizations)

In NFBPE program implementation, people are central. Unless concerned people understand, support, and complement the program, failure is unavoidable. The prime reason why innovations and reforms fail to achieve their potentials is that they do not receive adequate support of stakeholders (people). This confirms that human capital has a unique and decisive role in NFBPE program implementation. The critical support according to Buchert (1998:30) is "...that which comes from below not from powerful patrons and sponsors but from those responsible for implementation".

Equally, the abilities of implementers at the grass root level and the enthusiasm for improvement determine the extent of the success of NFBPE program implementation. For example, the Escuela Nueva of Colombia was understood in terms of the actions of teachers to promote self-directed learning by children (reform as what happens) rather than as an idea of the designers (reform as proposed or invented). During its most successful stage, the innovation was implemented by people who identified themselves with the idea. In later stages, international agencies and the national government worked side-by-side replicating the form rather than the substance of the program, with lack of sufficient attention to the issue of international and ownership of the reform (Buchert, 1998:15).

It is undeniable that high officials or decision makers can establish standards for curricula, examination criteria, and attendance and promotion policy. External agents also support the implementation process technically and financially. Both, however, cannot control what happens in each learning centers/ classrooms. What happens in learning centers/ classrooms is determined by the actions of teachers and their support systems and commitments (Lock heed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:145, Buchert, 1998:29). Practically, NFBPE teachers recruited

from the local area are more likely to have a higher level of commitment for a lower salary than those who come from a distant places and other high officials (MOE, 2000:52).

Thus, the recruitment, training, and allocation of NFBPE teachers and the whole implementation process of the NFBPE program have necessitated emphasis on "Partnership" to bridge the gap between the capacity of governments to finance education and the needs of the education sector. This implies that the implementation of NFBPE program requires the participation of government, parents/community, and NGOs that are found in the respective localities (Buchert, 1998: 23 –24; MOE/ICDR; 1999: 66).

When planning and implementing their respective NFBPE, therefore, government agents have to be very much in the ‘driver’s seat’. They have to act as key change agents. This is because, they have a unique obligation to provide basic education for all children and for ensuring adequate financing of basic education (World Bank, 1999: 20; Tietjen, 1991: 79; WCEFA, 1990:38; UNESCO, 2000: 28).

This of course, is not to say that government alone can possibly satisfy the high demand for basic education. The job of strengthening basic education is too big for any single institution and too important to be left to one perspective only. What is specifically expected of government agents, is the initiation of partnerships at all levels: among all sub-sectors and forms of education; between education and other government departments, including planning, finance, agriculture, media agencies, health, labor and social affairs; between government and NGOs, the private sector, local communities, religious groups and families. Government agents are also expected to regulate the sub-sector by preparing workable

implementation guidelines, defining curricula, setting standards, monitoring performance, and accrediting institutions.

By so doing, government agents should strengthen leadership. Pratt (1994: 332) has presented Lightfoot's observation that "What often perceived as solitary leadership...is fueled by partnerships and alliances with intimate, trusted associates" and NGOs. Particularly, NGOs and Philanthropic foundations have a large role to realize the goals for non-formal basic education (World Bank, 1999: 18). Based on intensive review of NFBPE programs in some selected countries, Tietjen (1991: 80) has also concluded, "Nearly all the non-traditional approaches...were implemented by NGOs". NGOs fund and implement many of the NFBPE programs in many countries including ours. As an instance, in the academic year 1999/2000, fifteen NGOs had a total student population of 35, 623, of which 4371 (12.2%) were children of age 7-14 years old in Ethiopia (FAWE, 2001 35; IIZ/DVV, 2000, No.7).

Overall, common goals, consensus on strategies, co-ordinations and working relationships among concerned people and organizations need to be established so as to promote effective implementation of the program. This can be built up on the principles of trust, partnerships and transparency among all the stakeholders, which in turn ensure their commitments and contributes to linking NFBPE provisions to working life; and to take full advantage of the changing environment that community service provides for increasing opportunities for employment and/or making a living. It is thus, the responsibility of the people or organizations (governmental as well as non-governmental) in a particular country to create suitable settings for good partnership that promotes successful implementation of NFBPE program.

2. 3.2 Availability of Curricula Materials

Curricula materials are critical ingredients in learning, and the intended program cannot be easily implemented without them. They provide information; organize the scope and sequence of the information presented, and provide opportunities for students to use what they have learned (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:47-48). One of the prerequisite for running NFBPE program for out-of-school children is the availability of appropriate and local-based curricula packages. They are important inputs for learning. With out them, it would be very difficult to ensure the transmission and acquiring of knowledge and skills and the development of desired attitudes (IIZ/DVV, 2000, No.7 p.50; MOE/ICDR, 1999:43-44).

The availability of curricula materials is, thus, one of the most powerful and consistent determinants of learning achievement. Inequality in access to such materials is a major source of rural/urban and regional differences in achievement. Particularly where teacher quality is poor, the value of curricula materials is even more important. Properly designed and quality curricula materials can help train unqualified teachers while providing instruction to students (WCEFA, 1990:51; Tietjen, 1991:7).

The availability and use of curricula materials in developing countries, of course, have not been widely documented. Nonetheless, the consensus is that primary students either lack textbooks and other instructional materials entirely or share them extensively with other students (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:52). In many NFE centers of regional states of Ethiopia, shortage of curricula materials is a major constraint. It has resulted in low motivation/interest by learners and high drop out (MOE/ICDR, 1999: 38, 45; MOE, 2000: 53).

Cognizant of this, some NGOs (AAE, Redd Barna Ethiopia-Norway, and RCWDA) have taken initiative roles to develop NFBE curricula materials. Before the recognition had developed, however, quite a number of NGOs did not know which curriculum to adopt for the out-of-school children: the formal curriculum for children or the curriculum for non-formal education for adults? (IIZ/DVV, 2000, No.7, p. 26).

Of the many curricula materials, textbooks and teacher guides have frequent acquaintance with learners and teachers. Particularly, textbooks have a major daily influence on what is taught in schools. According to Sadker et al (1988: 225-226), “students spend from 70 to 95 percent of classroom time using textbooks, and teachers base more than 70 percent of instructional decisions on them”. This shows that textbooks are important to deliver the intent of the curriculum at all levels. Taking from Altbach (1983:315); Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates (1991:48) have indicated that “Nothing has ever replaced the printed word as the key element in the educational process and, as a result, textbooks are central to schooling at all levels”. Truly, when textbooks are available, instructional time is not wasted. Consequently, learning achievements are promoted.

Similarly, teacher guides that are well integrated with the textbook or other instructional materials can have a positive impact on student achievement. Particularly, effective are guides that include information on what to teach and how to teach it, diagnostic tests that help teachers monitor student learning and modify the daily lesson accordingly, suggestions on how to manage the classroom, and activities for classroom use (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:50). They also help teachers boost student learning to higher cognitive levels by suggesting practical exercises and questions.

Overall, the availability of curricula materials has a substantial effect on learning. So government agents, by themselves or in collaboration with NGOs and other stakeholders, should make use of all resources so as to adopt and/or develop local-and program-based curricula materials and make available for facilitators and learners use. This really enhances the realization of the basic learning needs of children and the demands of the parents/Community in particular and the country in general.

2.3.3 Meeting the Basic Learning Needs of Children

The long-term goal in education is nothing less than to ensure everyone completes a basic education of adequate quality which enables him/her meet basic learning needs-the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values necessary for survival, to improve the quality of his/her life, and to continue learning (World Bank, 1999:vii, 6; WCEFA, 1990: ix). Basic education can help meet the intrinsic needs of the learners, assist them to meet other basic human needs, and promote social and economic development. In line with this, two reasons for basic education to claim public resources can be mentioned. First, a sound basic education lays the base for the subsequent learning. Second, deterioration at this level of learning strongly affects the incidence of poverty (Vandycke, 2001: 27). Increasing relevance, improving quality, promoting equity, and enhancing efficiency, which are said to be applicable to both in-school and out-of-school settings can, thus, be ascertained the basic learning needs of children.

2.3.3.1 Increasing Relevance

Research findings demonstrate that basic education can improve labor productivity and entrepreneurial skills, help develop appropriate values, attitudes, and behavior, and have positive intergenerational effects on families and communities. These results justify the importance attached to the relevance of basic education (WCEFA, 1990: 46). Basically, the relevance of curriculum/program is determined by the extent

it meets the educational objectives, which at basic level are: to impart essential cognitive skills and knowledge and to prepare students for further learning. The key to relevance is thus, the identification of needs (MOE/ICDR, 1999:7).

Research on needs identification has confirmed that the content of basic learning should focus on literacy, oral expression, numeracy, and problem-solving-general skills and essential learning tools that are applicable across locations and over time. An implementation of NFBPE program that graduates learners who do not have these core contents has failed, as a program regardless of how effective it may have been in meeting other cultural, social, or political needs.

2.3.3.2 Improving Quality

Of the three pillars of a good education system (access, quality, and delivery), quality is the key (*World Bank, 1999: 7*). Virtually, the quality and standard of education in a given country is mainly determined by the essence of its curriculum and the process of its implementation (TGE/ESS, 1994: 3). Currently, high on the agendas of many governments are activities aimed at improving quality in basic education. NFBPE program implementation practices must enhance the quality of education that children have access to.

For two reasons, however, quality at implementation level rarely achieved. First, implementation is a forgotten area; all talk about the planned, not the implemented program. Second, quality itself is difficult to measure and define. More over, the quality of learning outcomes influences and is influenced by factors outside the education system such as the home environment and perceptions of the future labor market (World Bank, 1999: 7-8, 46).

The provision of education of acceptable quality thus, depends on two determining factors: (i) an adequate system of school management, and (ii) a reliable information system enabling the operation of the education system at the local level to be monitored (World Bank, 1999: 9; taking as a foot note from www.education.unesco.org/unesco/educprog/iiep/res1.htm).

Discussions on learning quality, many of the times, depend on four sets of indicators- educational inputs, processes, educational outputs/outcomes, and learner characteristics. A systematic effort to improve learning quality in the implementation process of NFBPE program requires identification of how the multiple inputs of the system interact within the learning process to produce the desired outputs.

The understanding of these relationships suggests the following priorities for NFBPE reform:

- ◆ improving the availability and use of instructional materials;
- ◆ enhancing facilitator effectiveness by emphasizing subject mastery, communication skills, and motivation;
- ◆ improving managerial skills, community and institutional structures, and individual and organizational incentives;
- ◆ increasing the time actually spent on learning (WCEFA, 1990: 49, 53; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:4).

When these properties linked with improved preconditions for learning that enhance pupils' initial capacities, and with community environments that reinforce learning, true gains can be made in learning quality of the NFBPE programs.

2.3.3.3 Promoting Equity

Inequities most commonly relate to gender, economic status, location, religious, linguistic, or ethnic identifications, and special needs. As World Bank (1995: 3; 45) depicts, “girls, the rural poor, children from linguistic and ethnic minorities, nomads, refugees, street and working children, and children with special needs, go to school less than others”.

Gender difference in participation is a persistent concern. WCEFA (1990: 54) has indicated that with the exception of Latin America, female rates of enrolment in primary schooling continue to lag behind those of males: the rates for 6-11 year-olds in Africa were 69 percent for males and 56.5 percent for females; in Asia the respective rates were 77.4 and 59.3 percent in the early 1990s. The gap has actually widened since 1970 in Afghanistan, Nepal, and Pakistan, and in many other nations where female enrolments remain very sensitive to economic or social disturbance.

Practically, poverty affects both the ability of the family to support schooling and its willingness to bear the costs. Unequal distribution of schooling in a nation causes unequal access. According to one estimate, only half the rural children in most countries (and as few as 10 percent in some others) have the opportunity to complete four years or more of schooling. The barriers to learning attainment in rural areas include the limited quantity and poor quality of schools, poor reinforcement from the non-school environment, irrelevant curriculum, high opportunity costs for children whose labor is needed at home, and long distances between the home and the school. Another disadvantage is that the language of instruction used in schools often differs from that used in the home. These disadvantages translate into differences in learning achievement.

Practically, equity in meeting basic learning needs may come at a cost, but in the long run it will be a lower cost to society than the continuation of inequity. Closing the persistent historical gap requires concerted, compensatory efforts, not simply an expansion of access. Thus, all should seek complementary programs, which are “different but equal” programs to fulfill the learning needs of out-of-school children.

2.3.3.4 Enhancing Efficiency

Efficiency, which is production of output relative to input, helps us to understand how the education system works in terms of using available resources (Pratt, 1994: 343; FAWE, 2001: 4). Efforts to improve efficiency in today’s basic education programs emphasize reducing costs without significantly altering the desired effects, or enhancing effectiveness without increasing costs. For example, the introduction of split shifts to increase the utilization of facilities is an appropriate way to enhance efficiency in locations with sufficient pupils to justify extra shifts. Similarly, literacy, NFBPE for out-of-school children and other basic skill programs can make use of primary school teachers, facilities, and appropriate materials when school is not in session and thus reduce the proportion of the cost of these resources that must be charged to basic primary schooling (WCEFA, 1990:60; ESSSR, 1998:50-51).

Unfortunately, education systems in developing countries have difficulty in improving efficiency for three reasons:

- a. inadequate knowledge about the importance of inputs,
- b. inadequate knowledge about the cost of inputs, and
- c. difficulty obtaining appropriate information (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991: 39; taking from Lockheed and Hanushek, 1988).

A special form of educational inefficiency is that described as "wastage". This normally refers to the effect of pupils repeating a grade or dropping out of school. Since both actions increase the number of years of schooling provided relative to the number of graduates produced, such wastage is seen as synonymous with inefficiency. A special endeavor should, thus, be made to at least minimize wastage, enhance efficiency, and prepare learners for meaningful and productive life in the community (TGE/ESS, 1994: 3). Strengthening career guidance and consulting services for learners, encouraging them to play crucial roles in the implementation of the NFE programs, be it individually or in groups, help to avoid both attrition and repetition. Such endeavors lead to true gain from the implementation practices of NFBPE programs.

2.3.4 Meeting the Demands of Parents/Community

The discussions about meeting the demands of parents/community are not completely different from the discussions so far made under the preceding sub-section. Nonetheless, some peculiar points worth pinpointing here.

Virtually, considerations of the demands of parents/community are almost invariably essential for successful NFBPE program implementation to take place. To be meaningfully supported, NFBPE program implementation should be well communicated to and understood by the community and/or parents. This is because; appeals to national, international or donors needs only do not seem to be very effective in building support for implementation. There must be people within the community and the learning center that perceive the implementation meeting local needs (Pratt, 1994: 328). NFBPE centers, thus, should be linked with the community, which are the users of its products.

As Skager and Dave (1977:117) indicate, the home and the community play the most subtle and crucial role in initiating the process of lifelong learning, which continues throughout the entire life span of their children. This calls for the determination of the immediate and long-range needs of the community/parents before NFBPE program can be established for implementation. If not, resistance and/or rejection of the program by the implementers and beneficiaries is unavoidable. For example, youth clubs in Benin, Rural education centers in Burkina Faso, and Koranic schools in Mauritania, which the respective countries experimented with alternatives to formal primary school education proved to be unacceptable to the local communities, for none of them had addressed the immediate and long-range demands of the beneficiaries (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:31).

To be more specific, parents wish that their children get basic education of reasonable quality so as to be active participants in the socio-cultural life of their community. Tietjen (1991: 71-72) has confirmed, "...creating culturally appropriate facilities appear key in increasing parental demand.

The proximity and flexibility of the NFBPE centers and programs respectively promote parental needs to have their children at least for some parts of a day in domestic activities. Therefore, recognition of the vital role of parents and community is particularly important. They must have the possibility to express the difficulties that hinder the educational success of their children and to take part in the definition of solutions so as to achieve success.

When learning centers are tailored to meet parental concerns for their children's, particularly daughters' safety and chastity, other parental biases seem to be eroded. This relieves them from fear of their daughters' sexual abuse and abduction. If not, they are not willing to send their daughters to the learning centers especially for the night shift (FAWE, 2001: 48).

In the same vein, costs associated with schooling seem to be the single most important factor in depressing parental demand. Incentives and subsidies, which outweigh both direct and opportunity costs seem to overcome the difficulties in this regard.

NFBPE centers should be made responsive to the local needs and requirements and should act as a center for all educational activities of the community (TGE/ESS, 1994: 16-17). Its effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability can be maintained when the community ownership of the program is ascertained. Analyzing and diagnosing community needs with the intention to identify existing needs, fashion new ones so as to meet them and involve the beneficiaries in the implementation of the program in turn can achieve this (MOE/ICDR, 1999: 69).

Overall, the NFBPE program implementation practices should be community-based. Implementation activities that guarantee greater decentralization, which places more authority in the hands of the community, and local education officials can make an individual learning center/school more relevant and efficient through increasing its accountability to improve quality.

2.4 LINKAGE OF THE NON-FORMAL-AND THE FORMAL-BASIC PRIMARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

In essence, basic education is a lifelong process, which includes formal, non-formal, and informal patterns (Skager and Dave, 1977:117; Coffield, 2000:12; World Bank, 1998:78). These are all complementary and mutually reinforcing elements. Particularly, the Formal and Non-formal education programs are alike in that both have been organized by societies to augment and improve upon the informal learning process. They differ mainly in their institutional arrangements and their procedures. Occasionally, their differences merge in 'hybrid' programs combining significant features of both.

Both formal and non-formal education programs, regardless of type, seek to attract students, retain them through out the primary cycle, and teach the basic literacy, numertacy, and problem-solving skills. This is because; appropriate learning achievement at this level, regardless of delivery type, will help establish a sound basis for further learning and prepare future manpower. Basic education is, thus, the prime concern of both formal and non-formal education systems (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:221; WCEFA, 1990: 45).

Both programs support and contribute something to each other. Whereas the NFBPE program introduces some promising innovations to the formal program; the formal education also contributes financial, material, and human resources, including buildings and equipment to the delivery of the NFBPE (ESSSR, 1998: vii). The short falls of the formal education programs, however, call for the immediate and intermediate demand for alternative complementary and equivalent programs.

Consequently, if the alternative, which is "different but equal" program is to fulfill pupil expectations, standards of learning achievement must be the same as for the formal primary school system, and the credentials received must have the same value for both employment and access to further learning. ESSSR (1998:1) depicts that "clearly stated linkage and transfer mechanisms from NFE to formal education or vice versa" enhance the proper functioning and contribution of NFE to nation development.

Practically, however, "cross-fertilization between formal primary and less traditional primary approaches is not evident..." (Tietjen, 1991: 72). In the past regimes of Ethiopia, the NFE system was not well coordinated with the formal system resulting in inefficient utilization of facilities and inputs. As TGE/ESS (1994: 7) discloses, the formal and the non-formal education programs did not interrelate and complement each other. Still the implementation of the current Education and Training policy has brought little difference. As recent study by ICDR shows, requested to tell whether there were relationships between the formal and the non-formal education curricula, only 43.3% indicated that there was a relationship between the two (MOE/ICDR, 1999:75). It has also been stated in the executive summary of FAWE (2001:ix) that "...the various agencies who run NFE programs neither have established horizontal linkages between themselves nor do we find linkages

formed between the NFE and the formal education sector”. As a result promotion/transference from NFE to formal education or vice versa is restrained.

In reality, however, there are natural and practical demands by learners to be certified, transferred or promoted from one program or phase/grade to the other. “Where students are particularly interested in matriculating in to the formal system of education or obtaining some form of credential, the lack of standardized or coordinated institutional standards can be discouraging” (Tietjen, 1991: 70). NFBPE programs, thus, must be seen on equal basis with formal education in their contributions to wards human resource development (FAWE, 2001: 73). Therefore, the formal education and the NFBPE programs need to complement and supplement each other to satisfy the learning needs of children and ultimately to develop overall human resources in the country.

2.5. BEST IMPLEMENTATION PRACTICES OF NFBPE

There is no single virus that blocks learning and no simple vaccination against ignorance. (Buchert, 1998:47)

Recent years have seen a new appreciation of the lessons learned from the non-formal basic education efforts. In this paper, such efforts have been referred to as “best implementation practices of NFBPE programs”. They are practices that respond to the life circumstances of out-of-school children in imparting basic skills, providing them with a life-long education that they might not otherwise receive and, in some cases, assisting them to join and continue within the formal system.

Best implementation practices of NFBE programs are known by their bottom-up support and collaborative leadership; and by providing a structured program of learning in a non-institutional environment based on a learner-centered approach. Their programs are flexible, condensed, innovative in terms of teaching methods, and tailored to local conditions and children’s learning needs and designed to eliminate both the defects and traditions of formal schooling (Tietjen, 1991: 60).

The following sub-sections thus, describe some of the best implementation practices of NFBPE programs that have got acceptance by improving education/schooling for rural children and girls in Colombia and Bangladesh, and addressing the needs of child workers in India and Kenya, and providing Promising approaches to increase access, persistence and achievement of girls in Nepal, and finally their common features.

2.5.1 Improving Rural Education in Colombia through Escuela Nueva

After a decade of experimentation, Escuela Nueva, which means “New school”, was launched in 1975 and officially set forth in Colombia and transferred to Guatemala and elsewhere in Latin America (Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:160; MOE, 2000: 4). It was initiated to deal with the internationally recognized problems of coverage or access, but was implemented on the basis of local solution to local problems (Buchert, 1998: 15, 29). It has targeted to (a) provide the full five-year primary cycle, (b) improve the relevance and quality of education, (c) improve student achievement, (d) improve educational efficiency and productivity, and (e) integrate the school and the community. The strategies for implementing the program focus on curriculum, teacher training, administration, and the relationship between the school and the community.

As Buchert (1998: 40) indicates, its curriculum is contained in self-instructional guides divided in to a number of units, each with up to fifteen tasks. They are organized according to the principles of ‘active’ learning. The contents selected can be readily adapted to the circumstances of a particular community, are simple and sequential, with an emphasis on problem-solving skills. Presented as semi-programmed learning guides, the curriculum permits a flexible promotion system as a result of which repetition rates have become lower. To complement the curricular materials and to meet the challenges of multi-grade teaching techniques, Escuela Nueva has developed a special classroom design featuring resource corners, simple furniture, and library with 100 books (Buchert, 1998: 37; and Colbert de Arboleda, 1987, Rojas and Castillo, 1988 as cited in Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991: 160).

Escuela Nueva places special emphasis on teacher training and continuous in-service upgrading of their skills. Training follows the methods of learning by doing instead of listening to lectures. An initial ten-day workshop introduces teachers to the program's philosophy and content, teaching strategies, school organization, and student evaluation. Two follow-up workshops given during the year provide further training, particularly on how to adapt curricular materials to the needs of the students and the characteristics of the community. Supervisors undergo similar training, with greater emphasis on the pedagogical aspects of supervision. According to Buchet (1998: 38), supervision is used to help teachers with their implementation as well as to identify requests for conventional training in subject matter. Supervisory visits thus, provide pedagogical rather than administrative support.

An administrative structure has been developed that delegates authority. At the central level, a national committee ensures that the program's policies are in accordance with national goals and objectives. At the school level, a student council with parent committee operates the program. Escuela Nueva considers integration of the student, school, and community as crucial not only to the school's effectiveness as a learning institution, but also to community's assumption of responsibility for its own development.

Overall, external evaluations have proved that the method of Escuela Nueva is both effective and cost-effective. Taking from McEwan (in press), Buchert (1998: 45) has indicated that although its actual cost per pupil is higher than conventional schools (US\$ 120 against US\$ 84), higher learning outcomes make it more cost-effective. As a result, more than 10,000 schools have produced at least ten cohorts of graduates. It thus, has become a highly innovative reform that has affected many rural schools and lives. It has achieved both educational and social goals, and is adapted to the contexts of many countries including

Ethiopia by AAE. Consequently, its positive results have proved that implementation of the idea of Escuela Nueva can benefit education in any country and anywhere not merely in rural schools.

2.5.2. Improving Schooling for Girls and Rural Children in Bangladesh

To improve the enrollment and retention rates of girls and rural children, the Bangladesh government had initiated the NGO, Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) that in turn created a non-formal type primary education in 1985 (Tietjen, 1991:64). The BRAC program consists of two models that approximate the first three years of formal primary school, directed at two separate age groups. The first is the Non-formal primary Education Program (NFPE) that had been begun in 1983 as a pilot project to develop and test a low-cost alternative to primary education. It is a three-year program for children aged 8-10 who have never been in school or dropped out in grade 1. Its curriculum includes language, mathematics, basic science, social studies, and health and hygiene. The other is Primary Education for (11-16 years) Older Children (PEOC). It is a two-year course that combines a condensed version of the NFPE with more functional skills (Tietjen, 1991: 64; MOE, 2000: 8). Both NFPE and PEOC classes meet 2.5-3 hours per day for 268 days per year at times decided by parents. School space is rented from a group or individuals in the community, and no more than 30 children are permitted per teacher.

Teachers, who are commonly called paraprofessionals (preferably village residents and mothers or heads of household), are recruited from the village and have an average of nine years of schooling. In contrast with government schoolteachers, BRAC teachers are non tenured, their performance is evaluated regularly. In addition to initial training course,

teachers receive refresher training and meet monthly with supervisors and /or supervised by professional staff.

Curricula materials and teaching methods are learner-centered and participatory. Lessons have a practical focus, a children's magazine is published for at-home reading. Parent-teacher committees manage schools with the assistance of project organizers. The government is involved in the following efforts:

- to recruit, train, and deploy more women teachers by assigning them to schools within their own localities, and improving accommodations for female teachers in both teacher training institutions and rural areas,
- to provide physical facilities that meet the privacy requirements of girls (such as closed latrines), and
- to collect gender-sensitive data that allow the government to monitor progress toward achieving equal access for the Female Education Scholarship Program, whose scholarships have, where offered, decreased the primary school dropout rate from 15 percent in 1979 to 4 percent in 1987 (Tietjen, 1991: 64; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991: 165, taking from Mallon, 1989).

Overall, BRAC's implementation has resulted in a learning environment that does not alienate rural children and a schedule that can be adapted to the needs of the local community. Rural communities find the program implementation appropriate to their demands, and more than 90 percent of the children who started BRAC were graduated and admitted to formal primary schools. With 60 percent of the enrollees were females, the program has succeeded in attracting and retaining learners, specially girls. In general BRAC's program has achieved

considerable success and known for its high internal efficiency and retention rates, and high academic achievement of its learners.

2.5.3. Addressing the Needs of Child Workers in India and Kenya

To increase the access to education in developing countries, the needs of working children in both rural and urban settings are becoming the common day agendas. This is because; the earnings of children in developing countries are essential to the survival of families. Creative and practical approaches to educating their respective children have, thus, been devised. As a representative of developing countries, the case of India and Kenya are described below.

India: While in 1976, India had virtually achieved Universal primary education for boys (97.5 percent) at the lower grades, fewer than 64 percent of the girls ever-started schooling. Most of the unschooled children were workers. Responding to the persistent social and economic problems created by millions of working children, the government of India, in collaboration with donors and NGOs, initiated need-based projects in areas where child workers were concentrated (Tietjen, 1991: 65; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:162). Some of them are: Pune (Maharashtra) Primary Education Project, The Tilonia Experiment, and Comprehensive Access to Primary Education (CAPE). The implementation practices of these projects have succeeded in attracting the attentions of many countries of which Ethiopia is not an exceptional.

Kenya: In Kenya, the program that most commonly addresses the needs of working children is the one run by the *Undugu Society of Kenya*. Established in 1973, the *Undugu Society* targets street children, mainly parking boys and girls, who direct motorists to parking bays

and are between the ages of four and sixteen, and child prostitutes, who are mostly girls between the ages of twelve and sixteen. The Society sponsors schools, provides loans, and offers a number of programs in basic education, vocational training, and income generation. It emphasizes practical skills and literacy in Kiswahili and the English language. The program is divided in to three phases, and individuals move from one to the next schools, and the majorities are prepared for self-employment. The course lasts for four years (Myers, 1988; Narayan, 1988; Onyango, 1988 all cited in Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991: 162).

2.5.4 Approaches to increase Access, Persistence, and Achievement of Girls in Nepal

With the participation and implementation assistance of international donors (USAID, UNESCO, UNICEF), an international NGO (Save the Children), and local agencies, The National Literacy Program in Nepal was launched in 1983. United under the umbrella of the program, several different activities or projects (Cheli Beti, Naulo Bihana, and NFE in Takukot Panchayat) aimed at different regions and audiences have been undertaken.

The Cheli Beti project: Begun in 1983, the Cheli Beti ("yong girl") project provides one-year basic literacy and numeracy training for girls, aged 6-13, in the remote Seti zone, one of the least developed regions in Nepal. Before the start of the project in this Zone, less than 7 percent of the girls enrolled in formal primary school because of heavy household responsibilities, lack of female teachers, and preference given to boys. In 1986-87, over 750 girls were enrolled in 39 classes.

Currently the experiences have been replicated and classes are held six mornings a week between 7:30 and 9:00, before girls must start their chores. The classroom may be a local

house, the village square, or an open field-- whatever is convenient and available. Local female, secondary school students are recruited, trained by the project in teaching methods (35 days), and paid a nominal fee (\$0.70) per class. They are provided with a chalkboard and student materials, which enable them to implement the key word approach, linked to practical activities.

The Naulo Bihana Project: This intensive, nine-month (350-500 hours) program targets out-of-school children, aged 8-14, and offers the equivalent of the first three years of primary school. The program uses a nationally developed set of materials whose instructional strategy is founded on active learning. Peer teaching, and group discussions based on key words and poster drawings. Classes are held during the day, at convenient times for the students' activities.

Nonformal Education in Takukot Panchayat: This is a typically community-based education project. It has become a significant alternative to the formal school system for girls prevented from attending school because of their household responsibilities and poverty. Providing the three-year program, it combines literacy training with functional skill development (agriculture, livestock, etc.). The materials used have been developed by the National Literacy program, designed to introduce development-oriented activities with a learner-centered approach, such as the use of key words, comic book formats, posters, and peer teaching. The content of the lesson relates to the daily details of the participants' lives and provides opportunities for discussions.

Each class is held for approximately 2 hours, six evenings a week, in community-provided shelter. Participants are responsible for its upkeep and must pay a small registration and

materials' fee, which is deposited into a community-managed account. Classes are led by locally recruited facilitators and consist of scheduled reading and writing exercises supplemented with games, quizzes, contests, debates, and development projects.

Results are encouraging. Children who attend the classes for one or two phases join formal school. Local attitudes towards sending children to school have changed. Where no children were enrolled in primary school prior to the project's initiation in one village, there are now several attending schools. Fewer girls dropped out than boys, demonstrating a high motivation to learn (Junge and Shrestha, 1984; APEID/UNESCO, 1985b; Patel, 1989; UNESCO, 1989; Comings, Pers. Com., 1991; Sob and Leslie, 1988 all cited in Tietjen, 1991).

2.5.5 Common Features of the Best Implementation Practices of the NFBPE

The implementation practices of the NFBPE programs described above have several things in common. Above all they share two things: innovative approaches responsive to and founded on the realities of out-of-school children's lives; and multi-dimensional approaches for cost saving without quality reduction. They employ interventions that target to overcome several barriers to children's learning and make education both available and accessible to them.

Virtually, all educational activities are labor intensive and personnel costs in the formal education program account for over 95 percent of the total cost. Current strategies all over the world focus on reducing the direct and indirect costs of schooling and mobilizing community support (ESSSR, 1998:50; Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates, 1991:168-169). All the practices implicitly or explicitly employ the cost reduction strategies without significantly altering the desired effects, or enhancing effectiveness without increasing costs. Among such

strategies, reducing the length of schooling (although not all authorities would agree, Thorndike, 1980; in Bishop, 1989:71), increasing class size within reasonable limits, double and multi-shift use of facilities, multi-grade and multi-grouping classes, and all year utilization of facilities can be cited.

Bishop (1989:70-79); Lockheed, Verspoor, and associates (1991); and ESSSR (1998:50-51) support the cost reduction mechanisms particularly through: low capital investment (using borrowed or low-rent facilities); low operating cost (using part-time instructors, facilitators, volunteers, local people with special skills); and community participation-generating some income or in-kind contribution from program participants and activities.

All the practices in one way or another utilize the advances in pedagogy, psychology, educational technology, etc., to reduce the normal years of primary schooling without significant loss of quality and standard. This confirms the fact that it is not the number of years of schooling that is critical; it is the quality of schooling that matters. The programs address the limited time that learners have to devote to schooling and the costs their parents face in sending them to school.

Overall, they provide:

- ◆ Free education that has no hidden direct costs for materials, tutoring, uniforms;
- ◆ Classes at convenient places, times and schedules;
- ◆ Condensed primary school curricula that both shorten the time requirements and also acknowledge the relatively truncated time frame children have to devote to schooling;
- ◆ Chances for community participation that leads to ownership through joint planning, implementing and evaluating;
- ◆ recruiting teachers locally and training them;
- ◆ appropriate pedagogy introducing the children to structured learning through games, songs, stories, etc, in a relaxed learning environment;
- ◆ a friendly classroom environment that allows for individual success and personal validation;

- ◆ quality instructional materials that are of interest and reflect children's daily lives;
and
- ◆ The opportunity to matriculate into comparable formal primary school.

CHAPTER THREE

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Descriptive and comparative survey methods were employed in carrying out this research. The former was used to describe the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs in general, where as the latter was used to compare significant differences and similarities that existed between NGO-and Government-implemented NFBPE programs.

These methods were believed to elicit data pertaining to the NFBPE program implementation practices. This chapter, thus, presents the procedural steps followed: sample selection procedures; sources of data; data collection methods, instruments, processes, and analyses methods.

3.1 Sample Selection Procedures

NFBPE programs in Ethiopia are being implemented mainly by the leading initiatives of NGOs and collaborations of other stakeholders at different levels (MOE, 2001). Particularly, AAE, which is a large international NGO, has initiated an innovative approach known by its acronym “ACCESS”. According to AAE official data, currently 44,085 children at 275 NFBPE centers, in 23 Woredas, 14 Zones, and 6 Regional States of Ethiopia, are beneficiaries of the innovative ACCESS approach.

Based on the types of implementation mechanisms, AAE-ACCESS programs can be divided into three: ACCESS programs implemented by AAE itself (in Dalocha Woreda of Silte, and Waka Woreda of Dawaro Zones of SNNPR); those funded by AAE and implemented by government agents (e.g. in North Shewa and Jimma zones of Amhara and Oromia Regional States respectively); and those ACCESS programs funded by AAE and implemented by

partner local NGOs (e.g. RCWDA, Priprode, REST Tigray, Forum Nathareth, Focus on Children at Risk, EMRDA, FSCE, Vision Ethiopia, ORDA, Amhara Development Association, Agri-Service Ethiopia and AFD).

Of these, 3 ACCESS program sites (one implemented by AAE in Dalocha Woreda, Silte Zone of SNNPR; one implemented by RCWDA in Adami Tullu Woreda, East Shewa Zone of Oromia; and one implemented by Propride Entoto in Woreda 11, Zone 4 of Addis Ababa) were selected using purposive sampling technique, mainly guided by the availability and type of ACCESS NFBPE program in action.

The selection was generally done based on the following criteria:

- **BENE membership/partnership**-AAE is a core supporter and partnership; RCWDA and Propride Entoto are members of BENE, which has the mission of contributing to the promotion and expansion of innovative, relevant and quality basic education in Ethiopia (Taken from BENE pamphlet);
- **Focus areas:** These ACCESS program sites are proved to be need-driven. From the macro preliminary assessment, the researcher could have known that these ACCESS program sites had been embarked at areas where there were acute shortages of equitable access to basic education and where there were dire needs for flexible schedules due to economic bases of the beneficiaries, and lack of accessibility; and
- **Envisaged rich/potential experience and growing acceptance in Ethiopia**- ACCESS programs have demonstrated the possibilities of expanding effective educational services with simple structure and facilities, relevant and flexible curricula and school calendar, and reduced contact hours (Addis Education, Training and Development Consultants,

1998:74-75 in Ahmed, 1998:7). AAE's solid experiences in implementing as well as sponsoring others to implement similar programs were, thus, used in this study.

To select 6 ACCESS specific NFBPE centers from the 3 program sites, simple random sampling techniques were used. That is, the names of all the NFBPE centers under the 3 program sites were written on pieces of paper and put in 3 different containers for each program sites. Picking two from each container (blindfold), 6 NFBPE centers were selected to secure representative data for the study.

For cross-fertilization and validation, 3 NFBPE centers implemented by government agents in the 3 respective Woredas were also included. They were all selected by using purposive sampling technique, mainly taking in to consideration the availability of government-implemented NFBPE program in action. The following table summarizes the details of sample selection.

TABLE 1: Regions, Zones, Woredas, NFBPE Centers, and Implementers.

Region	Zone	Woreda	NFBPE center		
			Implementers	Quantity	Selection method(s)
Addis Ababa	Zone 4	Woreda 11	Propriede Entoto	2	Random
			Government	1	Purposive
Oromia	East Shewa	Adami	RCWDA	2	Random
		Tulu	Government	1	Purposive
SNNPR	Silte	Dalocha	Action Aid	2	Random
			Government	1	Purposive
Total				9	6 random; 3 Purposive

Also to get professional expertise and relevant representation of implementing stakeholders at all the levels, data sources at the central MOE, REBs, Zonal Education Departments, Woreda Education Offices, as well as Community and NGO representatives were selected using purposive/expert choice (Dyver, 1979:91; Mulusa, 1990:104) sampling technique.

To maintain gender balance for the Focus Group Discussions with the learners, the names of all male and female learners were registered alphabetically at all the NFBPE centers. Then using systematic sampling technique, 90 learners (5 males and 5 females per each center) were selected. Since the number of facilitators available at all the NFBPE centers was small and varies from center to center, availability sampling technique was used.

During the actual data collection it was found that there were only 24 facilitators at the selected 9 NFBPE centers. To secure adequate data, therefore, 31 NFBPE facilitators of other centers, all from the respective Zones and woredas already identified, were made to fill the questionnaire.

3.2 Data Sources

Two types of data sources, namely, secondary and primary were used. The secondary sources of data include internationally and nationally available literatures, policy documents, reports and relevant periodicals.

The primary sources of data were learners, parents and their representatives at all the 9 NFBPE centers, professionals and stakeholders from the NGOs, the Federal Ministry of

Education, REBs and their respective lower agents. More specifically, the main data sources have been summarized in the following table.

TABLE 2: Summary of the main Data Sources

Data Sources	Selection Methods
Ninety learners from the 9 NFBPE centers (10 per each)	Systematic sampling
Twenty-one education officials (from REBs, Zones, and Woredas)	Purposive Sampling
Fifty-five Facilitators	Availability and purposive sampling
Twenty-seven Parents/representatives (3 per each center)	Purposive sampling
Six NGO representatives sponsoring and/or implementing the NFBE program (3 filled the questionnaire; 3 interviewed)	Purposive sampling
Two officials from the Ministry of Education	Purposive Sampling

3.3 Data Collection Methods and Instruments

Both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods were employed so as to secure appropriate and sufficient data from different implementation stakeholders and beneficiaries of the sub-sector at different levels. Accordingly, five different data collection instruments were used. These were:

- **Focus-group discussion Guides** with 90 learners, 27 parents and/or representatives;
- **Check lists** to see the availability of NFBPE curricula materials, and elicit miscellaneous data;
- **A Questionnaire was filled by** the data sources identified from REBs, zonal Education Departments, woreda Education offices; 55 facilitators; and 3 NGO representatives;
- **Interview Guides** with the data sources identified from the Federal Ministry of Education and the NGOs running and/or sponsoring the program.

All the instruments of data collection were pilot tested. Fifteen copies of the pilot questionnaire were filled by 9 facilitators (6 from government-implemented NFBPE in Addis Ababa, 3 from NGO-implemented NFBPE in Oromia), and 6 officials (2 from Addis Ababa, and 4 from Oromia). The Focus Group Discussion and Interview Guide questions were also given to head of the Adult Education Panel of MOE and education officials at AAE and Propriede Entoto and consequently comments and appraisals were solicited.

The data obtained using the close-ended parts of the pilot questionnaire were fed into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer Program and quantitatively analyzed. Computed using Cronbach Alpha procedure, its internal consistency reliability was found to be 0.70 (see Appendices B 1-2). According to Borich et al (1995), this index is within the range of “strong to very strong” internal consistency reliability. Therefore, no significant changes were made to the questions of the questionnaire except some minor reformatting, truncating and refinements.

3.4 Data Collection Processes/Procedures

The interview guide questions pertaining to NFBPE implementation practices were transactionally discussed with all the interviewees. There were ample chances for bargaining back and forth between the researcher and the interviewees.

For the focus group discussions with all the subjects identified from all the centers and schools, one assistant (per each) was hired and was in charge. While the assistant was reading for the focus group discussion participants and leading them to respond, the researcher was

taking notes using tape recorder and paper-pencil, and also giving some clarifications when required.

The researcher, in collaboration with pertinent stakeholders at all levels and centers moderated all the observation checklists and the questionnaire.

3.5 Methods of Data Analyses

To analyze the data secured from the different sources, different methods were employed based on the specific nature of the data. In so doing, the collected data were coded, edited, and sequenced. All the close-ended questions of the questionnaire including the preliminary data were entered in to the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) computer Program and quantitatively analyzed, interpreted and reported using frequency count, percentages, mean, standard deviations, Pearson's correlation coefficient, Levene's t-test for equality of variances and levels of significances.

The data obtained from the open-ended questions of the questionnaire and from all the other tools were qualitatively analyzed and discussed under each pertinent basic research questions. Finally, major findings and conclusions were made. Based on the peculiarities of the findings, some recommendations have been given.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF DATA

This chapter deals with the presentation and analysis of the data gathered from NFBPE program implementation stakeholders at different levels and personal observation, and discussions of major investigations under pertinent basic research questions. Different tools were used to gather the data: a questionnaire, focus group discussion and interview guide questions and observation checklists. Ninety copies of the questionnaire consisting of close-ended and open-ended items were distributed to the selected facilitators; center coordinators; woreda, zonal and regional education officials in Addis Ababa, Oromia, and SNNPR. Of these, 79 (88%) copies were properly filled and returned, three were returned but were not filled, and 8 copies were not returned.

Pre-designed focus group discussion guides were presented to 90 learners and 27 parents/committee members at 9 NFBPE centers (6 implemented by NGOs and 3 by government agents).

Similarly, pre-prepared interview guide questions were presented to two MOE officials and 3 NGO representatives (*AAE*, *Prorpride Entoto*, and *RCWDA*) per each NFBPE program sites. The first part of this sub-section presents descriptions about the respondents and settings for background. Next, the main data have been treated under each of the basic questions raised in chapter one, and finally major investigations have been discussed under pertinent research questions.

4.2. BACKGROUND DESCRIPTIONS

In this sub-section the data gathered using different tools have been described for setting background. The data presented in tables 3-8, 9-10, and 11-12 were gathered using the questionnaire (preliminary part), focus group discussion guides and observation checklists respectively.

TABLE 3: Respondents of the Questionnaire per Implementing Agents

Region	Sex	Respondents per implementing Agents						Total	
		NGO			Government				
		Facilitators	Coordinators	Sum	Facilitators	Officials	Sum	No	%
Addis Ababa	M	-	-	-	2	7	9	9	11
	F	5	-	5	9	-	9	14	18
	Sum	5	-	5	11		7	23	29
Oromia	M	16	1	17	3	7	10	27	34
	F	-		-	-	-	-	-	0
	Sum	16	1	17	3	7	10	27	34
SNPPR	M	13	2	15	4	7	11	26	33
	F	-		-	3	-	3	3	4
	Sum	13	2	15	7	7	14	29	37
Total	M	29	3	32	9	21	30	62	78
	F	5	-	5	12	-	12	17	22
	Sum	34	3	37	21	21	42	79	100

As can be seen from the above table, 62 (78% of the respondents) were males. Only 18 and 4 percent, all of who were from Addis Ababa and SNNPR respectively, were females. There was no any female respondent from Oromia. The reasons for this were solicited from the respective implementers. They indicated that it was difficult to get literate females at the remote centers. The unavailability and low salary at the government-implemented NFBPE centers also made the few available literate females to join other living alternatives rather than giving free services particularly in Oromia. Some of the alternatives were said to be working in private houses, working in hotels, and making marriages.

All the respondents from REBs, Zonal Education Departments, and Woreda Education offices in all the regions were exclusively males. All the three education coordinators who filled the questionnaire from the NGOs were also males.

Table 3 further shows that thirty-four facilitators and three coordinators at the NGO-implemented NFBPE programs, and twenty-one facilitators and twenty-one officials at the government-implemented NFBPE programs were the respondents for the questionnaire.

TABLE 4: Qualifications of the Respondents

Implementing Agents	Type	Below grade 9	Grade 10-12	Grade12+ TTI/equivalent	Diploma	BA/ B.SC	MA/ MSC	Total
NGO	Facilitators	7	11	16	-	-	--	34
	Coordinators	-	-	1	-	2	-	3
	Sum	7	11	17	-	2	-	37
Govt	Facilitators	-	15	4	2		--	21
	Officials	-	-	4	9	7	1	21
	Sum	-	15	8	11	7	1	42
Total	Facilitators	7	26	20	2	-	-	55
	Officials	-	-	5	9	9	1	24
	Sum	7	26	25	12	9	1	79
	% of the total	9	33	32	15	11	1	100

Thirty-three percent of the total respondents, all of who were facilitators, had educational levels from grade 10 to 12. Only 7 (9% of the total), all of who were facilitators from the NGO-implemented programs were below grade 9. Of the rest, 32 percent were 12+TTI/equivalent, 15 percent were diploma, 11 percent were B.A/B.Sc., and 1 percent was M.A/M.Sc. All the B.A/B.Sc. and M.A/M.Sc. holders were coordinators and officials at NGO –and government-implemented programs respectively.

TABLE 5: Service years of the Respondents

Implementing Agents	Type	Service years				Total
		1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	10 and above	
NGO	Facilitators	17	11	5	1	34

	Coordinators	-	-	-	3	3
	Sum	17	11	5	4	37
Govt	Facilitators	20	-	-	1	21
	Officials	-	1	4	16	21
	Sum	20	1	4	17	42
Grand Total	Facilitators	37	11	5	2	55
	Officials/coordinators	-	1	4	19	24
	Sum	37	12	9	21	79

As can be depicted from table 5, thirty-seven, twelve, nine, and twenty-one respondents had 1-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10 and above services respectively. All those who had 1-3 years of services were facilitators; where as the majority of those who had 10 and above years of services were officials and Coordinators.

TABLE 6: Facilitators' Training

Implementing Agents	N0/%	Initial Training						On-job Training					
		No Training	1-10 days	11-20 days	21-30 days	Above 30 days	Total	No Training	1-30 days	31-60 days	61-90 days	Above 90 days	Total
NGO	No	6	9	11	3	5	34	7	12	2	1	12	34
	%	18	27	32	9	15	10	21	36	6	3	35	100
Govt	No	14	7	-	-	-	21	5	16	-	-	-	21
	%	67	33	-	-	-	10	24	76	-	-	-	100
Total	No	20	16	11	3	5	55	12	28	2	1	12	55
	%	36	29	20	6	9	100	22	51	4	2	22	100

As can be seen from the above table, 67 percent of the facilitators in NFBPE Centers implemented by government did not have initial trainings, where as it was only 18 percent for

those in centers implemented by NGO. Only 7 (33 %) of the government-implemented NFBPE enters' facilitators indicated that they had got initial training of 1-10 days.

By the same token 5 (24 percent) and 7 (21 percent) of the facilitators in NFBPE centers implemented by government and NGOs respectively indicated that they had no any on-job trainings for the purpose. Similarly no any facilitator from government- implemented NFBPE centers had got on-job training of above 30 days, where as 36 percent, 6 percent, 3 percent, and 35 percent of the facilitators from NGO-implemented NFBPE centers indicated that they got on-job trainings of 1-30, 31-60, 61-90, and above 90 days respectively.

TABLE 7: Facilitators' Salary

Implementing Agent	No. of Facilitators	No salary	Minimum salary	Maximum Salary	Mean	Stdd	t	Degree of freedom (df)	Significance (2-tailed)	Mean difference
NGO	34	-	120	560	196	109	4	53	.000	-99
Govt	21	3	70	150	97	39				

As can be seen from table 7, facilitators at NGO implemented NFBPE centers were paid more salary than those facilitators at the government-implemented NFBPE centers. As tested by Levene's test of equality of variances, there was very great difference between the salaries of the facilitators at NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs. At *Batu No. 2* center of the government-implemented NFBPE program, there was no any stipend for the facilitators. The facilitators were giving free services only to get certificate of participation that might help them to join another employment opportunities.

TABLE 8: Facilitators' Teaching Loads per week

Implementing Agent	No. of Facilitators	Minimum Load	Maximum Load	Mean	Stdd
NGO	34	15	34	25.32	6.51
Government	21	14	30	21.25	3.99
Total	55	14	34	23.81	6.00

The above table shows that NGO-implemented NFBPE facilitators had a bit more periods of teaching per week than those at government-implemented NFBPE centers. The standard deviation of the loads of the facilitators at NFBPE centers implemented by NGOs was almost by half-greater than those at government-implemented NFBPE centers.

TABLE 9: Profile of the Learners in the Focus Group Discussions

Region	NFBPE Centers			Sex		Age Range					Their Parents' Livelihood			
	Name	Implemented by	Funded by	M	F	< 7	7-9	10-12	13-15	> 15	Farming	Weaving	Petty Trade	Others
Addis Ababa	Kebele 08	Propride Entoto	AAE	6	4	4	2	2	1	1	-	7	2	1
	Kebele 19	Propride Entoto	AAE	5	5		3	3	3	1		8	1	1
	Entoto Amba	Govt	Govt	5	5	-	1	6	3			7	1	2
Oromia	Anano	RCWDA	AAE	5	5	-	2	5	3		10			
	Wayiso no. 1	RCWDA	AAE	6	4	-	5	4	1		10			
	Batu No. 2	Govt	Govt	5	5	-	-	5	5		9			1
SNNPR	Kuke	AAE	AAE	5	5	-	2	8			10			
	Wabera	AAE	AAE	5	5	-	2	6	2		10			
	Worabet Shama	Govt	Govt	5	5	-	2	8			9			1
Total				47	43	4	19	47	18	2	58	22	4	6

Source: Synthesized from the discussions with the learners

As has been shown in the above table, 47 males and 43 females were the overall participants (learners) of the focus group discussions. The majority of them were within the age range of 10-12. At the centers implemented by *Propride Entoto* in Addis Ababa, however, 4 learners were below 7 years of age, whereas 2 were above 15 years of age. Those above 15 years old were working in private houses. They pointed out that the flexibility of the implementation practices of the program encouraged them to attend the program while also managing their responsibilities of the household chores. As the same data sources indicated, those below 7 years of age were also attracted by the proximity of the learning centers to their homes.

Fifty-eight, twenty-two, four, and six discussion participants told that their parents were making a living by farming, weaving, petty trading, and others like government as well as private employees.

TABLE 10: Profile of the Parents/Representatives in the Focus Group Discussions

NFBPE Centers	Sex		Age Range				Level of Education				Role to be participant	
	M	F	26-33	34-41	42-49	> 50	Reading and Writing	1-4	5-8	9-12	Parent	Com-Mittee
Kebele 08	1	2	2	1			2		1		2	1
Kebele 19	2	1	2	1			2			1	2	1
Entoto Amba	2	1	2	1			2		1		3	
Anano	2	1	1	1	1		1					3
Wayiso No. 1	3	-	1	1		1	1	2	2		1	2
Batu No.2	1	2	1	-	2		2			1	1	2
Kuke	3	1	-	2	1		2	1			2	1
Wabera	2	-	-	2	1		1	1	1		1	2
Worabet Shama	3		-	3				2	1		2	1
Total	19	8	9	12	5	1	13	6	6	2	14	13

Source: Synthesized from the discussions with the parents/representatives

The above table shows that 19 males and only 8 females were focus group participants. This was because; government-implemented centers had no females in the committee of the

NFBPE program. Each NGO-implemented centers also had only one female as committee member; where as 4 to 6 males were common at many of the centers. From the same table, it can be seen that the majority of the participants had basic literacy (merely reading and writing skills) level of education. The composition was also 14 parents and 13 committee members.

TABLE 11: NFBPE Learners enrolled at the Beginning of the 1994 Ethiopian academic Calendar and Available Until February, 2002 at the Visited NFBPE Centers

NFBPE center	Enrolled and available	Phases									Total
		I			II			III			
		M	F	Sum	M	F	Sum	M	F	Sum	
Kebele 08	Enrolled	25	42	67	9	12	21	0	0	0	88
	Au, Feb-2002	25	42	67	9	12	21	0	0	0	88
Kebele 19	Enrolled	35+39*	49+47*	84 + 86*	1+15*	3+20*	4 + 35*	0	1	1	89
	Au, Feb-2002	35+39*	49+47*	84 + 85*	1+15*	3+20*	4+34*	0	1	1	89
Entoto Amba	Enrolled	347	130	477	75	44	119	51	19	70	666
	Au, Feb-2002	107	97	114	69	41	110	51	19	70	294
Anano	Enrolled	69	57	126	28	34	62	22	13	35	223
	Au, Feb-2002	69	57	126	28	32	60	22	13	35	221
Wayiso No.1	Enrolled	24	48	72	24	14	38	33	18	51	161
	Au, Feb-2002	24	48	72	24	14	38	33	17	50	160
Batu No.2	Enrolled	33	21	54	13	14	27	0	0	0	81
	Au, Feb-2002	23	19	50	10	14	22	0	0	0	72
Kuke	Enrolled	52	36	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
	Au, Feb-2002	52	36	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Wabera	Enrolled	54	40	94	54	40	94	0	0	0	188
	Au, Feb-2002	54	40	90	54	40	94	0	0	0	184
Worabet Shama	Enrolled	27	53	90	23	16	39	10	17	27	156
	Au, Feb-2002	27	53	89	17	10	27	10	17	27	143
Total <u>government</u> -implemented NFBPE	Enrolled	407	204	621	111	74	185	61	36	97	903
	Au, Feb, 2002: - No.	157	169	253	96	65	159	61	36	97	509
	- %	39	83	41	86	88	86	100	100	100	56
Total <u>NGO</u> -implemented NFBPE	Enrolled	259	272	531	116	103	219	55	32	87	837
	Au, Feb, 2002, - -No.	259	272	527	116	101	217	55	31	86	830
	- %	100	100	99	100	98	99	100	97	99	99

Au, Feb-2002= Available until February, 2002; *=Kindergarten attendants

As can be seen from the above table, 99 percent of the learners enrolled in September 2001 at the NGO-implemented NFBPE centers were available until February 2002, where as only 56 percent were available at government-implemented NFBPE centers during the same period.

TABLE 12: Schedule of the NFBPE centers Visited

No.	NFBPE centers	Parts of the day	Days	Remarks
1	Kebele 08	Day (two shifts)	Monday to Friday	Flexible on parents' demands
2	Kebele 19	Day (two shifts)	Monday to Friday	Flexible on parents' demands
3	Entoto Amba	In the Evening (5:20-8:00 P.M)	Monday to Friday	Not Flexible
4	Anano	Day (two shifts)	Monday to Friday	Flexible
5	Wayiso No. 1	Early in the morning	Sunday to Thursday	Flexible based on seasons and requests of parents
6	Batu No.2	Early in the morning	Monday to Friday	Not Flexible
7	Kuke	Day (two shifts)	Tuesday to Friday	Flexible
8	Wabera	Day (two shifts)	Tuesday to Friday	Flexible
9	Worabet shama	Day (two shifts)	Monday to Friday but Tuesday	Flexible

As can be seen from the above table, at all the NGO-implemented NFBPE centers, except one (*Wayiso No.1*), learning was conducted by shifts with relatively adequate learning times. At the two government-implemented centers (*Entoto Amba and Batu No. 2*), the program

implementations were being run early in the morning. They were not flexible and had relatively less learning times allotted. The reasons were solicited from the group discussion participants that at NGO-implemented NFBPE centers the parents or their representatives used to decide the learning days and times, whereas parents/representatives at the government-implemented NFBPE centers were said to have little roles in any implementation decisions of the program.

4.3 PRESENTATION AND ANALYSES OF THE DATA UNDER EACH OF THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In this sub-section, the data gathered using the different tools have been treated under each of the six research questions raised in chapter one.

4.2.1 NFBPE Program Implementation Practices In Fulfilling the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/ Community

Requested to rate their valuations of the extent of the NFBPE program implementation in fulfilling the listed practices pertaining to the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents/community, 79 respondents had replied variously of which the average means and standard deviations of each have been summarized in table 13. To show distinctly, the responses given by government and NGO-implemented agents have been presented side by side in Appendix C.

TABLE 13: Respondents' Ratings of the Extent of the NFBPE Program Implementation in Fulfilling the Practices pertaining to the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/Community

No.	NFBPE Program Implementation practices	Respon	Mean	Std	t	Signifi cance
1.1	The NFBPE program implementation has provided quality	77	3.4	.69	-2.3*	.024

	education to learners					
1.2	The NFBPE program implementation has reduced direct cost (e.g. for books, uniform, etc) of schooling	79	3.0 2	1.01	.20	.840
1.3	The NFBPE program implementation has minimized the years of schooling without quality reduction	79	3.3	1.92	-1.5	.140
1.4	The implementation of NFBPE program has resolved the home-school distance problems	78	3.6	.84	-1.7	.100
1.5	The flexibility of the NFBPE program implementation has effectively solved dropout problem	79	3.6 0	.72	-1.7	.103
1.6	The NFBPE program implementation has addressed the needs of girls who were deprived of schooling due to involvement in domestic work and culture	77	3.7 4	.60	.35	.729
1.7	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to improve literacy skills	78	3.5 6	.59	.84	.404
1.8	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners get basic learning contents (knowledge, skills, values, attitudes)	79	3.2 1	.67	1.02	.310
1.9	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to understand their social environment	79	3.2 0	.74	.07	.944
1.10	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to understand their physical environment	78	3.1 4	.70	-.24	.809
Total (Average)		78	3.3	.84	.99	.44

**Significant difference (difference is significant at 0.05 level)*

Even though it is delicate to demarcate the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents/community separately, numbers 1.1, 1.6-1.10 are more related to learners' learning needs, whereas numbers 1.2-1.5 are more related to the demands of the parents/community. The average mean and standard deviation of the valuations of the respondents pertaining to the extent of the NFBPE program implementation practices in fulfilling the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents/community were 3.30 and .84 respectively. It has also been shown in Appendix C that the total/average means of the valuations of the respondents from NFBPE programs implemented by government and NGO agents were 3.20 and 3.40 percent respectively. That means, the implementation practices of the NFBPE program somewhat more than satisfactorily fulfilled the learning needs of those enrolled in terms of enabling them read, write and do simple arithmetic calculations.

The discussions made with the children and the parents/representatives at all the centers, and the interviews conducted with 2 MOE officials and 3 NGO representatives also revealed that the implementation practices of the NFBPE program had somewhat fulfilled the learning

needs of those enrolled in terms of enabling them read, write and do simple arithmetic calculations. It was further indicated that the programs' flexibility (particularly at the six NGO-implemented NFBPE centers) enabled the learners to assist their parents in economic, social and cultural engagements. Particularly the parents at NGO-implemented NFBPE centers commonly told the following:

We have some of our children in the morning, the others in the afternoon shift to use their labors. This in turn could back-up our economic, social, and cultural needs and the learning needs of our children. Our children, who before were illiterate could read, write, and solve simple arithmetic calculations, and developed improved conducts. Recruiting facilitators from the localities had also reduced unemployment and given us confidence to send our children to persons we knew and could consult at our disposals.

Specifically, the program implementation in Addis Ababa had given focus to the areas where the "Dorze" tribe, who were making a living by weaving, collecting firewood, and petty trading live. Their children used to support them since the time was adjustable in case of the *Propride*-implemented program.

The other advantages that the focus group discussion participants stressed most were absence of direct and indirect cost, resolution of the home-school distance problems and parents' fear of their daughters' harassment. There was no expense for uniform, books, transportation, and the like. These were coupled with the accessibility of the centers for the parents to get their children as required for social, cultural, and economic activities. When there was in case social or cultural problems or engagements, the parents used to go to the nearby NGO-implemented learning centers and ask the facilitators to let their children go home and assist them in whatever activities.

On the other hand the discussion participants at *Entoto Amba*, *Batu No. 2*, and *Worabet Shama* had reservations pertaining to the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs in fulfilling the parents' demands. They indicated the following to be the reasons for this:

- The facilitators at these particular centers were said to feel irresponsible for the implementation practices. It was underscored that they had no morale to stay at the centers due to no salary at Batu No. 2 of Oromia and low salary and other supports from the government side at all the centers;
- No continuous training was given to the facilitators;
- Parents had persistent concerns for their small children and daughters. As an instance, for the program was conducted in the evening at Entoto Amba, the fear of the parents with regard to their daughters' harassments, and their concerns for smaller children had not been completely resolved.

It was also indicated by the respective discussion participants that at all the NFBPE centers, the accommodation capacities of the available NFBPE centers were low to accept all out-of-school children in the respective vicinities.

One interviewee from MOE and another from *Propride Entoto* also indicated their reservations on the implementation practices of the sub-sector in fulfilling the learners learning needs and the demands of the parents/community. They indicated that the coverage of the program was smaller than expected. They further confirmed that lack of common understanding among different implementation stakeholders pertaining to the promotion and transference of learners from NFBPE centers to formal or vice versa had its negative impact on the implementation practices of the program to the satisfaction of the learners and their parents.

4.2.2 Linkage between the Implementation Practices of the Formal and Non-Formal Basic Primary Education programs

Requested to indicate whether there was linkage between the implementation practices of the NFBPE and the formal education program or not, 88.6% of the subjects who filled the question responded affirmatively. Table 14 presents the details.

TABLE 14: Availability of Linkage between the Implementation Practices of the Formal and Non-Formal Basic Primary Education programs

System	Response	Frequency	Percent	Valid percent
Valid	Yes	70	88.6	93.3
	No	5	6.3	6.7
	Total	75	94.9	100
Missing		4	5.1	
Total		79	100	

As has been presented in table 14, only 5 (6.3 %) of the subjects responded that there was no linkage between the implementation practices of the two sub-sectors. This of course, is in contradiction with *FAWE's* findings, which has been stated in the executive summary concluding that there were no linkages formed between the two sub-sectors (FAWE, 2001:ix).

Further, 27.1, 32.9, 37.1, and 2.9 percent of the respondents who responded to the above question affirmatively, had valued the extent of the linkage in promoting smooth promotion and transference of learners from the NFBPE program to the formal or vice versa as very greatly, greatly, medium, and small respectively as shown in table 15 below.

TABLE 15: The Extent to which the Linkage between the NFBPE and Formal Education Program implementation practices promoted smooth Transference or Promotion.

Alternatives	Frequency	Percent
Very greatly	19	27.1
Greatly	23	32.9
Medium	26	37.1
Small	2	2.9
Total	70	100

The majority (37.1% of the respondents) had rated the linkage between the implementation practices of the two sub-sectors as medium in promoting smooth transference or promotion of

learners from one to the other, where as only 2.9 percent valued it to be small. The interviewees had also valued the linkage as low. They had indicated that even though there was an institutionalized consensus that NFBPE learner who completed phase III could join grade 5, its realization used to depend upon the extent of relationships between the personnel at NFBPE centers and the nearby formal primary schools where NFBPE learners were to join rather than on rules and regulations or guidelines.

Further, those who had already answered to the question by saying “there was no linkage between the implementation practices of the two sub-sectors”, and four interviewees (one from MOE, three from NGOs) had indicated the difficulties resulted as follows:

- ◆ Problems related to entrance examinations that was being given to learners who used to come from NFBPE program to attend formal school programs:
 - Giving the same entrance examination for children who had already covered the courses at the first, second and /or third phases of the NFBPE programs;
 - Giving entrance exam by itself was said to have a negative impact on the morale of NFBPE learners, facilitators, and parents;
- ◆ Formal schools procrastinate to accept/admit learners who could come from NFBPE;
- ◆ Forced by stereotype conceptions against NFBPE quality, formal schoolteachers and some officials at woreda and higher levels used to give low status to the level of competency and credentials of the NFBPE learners;
- ◆ Rigidity of the formal school implementation practices to coincide with the flexibility of the NFBPE program implementation;
- ◆ Lack of mutual understanding among NFBPE implementers of the government and NGO programs;

- ◆ Lack of adequate second cycle primary schools in the vicinities and low accommodation capacity of the available ones to sustain the participation of learners developed in the NFBPE centers.

Finally, the same respondents had enumerated the following to be solutions for the above difficulties.

- Bring together the implementers of the two sub-sectors and orient/train them so as to avoid the dichotomy resulted from stereotype conceptions, and emphasize the mutuality of the two; the conceptions, rationales, and implementation practices of NFBPE, its linkage to the formal program, as well as its importance to meet the universal goal of primary education by 2015;
- Conducting research on the NFBPE status, capacity, and roles to retain and promote learning and disseminating the findings to concerned stakeholders;
- Conducting question and answer competition among the students from the two sub-sectors;
- Creating mechanisms that enable teachers and workers at both sub-sectors work together trust each other, and share experiences.

The respondents further indicated that government should take leading roles to create conducive atmosphere to undertake the above points.

The focus group discussion participants also expressed that there were some stringent requirements of the formal schools that inhibit smooth transference of learners from NFBPE programs to formal schools and continuing there. These were the requirements by formal schools to take entrance exam, to call parents, to fulfill uniform specially in Addis Ababa, shortage of rooms, and institutionalized bureaucratic works that forced the NFBPE learners to

lose some times or dropout or those who hadn't completed phase III to go back to their respective NFBPE centers. As the groups indicated, degrading (returning back) the learners by one level was also practiced at formal primary schools. This was said to demoralize the NFBPE program learners and all other stakeholders including parents.

4.2.3 Significant Similarities and Differences between the NGO-and Government-Implementation Practices of the NFBPE

The following table shows respondents' ratings pertaining to the differences and similarities between the implementation practices of NFBPE programs run by NGO and government agents.

TABLE 16: Respondents' Ratings of the Similarities and Differences between the Government and NGO-Implemented NFBPE Programs.

No	Points of Comparison	Government-Implemented NFBPE			NGO-Implemented NFBPE			Correlation Coefficient (Pearson)	
		Count	Mean	Stdd	Count	Mean	Stdd	r	Significance
5.1	Facilitators are recruited from the community where the NFBPE programs are being implemented	49	1.6	.90	62	2.6	.81	-.17	.23
5.2	Facilitators have got adequate trainings and experiences to promote learning	49	1.3	1	55	1.7	1	-.05	.75

5.3	There are adequate textbooks at the NFBPE centers to promote learning	53	.9	1	62	1.6	1.1	.30*	.03
5.4	The program implementation has promoted learner time utilization	50	1.4	.95	60	2	.94	.20	.15
5.5	The program implementation enables the learners to join formal education programs	58	1.9	1	62	2.3	.99	.43*	.002
5.6	The NFBPE program implementation has promoted girls' participation	48	1.7	.91	61	2.6	.85	.20	.17
5.7	The NFBPE program implementation is flexible enough and locally adoptable	48	1.5	1.1	61	2.4	.93	-.03	.85
5.8	The NFBPE program implementation promotes actions to fulfill the demands of the local community	49	1.2	.92	62	2.3	.82	.08	.57
5.9	The NFBPE program implementation promotes actions to fulfill the learning needs of children	49	1.4	.86	62	2.5	.76	.25	.08
Total/Average		50	1.4	.96	61	2.2	.91	.19	.30

**Significant correlation existed (Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level, 2-tailed)*

Table 16 shows that the overall mean of the NGO- implemented NFBPE program was greater than that of the government-implemented program. That means, the respondents rated the NGO-implemented programs as performing more efficiently than government-implemented program. Only on two points did the sub-sectors have relationships/correlations. In the first place, the implementation practices of the two sub-sectors pertaining to the adequacy of textbooks had small mean. It was .90 for government-implemented programs and 1.6 for NGO-implemented NFBPE programs. As calculated using Pearson's correlation coefficient, they had a correlation of .30 at a significant level of less than 0.05. Second, with regard to the implementation practices of the two sub-sectors in enabling the learners to join formal schools, they had a correlation coefficient of .43 at a significant level of 0.002.

The discussions with all the focus groups and interview participants also disclosed that NFBPE programs implemented by NGO were doing well better than those implemented by government agents. It was also observed that government-implemented NFBPE program did not arrange learners according to their abilities, where as multi-grade and multi-groupings were common practices in NGO-implemented NFBPE programs.

Of the similarities that the focus group discussion and interview participants indicated include: both NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs provided basic learning contents (knowledge, skills, and attitudes), and enabled learners to improve literacy and numeracy skills and used to join formal schools at multiple stages.

Simplistically, based on the data gathered using checklists, and conducting focus group discussions, the differences between the implementation practices of NFBPE programs run by NGO and Government agents have been summarized as follows:

NGO-Implemented NFBPE Program	Government-Implemented NFBPE program
-Mostly followed day (shift) system,	-Mostly conducted when the formal school Program was not in session in the same premise,
-Stationery (exercise books, pens and pencils) were provided specially for poor children,	-Not common (except at <i>Worabet Shama</i> the Irish Aid used to give once a year),
-Strong follow-up by coordinators, Facilitators and committee members,	-Not strong, but seasonal and situational,
-Modest salary for facilitators,	-No-or low-salary for facilitators,
-Relatively adequate facilities and instructional materials,	-Low facilities and instructional materials,
-Continuous training and capacity building for facilitators,	-Not common,
-Facilitators used to get their specified salaries on time,	-Facilitators sometimes used to get their Salaries after two or three months passed (e.g. at <i>worabet Shama</i>)
-Facilitators had higher morale,	-Lower morale and desperate,
-Provision of syllabi, minimum learning competency, etc. (e.g. by AAE)	-These materials were rarely available at government-implemented NFBPE centers,
-Lower dropout rate,	-Higher drop out rate,
-Commonly tended to use program-Specific curricula materials.	-Mostly depended on formal school and adult education learning materials.

The interviewees had also indicated the differences and similarities between the *implementation practices of the two sub-sectors based on some points. Their views have been summarized in table 17 below.*

TABLE 17: Similarities and Differences between the Implementation practices of the NGO and Government-Implemented NFBPE Programs

Points of comparison	Differences between the two		Similarities
	NGO-Implemented NFBPE	Government-Implemented NFBPE	
Source of Facilitators	Selected from and by the local community	.Volunteers and .Formal school teachers	Both gave values to the roles of facilitators in implementing NFBPE
Training of facilitators	Initial and continuously	Less initial and continuous training	Both used to give values for training
Source of Curricula materials	Varied and localized	Mostly formal school oriented, not localized, utilized materials developed for adults,	Both used the same national/regional philosophy, similar contents
Flexibility of the program	Very greatly flexible	Very low	Minimal
Promotion of retention rates	Very high	Medium	Minimal
Promotion of girls participation	Very high (e.g.54% at <i>Propride Entoto</i> NFBPE program)	High	Both gave due emphasis, yet, difference of degree
Management and monitoring practices	Local community (elected members) manage	Government agents manage, committee members had supportive roles	Both had committee
Linkage to the formal program in terms of transference or promotion	There was possibility, even though there were difficulties in realizing the possibility	There was possibility, even though there were difficulties in realizing the possibility	Both exercise promoting/ transferring learners to formal schools

4.2.4 Extent of the Availability of Curricula Materials

Requested to give their ratings of the extent of the availability of curricula materials at the NFBPE centers, the respondents had given their valuations as summarized in tables 18 A (for textbooks), 18 B (for facilitators' guides), and 18 C (for supplementary/source materials). For comparison, the valuations given to the NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE

programs have been presented side by side for each of the curricula material one after the other.

TABLE 18 A: Respondents' valuations of the extent of the Availability of Textbooks at both NGO-and Government-Implemented NFBPE Centers.

Curriculum materials	NFBPE Implemented by	More than Adequately		Adequately		Undecided		Not Adequately		Not Available		Of the Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Textbooks Overall	Govt	0	0	5	12	2	5	31	76	3	7	41	52
	NGO	0	0	21	42	3	6	24	48	1	2	50	63
Textbooks For : . Amharic	Govt	2	6	7	20	2	6	13	37	11	31	35	44
	NGO	2	9	13	45	3	10	4	14	7	24	29	37
. English	Govt	2	4	12	21	3	5	30	53	10	2	57	72
	NGO	3	5	29	45	7	11	22	34	3	5	64	81
.Local /mother Language	Govt	0	0	2	5	3	8	23	59	11	28	39	49
	NGO	6	19	16	42	5	13	9	24	2	5	38	48
. Mathematics	Govt	2	3	10	17	3	5	33	55	12	200	60	76
	NGO	6	9	27	41	6	9	23	35	4	6	66	84
.Environmental science	Govt	3	10	7	23	4	13	3	10	13	43	30	38
	NGO	5	8	29	45	5	8	23	35	3	5	65	83
.Different reference materials	Govt	0	0	2	33	0	0	1	17	3	50	6	8
	NGO	3	23	2	15	1	1	8	5	38	2	13	16
Total (Average)	Govt	1	3	6	16	2	5	19	50	9	24	38	48
	NGO	4	7	20	43	81	9	16	35	3	7	46	58

The above table shows that, of the total 41 respondents who filled the government-implemented program column pertaining to the extent of the availability of the textbooks, only 5 (12 %) indicated that there were adequate textbooks overall. The majority (76%) of them indicated that there were no adequate textbooks overall at government-implemented NFBPE centers.

On the other hand, 42% and 48% of the respondents who filled the NGO-implemented program column rated the availability of textbooks overall as adequately and not adequately respectively. Even though there were shortages at both NGO-and government-implemented programs, for all the textbooks specified by subject areas, the trend of the data indicated that NGO-implemented centers had relatively more textbooks than the centers implemented by government agents. In average, only 16 percent of the respondents to the government implemented centers indicated that there were adequate textbooks, where as it was 43 percent for NGO-implemented centers. On average, 48% and 58% of the total subjects have responded to the government-and NGO-implemented NFBPE program implementation pertaining to the extent of the availability of textbooks respectively.

TABLE 18 B: Respondents' valuation of the Extent of the Availability of Facilitators' Guides at both NGO-and Government-Implemented NFBPE Centers.

Curricula materials	NFBPE Implemented by	More than Adequately		Adequately		Undecided		Not Adequately		Not Available		Of the Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%
Facilitators'	Govt	2	7	12	29	3	7	18	44	5	12	41	52

guides over all	NGO	4	8	24	47	5	10	17	33	1	2	51	65
Facilitators' Guide for .Amharic	Govt	7	20	1	40	2	6	6	17	6	17	35	43
	NGO	6	10	14	45	4	13	3	10	7	23	31	39
. English	Govt	3	8	13	34	2	5	12	32	8	21	38	48
	NGO	8	17	21	45	5	11	8	17	5	11	47	59
.Local /mother Language	Govt	7	12	20	35	6	11	17	30	7	12	57	72
	NGO	8	12	37	56	8	12	10	15	3	5	66	84
. Mathe-matics	Govt	7	12	24	45	3	6	16	30	6	11	53	67
	NGO	10	15	34	52	6	9	13	20	2	3	65	82
.Environment-al science	Govt	1	20	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	60	5	6
	NGO	0	0	1	13	0	0	3	38	4	50	8	10
Total (Average)	Govt	5	13	14	37	3	8	12	32	6	16	38	48
	NGO	6	13	22	49	5	11	9	20	4	9	45	57

Table 18 B depicts that on average, 37 and 49 percent of the respondents valued the NFBPE program implementation by government and NGO respectively had adequate Facilitators' Guides for the specified subjects. In comparison with Table 18 A, there were small differences between the two sub-sectors with regard to the availability of facilitators' guides. Both had relatively adequate facilitators' guides for the specified subjects.

TABLE18 C: Respondents' valuations of the Extent of the Availability of Supplementary (source) Curricula Materials at both NGO-and Government-Implemented NFBPE Centers.

This table shows that 87 and 62 percent of the respondents for the government-and NGO-implemented NFBPE programs respectively pointed out that the listed/specified Supplementary (Source) curricula materials were not available.

Overall, there was shortage of curricula materials at all the centers. The focus group discussion and interview participants indicated that particularly NFBPE centers implemented by government agents did not have adequate materials even for facilitators let alone for the students. As a result, facilitators were forced to use adult curricula materials and borrow from

Supplementary (source) Curricula materials	NFBPE Implemented by	More than Adequa tely		Adequ ately		Undecid ed		Not Adequate ly		Not Available		Of the Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	5	Count	%	Count	%
Syllabi	Govt	2	4	1	2	2	4	4	8	44	83	53	67
	NGO	1	2	12	18	6	9	20	30	27	41	66	84
Flow chart	Govt	1	2	1	2	2	4	1	2	46	90	51	65
	NGO	0	0	3	5	3	5	0	0	55	90	61	77
Workbook	Govt	0	0	3	6	2	4	4	2	42	82	51	65
	NGO	3	5	11	17	5	8	17	27	28	44	64	81
Minimum Learning Competency	Govt	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	4	46	92	50	63
	NGO	2	3	6	10	3	5	5	8	44	73	60	76
Total (Average)	Govt	1	2	1	2	2	5	3	7	45	87	52	66
	NGO	1	2	8	13	4	6	6	10	39	62	63	80

near by formal schools and other centers implemented by NGOS. Specifically, they pinpointed out that there were great shortages of textbooks. Except at two centers (*Anano* and *Wayiso No.1*), learners at the other centers did not get any book to take home. At *Anano*, 5 or 6 learners used to share one book of one subject for one week and get another subject the next week. This was going on turn-by-turn in which case each learner used to get one type of the textbook monthly. At *Wayiso No.1*, seven learners used to share one textbook permanently.

The data from the respective subjects and personal observation further revealed that at *Propride Entoto* centers of Addis Ababa and *Action Aid* centers of SNNPR, there were Minimum Learning competency and syllabi for facilitators' references, where as learners used (at their respective centers) the few available curricula materials developed by AAE and North Shewa Zonal education department of the Amhara Region. At *Entoto Amba*, *worabet Shama*, and *Batu No.2*, however, the learners had never seen any face of textbooks. Their facilitators used to teach using the materials developed for adults, formal schools and outdated reference materials. The children were given home works and notes on blackboards. They pointed out that they faced difficulties for doing the home works.

Further investigations using checklists indicated that at all NFBPE centers there were great shortages of curricula materials overall; and the subjects commonly taught were the English Language, Environmental Science, and Mathematics (at all the phases). Amharic was given in Addis Ababa throughout all the phases, and in SNNPR at phase III. In Oromia and SNNPR, Afan Oromo and Siltenya respectively were given throughout all the phases.

The data gathered using the checklist made the critical shortages of curricula materials more vivid almost at all the NFBPE centers. Overall, the extent of the availability of curricula materials varied from center to center. Appendix D presents the specific quantity of the curricula materials available at each NFBPE centers observed.

4.2.5 Prominent Factors that Facilitate or Inhibit the NFBPE Program Implementation

4.2.5.1 The Facilitating Factors of the NFBPE Program Implementation

Requested to write prominent factors that had facilitated the NFBPE program implementation practices, 92% of the total respondents replied to the specific question by writing. Common points of their responses have been summarized as follows:

- Community participation and support in giving places or plots of land where to construct centers, free labor, materials, and serving as committee of the NFBPE centers, which in turn boosted ownership sentiments. At all the NGO-implemented NFBPE centers, community representatives had leading roles in site and facilitators' selections, and decisions of scheduling. In line with this, initiating local females to engage in leadership of the program and recruiting and assigning females to teach (particularly in Addis Ababa) had attracted more girls to join and continue.
- Commitment, support and willingness of the sponsoring and implementing NGOs so as to introduce, disseminate, and implement the innovative approach (ACCESS) had served as a model to be replicated by other NGOs and government agents. Most NGOs had the roles of training facilitators, paying their salaries, upgrading the awareness of the community, arranging and making available different services for the community. These in turn enhanced the implementation of the NFBPE programs. In line with this, it was indicated that their commitment to promote learner-centered approach, gender sensitive practices, cost-effective ways of implementation and their support by giving materials, financial, and technical assistances and visiting and discussing with children and the community enhanced morale of the children and that of their parents.
- The flexibility, adaptability and cost-effectiveness of the NGO-implemented NFBPE program implementation and proximity of the centers to the learners' homes had made learners; particularly females join, stay and complete the program. In line with this, its

accessibility to all with no any discrimination by age, sex, economic, social or cultural status; enhancing wise use of time; encouraging the experiences of putting the children in discussions of local, social and economic affairs, and their being need-driven; using formal school classrooms (in the evening at *Entoto Amba* of Addis Ababa, early in the morning at Batu NO. 2 of Oromia), and shift systems at five NGO-implemented centers enabled the learners to continue on their usual economic, social and cultural responsibilities.

- Recruitment of local facilitators who knew the social, language, culture and needs of the community and the children; and making their trainings program-centered and simple; upgrading their capacity through continuous training every quarter for five days (particularly at NGO-implemented NFBPE programs);
- Possibility to join formal school or linkage of its implementation to the formal program in terms of transference and promotion from NFBPE to the formal program, although there were limitations and stringent conditions in ascertaining the possibility;
- Conducting competition contests among learners, rewarding those who did better, and consequently grouping learners according to their abilities and potentialities, rather than according to their ages;
- Joint commitment of NGOs, facilitators, community and learners and hostage of the government agents at different levels; continuous follow-up and discussions with parents and children about social, economic and cultural issues; the alternative approach's getting recognitions among community, government, learners, and facilitators; using locally available teaching and learning materials and economically organizing the community were among the factors that the respondents indicated as facilitating the implementation practices of the sub-sector.

The focus group discussion and interview participants had also indicated that flexibility and adaptability of the program implementation, accessibility to all irrespective of age, sex, religious sects had a positive impact on enhancing enrollment, retention and achievement of learners, particularly females.

They also indicated that modest salary that the facilitators were provided by NGOS, follow-up of the committee, coordinators, and facilitators; lack of direct and indirect cost, provision of four years formal education within 3 years with equal and reasonable quality were among the factors that were said to facilitate the implementation practices of the sub-sector.

Particularly, focus group discussion and the interview participants at NGO-implemented NFBPE program had revealed that the respective NGOs (AAE and RCWDA) had supported local community by providing grinding mills; water, health, and loan services. These had in turn boosted parents' morale to enroll their children and keep them there. As one interviewee from NGO-implemented NFBPE program had pointed “integrated development approach, strong and genuine community empowerment, selection of facilitators from within and by the community, and strong lobby and advocacy by implementing agencies” had facilitated the NFBPE program implementation. The same sources further noted that expediting NGO-experiences, and utilization of formal school resources, facilities, and volunteers by government-implemented NFBPE programs also facilitated the implementation practices of the sub-sectors.

4.2.5.2 NFBPE Program Implementation Problems/Inhibiting Factors

Requested to rate the degree to which the factors listed in the left side column of Table 19 inhibited the implementation practices of the NFBPE, 99 percent of all the respondents had made their ratings variously. Their detailed responses, showing government-and NGO-implementing agents, have been shown in Appendix E. The averages, however, have been summarized by count and percentage in Table 19 below.

As can be seen from table 19 (below), 24 percent of the respondents indicated that lack of government implementation strategies or guidelines that were clearly or precisely indicated to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement NFBPE had very greatly inhibited the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs both by government and NGOs. Similarly, 22 percent of the respondents indicated that lack of clear-cut implementation guidelines to maintain the linkage of non-formal and formal education programs in terms of promotion and transference had greatly inhibited the implementation practices of the program.

On the other hand, 50, 37, 32, and 29 of them indicated that NGOs' lack of appropriate recognition for NFBPE program implementation, separation of the planning and implementation activities of the NFBPE program, lack of trust among different stakeholders of the NFBPE program implementation, and shortage of time from planning to implementation of the NFBPE program did not have any inhibiting impact.

TABLE 19: Respondents' Ratings of the Degree To which the Factors Listed in the Left side Column of the following Table inhibit the Implementation Practices of the NFBPE Programs

Inhibiting Factors	Degree of Inhibiting Impact										Of the Total	
	Very Greatly		Greatly		Low		Very Low		No Inhibiting Impact			
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Separation of the planning and implementation activities of the NFBPE program	7	9	17	22	14	18	12	15	29	37	79	100
Lack of trust among different stakeholders of the NFBPE program implementation	6	8	15	19	15	19	17	22	25	32	78	99
NFBPE program implementation stakeholders' lack of awareness about government strategies to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement the program	12	16	8	10	26	39	18	23	13	17	77	97
Lack of government implementation strategies that are clearly or precisely indicated to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement NFBPE program	19	24	7	19	16	20	13	17	11	14	79	100
Lack of clear-cut implementation guidelines to maintain the linkage of non-formal and formal education programs in terms of promotion and transference	17	22	19	4	15	13	11	14	16	21	78	99
NFBPE program implementation still suffers from lack of appropriate recognition from the: • Parents	11	14	10	13	25	34	13	17	18	23	77	97
• Government agents	6	8	10	13	28	37	18	23	15	20	77	97
• NGOS	5	7	4	5	7	10	21	28	37	50	74	94
Time from planning to implementation of the NFBPE program is too short	8	11	16	21	16	21	13	17	22	29	75	95
Total (Average)	10	13	14	18	14	18	18	23	22	28	78	99

Further requested to write major NFBPE program implementation problems/inhibiting factors and their possible solutions, 86 percent of the subjects responded. Their common responses have been summarized below.

- Low or absence of the required capacity at woreda education offices to implement the innovative approach;
- Community had economic problems and lived dispersed/in scattered manner;
- NFBPE centers did not have fences, adequate compounds for sports, co-curricular activities, furniture, etc.

- Sustainability problems: Very little attention was given by concerned stakeholders to guarantee sustainability;
- Resource constraints, particularly in NFBPE centers implemented by government;
- Lack of common/mutual understanding among government, community and other sector offices pertaining to the importance of the NFBPE program as an alternative route to education and as problem-solving mechanism;
- Lack of program-specific curricula materials (except at RCWDA and to some extent at AAE projects);
- Inconvenience of learning rooms: many of the NFBPE Learning rooms were disrupted by heavy rain and weather conditions;
- Attrition of the facilitators after long years' experiences, particularly ant government-implemented NFBPE centers;
- Lack of clear and uniform government guidelines on NFBPE implementation practices;
- Resistance from government agents to adapt/accept the innovative activities of NGOs in its development endeavors;
- Due to unavailability of the second cycle of the formal primary schools at some rural areas, girls as well as small children had fears where to join after they had completed the program at the NFBPE centers and low accommodation capacity of those available to accept NFBPE graduates at different levels;
- Dependency on external financial resources/donor-driven program;
- The awareness level of the community pertaining to the right of every citizen for basic education was low;
- Starvation, draught, and seasonal mosquitoes occasionally disrupt the implementation of the programs;

- Lack of female facilitators (at least as models), particularly at rural NFBPE centers;
- Lack of appropriate coordination and integration between the activities of government agents and NGO agents on the same purpose;
- Lack of program-specific curricula materials, and scarcity of the available ones;
- High dropout, particularly at NFBPE programs ran by government. This was aggravated on account of economic problems and rigidity of the program implementation for those who were working in private homes, assisting their families who were making a living by farming, weaving, and petty trading.

The focus group discussion and interview participants had also indicated that fear of sustainability; stringent requirements of the formal schools to admit learners who came from NFBPE programs; facilitators' searching other alternatives quitting NFBPE program; lack of light, shortage of textbooks; lack of institutionalized certificate for the learners that could be equally recognized and accepted by formal school implementers; and lack of specific implementation guidelines for smooth promotion of NFBPE learners to formal schools (with out delay or postponement by the name of entrance exam) were some of the commonly raised inhibiting factors of the NFBPE program implementation.

Further, resistance by government agents to accept the flexible program in time, place and approach; unavailability, irrelevancy and shortage of curricula materials in particular and educational materials supply in general and low local resource mobilization were cited by NGO representatives as inhibiting factors of the program implementation.

Of the inhibiting factors peculiar to government-implemented NFBPE programs:

- Relatively high absenteeism,
- Delay of salary even up to two or more months,

- Lack of continuous training for facilitators,
- Lack of program-specific recurrent budget to run NFBPE,
- No or low salary for facilitators, and inefficient handling of children and the learning rooms were commonly cited.

Of the possible solutions suggested by the subjects, the following were frequently cited:

- Government should view NFBPE implementation as the best alternative route to ascertain the universal primary education by 2015. Consequently, government should take actions to upgrade NFBPE personnel's capacities working at woreda level; develop clear and workable NFBPE program implementation guidelines; and coordinate all efforts geared to the program, open forums for discussion, initiate different stakeholders to support, and develop curricula materials for the sub-sector;
- All stakeholders should work collaboratively to construct schools that could accommodate NFBPE graduates; support poor learners by providing exercise books, pens, and pencils; upgrading the awareness of all concerned stakeholders through conducting panel discussions; seminars, workshops, long and short term trainings;
- Supporting the program implementation materially, financially and assigning adequate and appropriately trained man power;
- Research works that intensify government efforts to the implementation of the sub-sector should be encouraged;
- Mechanisms to make facilitators permanent employees should be sought,
- Government and NGO agents should work hand in hand to extend grades at the NFBPE centers so that the learners, particularly girls could be motivated;
- Mobilizing local financial resources and encouraging revenue generation mechanisms geared to sustainability;

- Encouraging more flexible calendar as per community demands, particularly at government-implemented NFBPE program implementations;
- Mechanisms should be created to give textbooks to individual learners or small groups;
- The existing Policy and strategy pertaining to the NFBPE program implementation should be scrutinized and revised,
- Planning and preparations should be made to take over the NGO efforts by the community or government during Phase out of the NFBPE programs. For this, joint commitment and inspirations are required of all stakeholders;
- The implementation practices of the NFBPE program should address the economic, social, and cultural needs of children in particular and the community in general. Finally, the focus group discussion participants at *kebele 08* of the *Propride Entoto* in Addis Ababa had recommended that the schools should regularly invite parents to talk over the problems that might threaten the implementation practices of the sub-sector.

4.2.6 Recommendable/Best Implementation practices of the NFBPE Program

Requested to list down the best implementation practices of the NFBPE program that could be recommended for the formal program implementation, 85 % of the subjects had responded. Their common views have been enumerated below:

- Flexibility according to local circumstances, encouraging seasonal/local specific school calendar;
- Initiating, encouraging and supporting girls to join, continue and complete;
- Empowering learners and the community to participate in any decision of the implementation; promoting learner-centered methodology-group works, use of learning technologies (locally available), and giving home works by group according to their choices;

- Recruiting facilitators from and by the local community, giving reasonable program-specific initial and on-job-training, and modest stipend, promoting their close and strong bondage with the learners, parents and the community;
- Encouraging multi-grouping and multi-grade system: where different sorts of learners (in ability) are available in a class, grouping the learners according to their abilities (not according to their ages); where there is shortage of teachers, adapting multi-grade systems;
- Identifying and making special support for poor children who might drop out from learning due to financial, and material constraints;
- Establishing low-cost and simple learning centers near to learners homes;
- Promoting participatory approach and inspiring the sense of ownership among learners and the community through establishment of the parent committee and upgrading their capacities through different workshops, seminars, experience sharing, designing and developing curricula materials by active participation of stakeholders;
- Close follow-up, support to learners and monitoring the whole implementation of the program by stakeholders; and
- Small class-size (commonly 40 to 50 students per class).

According to the data obtained from focus group discussion and interview participants, NGO-implemented programs were said to be flexible in terms of learning time, place, and management; community involvement in planning, monitoring and evaluation of the program; facilitator selection, and control; the learner-centered approach; cost-effectiveness; low drop out rate; high female participation; boosting commitment of facilitators, NGOs and committee members; localizing curriculum and the implementation practices; and local resource mobilization or utilization. These were among the best implementation practices of the

NFBPE program that could be recommended for the comparable formal program implementation.

4.4 DISCUSSIONS

So far, the data gathered from different sources were presented and analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively in the background descriptions and under each basic research questions. In this sub-section, common issues have been brought together and briefly discussed under the respective themes of the research questions.

Implementation Practices in Fulfilling the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/community

The quantitative analysis of the data obtained through the questionnaire indicated that the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs were valued by the respondents to be *somewhat more than satisfactorily* fulfilled the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents or the community (an average mean of 3.30). The t-test on this specific issue showed no significant differences between the responses of the representatives of the government-and NGO-implemented NFBPE programs, except on one point: "the provision of quality education to learners". Only on this particular point did the means of the responses of the two parties significantly vary with a t-value of -2.3 that has a significant difference at an alpha level less than 0.05. Plainly, the mean of NGO-agents was significantly greater than that of government-agents. The focus group discussion and interview participants also revealed that the learners could develop reading, writing and numeric skills. Reduced home-school distance, no-or low-cost of learning, and the flexible schedules (particularly at the NGO-implemented centers), attracted the children and consequently satisfied the demands of the parents.

Further qualitative analyses of the data, nonetheless, revealed that low coverage, and less flexibility of the government-implemented NFBPE programs, and stringent requirements of the formal primary schools to accept learners coming from NFBPE centers limited the extent of the NFBPE program implementation practices in fulfilling the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents or community. Particularly, the focus group discussion participants at the government-implemented NFBPE centers indicated that the implementation practices did not fulfill the demands of the parents or the community to the level of satisfaction for the following reasons:

- Irresponsiveness of the facilitators due to lack or low salary, and trainings, and
- Parents' persistent concerns for their kids due to the unfavorable conditions of the physical environments and scheduling of the programs.

It has also been further indicated that there was low mutual trust among the different implementation stakeholders, and the local community had low awareness about the rationales for and implementation practices of the NFBPE programs particularly at government-implemented centers. Moreover, the low intake capacities of all the NFBPE centers, except *Entoto Amba* and *Batu No. 2*, also restricted or limited the learning chances of many out-of-school children in the respective communities. Overall, the implementation practices were valued as low in fulfilling the learning needs of all out-of-school children and the demands of parents/community.

The Extent to which the Linkage between the NFBPE and Formal Education Program implementation practices promotes smooth Transference or Promotion of Learners from one program to the other.

Even though the linkage between the implementation practices of the NFBPE and the formal programs was rated high (88.6 %), the extent of the linkage in promoting smooth transference

or promotion of students from one program to the other was rated as *medium* by the respondents, and *small* by the interviewees. Numerous problems related to this were enumerated:

- Lack of mutual understanding between NFBPE and formal school implementing agents, which of course had been procrastinating and delaying to admit NFBPE learners by the name of entrance exam, and other stringent requirements of the formal schools;
- Rigidity of the formal school programs to coincide with the flexible approaches of the NFBPE program implementation, and unavailability of the second cycle formal primary schools in the vicinities and low accommodation capacity of the few available ones to accommodate learners who graduated from NFBPE programs.

Differences and Similarities between NGO-and government-implementation practices of the NFBPE programs

The analyses of the data from the preliminary part of the questionnaire indicated that 67% and 18% of the facilitators at government-and NGO-implemented NFBPE programs respectively did not have initial trainings. Similarly, 24% and 21% respectively did not have on-job training. Moreover, no any facilitator from government-implemented centers had got on-job training of above 30 days, where as 6%, 3% and 35% of the facilitators at NGO-implemented centers had on-job training of 31-60, 61-90, and above 90 days respectively. The focus group discussion and interview participants also confirmed that facilitators at NGO-implemented NFBPE centers used to get a quarterly training (once in three months) for 5 days.

Similarly, as tested by Levene's test of equality of variances, there were very great differences between the salaries of the facilitators at NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs. Of the facilitators included in this study from government-implemented programs,

3 (out of 21) did not have any stipend; the minimum and the maximum monthly salaries were 70 and 150 Ethiopian Birr respectively. On the other hand, all the facilitators at the NGO-implemented centers had monthly salaries; the minimum and maximum were 120 and 560 respectively.

The analysis of the data obtained by observation checklists also indicated that of the NFBPE learners enrolled at the beginning of the 1994 Ethiopian academic year, 99% and 56% were available until February 2002 (the time when the centers were visited) at NGO-and government-implemented programs respectively.

The results of the quantitative analyses of the data obtained by questionnaire also indicate that NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices had no significant correlation, except on two points. Both had low means pertaining to the adequacy of textbooks at the NFBPE centers with a correlation coefficient of .30 at a significant level of 0.03; and *to enable the learners join and continue formal education programs* with a correlation coefficient of .43 at a significant level of 0.002--both at significant levels of less than 0.05.

NGO-implemented NFBPE programs were conducted mostly in shifts, provided stationery for the learners and modest salary for the facilitators, had strong follow-up, relatively adequate facilities, continuous trainings for facilitators, and had lower dropout rate; where as government-implemented programs were mostly conducted when the formal schools were not in session, provided no or low salary, low follow-up, low facilities, lower facilitators' training, and had relatively higher dropout rates.

Similarly, the result of the analysis of the data obtained from the interviewees revealed that at NGO-implemented NFBPE programs, the facilitators were selected from and by the local community, there were initial and continuous trainings, had flexible schedule, promoted retention rates, managed and monitored by local community; where as at government-implemented NFBPE programs, volunteers and formal school teachers were utilized, there were less initial and continuous training, there was very low flexible schedule, and commonly managed by government agents.

The qualitative and quantitative analyses also indicated that NGO-implemented programs had relatively more quantity and quality curricula materials overall. This implies that NGO-implemented NFBPE programs had more innovative and affirmative practices than government-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices.

The similarities of the two-implementation practices include: at both programs, there was possibility of joining and continuing formal school programs, both provided basic learning contents and enabled the learners to read, write and solve simple arithmetic calculations.

The Extent of the Availability of Curricula Materials

The findings indicated that there were great shortages of curricula materials, severely at government-implemented NFBPE centers. Only 16%, 37%, and 2% of the respondents indicated that adequate textbooks, facilitators' guides, and supplementary (source) curricula materials respectively were available at government-implemented centers. On the other hand, 43%, 49%, and 13% of the respondents who filled for the NGO-implemented centers

indicated that adequate *textbooks, facilitators' guides, and supplementary (source) curricula materials* respectively were available.

The analysis of the data obtained from observation checklists further revealed that both NGO and government implemented NFBPE centers did not have adequate curricula materials. At all the centers, except two (*Anano* and *Wayiso No.1* of RCWDA centers), learners did not have any textbook in particular and other curricula materials in general. At these two centers, too, there was great scarcity of the curricula materials except facilitators' guides for all subjects taught. Both NGO-and government-implemented centers did not have adequate supplementary (source) materials. In comparison, however, NGO-implemented programs had relatively more quantity and quality curricula materials overall.

Further inquiries also confirmed that even the available curricula materials, in most cases, were not developed for the respective specific programs. At some NFBPE centers, the first cycle formal primary school curricula were used for the out-of-school children program implementation. Others used the curricula materials prepared for Adult program. Still in other cases Minimum Learning Continuum for the same program had been designed and utilized. It was only at RCWDA NFBPE centers that region-specific curricula materials were utilized, yet scarce in quantity.

Prominent Factors that Facilitated the Implementation Practices of the NFBPE Programs

Community participation, commitment of NGOs, flexibility, adaptability, cost-effectiveness, recruiting facilitators from and by the community and giving initial and continuous program-

specific trainings (particularly at NGO-implemented programs) were the prominent factors that facilitated the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs. These were among the best implementation practices of the NFBPE programs that have been recommended for the comparable formal education program implementation practices.

It was also indicated that government-implemented NFBPE centers directly or indirectly expedited the aforementioned facilitating factors of the NGO-implementing centers. The other facilitating factors at the government-implemented NFBPE centers were utilization of formal school facilities, premises, and personnel, volunteer facilitators, and above all the making of the chances available for those children who, for various reasons, were out-of-school.

Inhibiting Factors of the NFBPE program Implementation Practices

The qualitative and quantitative analyses of the data revealed that lack of clear-cut implementation guidelines to maintain the linkage of non-formal and formal education programs in terms of promotion and transference of learners from one program to the other, and to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement NFBPE; low personnel capacity at woreda level; resource constraints, specially at government-implemented NFBPE centers; fear of sustainability; unavailability of nearby second cycle of the primary school and low intake capacity of the available ones; unavailability and /or shortage of program-specific curricula materials, and attrition of facilitators due to no-or low-remuneration at government-implemented NFBPE centers substantially inhibited the overall implementation practices of the NFBPE programs.

Best Implementation Practices of the NFBPE Programs

NGO-implemented programs were said to be flexible in terms of learning time, place, and management. In line with this, community involvement in planning, monitoring and evaluation of the program; facilitator selection, and control; the learner-centered approach; cost-effectiveness; low drop out rate; high female participation; boosting commitment of facilitators, NGOs and committee members; localizing curriculum and the implementation practices; and local resource mobilization or utilization, multi-grouping and multi-grading approaches were commonly indicated as the best implementation practices of the NFBPE program that could be recommended for the comparable formal school program implementation.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

To investigate the implementation practices of *NFBPE* programs in 9 selected centers of Addis Ababa, Oromia and *SNNPR*, six basic questions were raised. Based on these basic questions, a questionnaire, focus group discussion and interview guide questions, and observation checklists were developed.

Data were collected using the questionnaire from 55 facilitators; 24 officials (3 NGOS and 21 government agents); focus group discussion guides with 90 learners and 27 parents/representatives; and interview guides with 2 MOE and 3 NGO representatives. The data were presented, quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed and discussed under each pertinent research questions. This chapter, thus, presents the summary of the major findings of the study and then concludes on the basis of these findings. Finally, feasible recommendations have been provided.

5.1 SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS

From the overall analyses of the data obtained from different sources and the discussions made so far, the following major findings have been obtained.

1. It was valued by the data sources that the implementation practices of the *NFBPE* programs enabled the learners (who got the opportunity to join) develop reading, writing and numeric skills. The proximity of the *NFBPE* centers to the learners' homes, low-and no-cost, and

flexible schedules of the implementation practices (particularly at NGO-implemented centers) were also said to attract out-of-school children in the vicinities and consequently fulfilled the demands of their parents.

On the other hand, the low coverage and intake capacities of the NFBPE centers, the less flexibility of the government-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices to be adaptable to the social, economic and cultural needs of the learners and the parents, lack of transparency among different level implementation stakeholders and low awareness of the community about the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs substantially inhibited the implementation practices to fulfill the learners' learning needs and the demands of the parents or community to the required level of satisfaction.

2. The existing linkage between the formal and NFBPE program implementation practices was medium to low in facilitating smooth promotion or transference of the learners from one program to the other. Of the several reasons cited for this include stringent requirements and rigidity of the formal schools, resistance of the government agents to accept innovations, unavailability of clear-cut NFBPE program implementation guidelines that could strengthen the practicality of smooth transference and promotion of learners from one program to the other.

3. Both government-and NGO-implemented NFBPE programs used to provide basic learning contents, exercise the possibilities of transferring learners to formal primary schools and had shortage of curricula materials. Apart from these, no prominent similarities were observed between them. By all comparisons, NGO-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices had attracted more positive valuations from the

respondents, focus group discussion and interview participants. The data obtained by observation checklists also confirmed the relative efficiency of the NGO-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices more so than that of the government-implemented program. Simplistically:

- The majority of the facilitators at the government-implemented NFBPE centers did not get pre-service and on-job trainings. Similarly, no one facilitator from government-implemented NFBPE centers got on-job training of above 30 days. On the other hand, more facilitators at NGO-implemented NFBPE centers got comparatively adequate pre-service and on-job trainings.
- As tested using Levene's t-test of equality of variances, there was significant difference between the salaries of the facilitators at government-and NGO-implemented NFBPE centers. Facilitators at government-implemented NFBPE centers were paid lower remunerations than those at NGO-implemented centers. At the extreme cases, three (out of 21) facilitators at the government implemented NFBPE centers were giving free services merely to get certificate of participation that might help them to join other options.
- Based on the 1994 Ethiopian academic year, it was found out that 99 and 56 percent of the learners enrolled in September, 2001 at the NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE centers respectively were available until February, 2002;
- From the analyses of the data obtained from all the sources, it was found that NGO-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices encouraged more flexible schedule, locally adaptable and participatory actions in overall management, timing, selection and control of facilitators.

4. The qualitative and quantitative analyses of all the data indicated that there were great shortages of curricula materials, severely at government-implemented NFBPE centers. NFBPE centers implemented by government agents did not have adequate materials even for facilitators let alone for the learners. This finding coincides with those obtained by MOE/ICDR (1999) and MOE (2000) that indicate "...shortages of curricula materials were the major constraints" at many NFBPE centers in different regions of the country. The few available ones were also not program-specific; rather developed for other contexts (for adults, formal schools, and other areas).
5. It was found that NGO-implemented NFBPE centers were characterized by active community participation in overall management of the programs, flexibility, adaptability, classes situated locally easily within reach of the children, cost-effectiveness, recruitment of local facilitators from and by the local community and giving program-specific initial and on-job trainings, encouraging multi-grouping and multi-grade approaches. These were said to be the factors that facilitated the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs and consequently recommended for the comparable formal program implementation. On the other hand, lack of clear-cut implementation guidelines to enhance promotion of learners from NFBPE centers to formal schools or vice versa and utilize NGO-initiatives, lack of program-specific curricula materials and trained and well paid facilitators, severely at government-implemented NFBPE centers, inhibited the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the foregone major findings of the study, the following conclusions have been drawn.

- The implementation practices of the NFBPE programs enabled the learners (who got the chance to enroll) read, write and solve simple arithmetic calculations. The parents also got satisfactions from the proximity of the NFBPE centers to their homes, low-or no cost and flexible schedule of the NGO-implemented NFBPE programs. The coverage and intake capacities of the NFBPE programs, however, were valued to be too small to satisfy the unmet needs. It was also found that some government-implemented NFBPE programs were not flexible enough to satisfy the parents' demands with regard to their economic needs and the concerns they had for their kids (daughters and small children). In line with this, lack of transparency and mutual trust among implementing agents and low awareness of the community members about the implementation practices had limited the extent of the implementation to fulfill the said needs and the demands. This implies that the planning and implementation practices of NFBPE were hardly based on needs assessments, which could place them on a sound foundation of appropriate coverage and intake capacities and ensure potential supports and commitments for sustainability. Therefore, it can be summed up that the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs overall did not fulfill the learning needs of all out-of-school children and the demands of the parents or the community to the required level.
- Due to the stringent requirements and rigidity of the formal schools, resistance and procrastination of government agents to adapt innovations, unavailability of clear-cut implementation guidelines, there was no smooth promotion or transference of learners from NFBPE programs to formal primary school programs or vice versa.

Consequently, the credentials given from the NFBPE programs were viewed as inferior standard to those given from the comparable formal schools. It is therefore unlikely to create literate environment in which case learners smoothly move from one to the other program as circumstances and their work times force them.

- All analytical comparisons have proved that NGO-implemented NFBPE programs had succeeded in localizing the program and consequently, attracted community support in their overall management aspects and were more efficient in retaining the learners enrolled than those implemented by government (99 % against 56%). In government-implemented NFBPE centers, on the other hand, there was diffusion of responsibilities so as to manage the whole implementation practices as required. Consequently, no adequate trainings and remunerations were available for facilitators, and no flexible schedules were practiced as per the social, economic and cultural roles of the learners and that of their parents demanded. Overall, therefore, there were no significant similarities between the implementation practices of NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs, except that both used to exercise transference of their learners to formal primary schools, both imparted basic learning contents and skills, and both had shortages (though differ in degree) of curricula materials.
- Curricula materials, which are critical ingredients to ascertain quality and standard of education, were scarce at all the centers, severely at the government-implemented NFBPE centers. The findings indicated that appropriate and local-based curricula packages were not available. Such constraints kill the interests of the learners and result in high dropout rates. This coupled with the low quality and quantity of the facilitators inhibited the implementation practices of NFBPE programs particularly at

government-implemented programs. The available ones were also not developed for the respective specific programs. Such practices have two implications. It is impossible to base the implementation practices on the respective social, economic, and cultural contexts of the learners and their parents or the community where the implementation takes place. Second, it is unlikely to realize quality and standard of the program implementation in particular. Simplistically, ensuring locally adaptable curricula standards and comparable learner profiles through out the country is non-existent. In reality, using adult curricula materials for children is neither appropriate nor a just practice. Children and adults have different psychologies and experiences. Using materials developed for other social, cultural and economic contexts is also out of the reality of the context where it is being implemented.

- Even though there were facilitating factors like community participation, flexibility and adaptability of the NGO-implemented NFBPE program implementation practices overall, the inhibiting factors were numerous. Lack of clear-cut NFBPE program implementation guidelines for successful implementation and utilization of NGO-initiatives, resource constraints and low collaboration among different stakeholders, lack of program-specific curricula materials coupled with low-or no-training and attrition of the facilitators at government-implemented NFBPE centers had highly inhibited the implementation practices of the NFBPE programs. These all single out that there was diffusion of responsibilities, and no suitable settings for good partnership that promotes successful implementation of NFBPE programs severely at government-implemented NFBPE programs.
- Flexibility, adaptability, cost-effectiveness, and wise use of resources: man power, material and time, multi-grouping and multi-grading approaches (particularly at NGO-

implemented NFBPE centers) were among the best implementation practices of the NFBPE that were recommended for the comparable formal education implementations.

5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Commitment deepens with success, and success hinges on the program's ability to meet local needs and adapt to local conditions. (Lockheed, Verspoor and associates, 1991:232)

Successful program implementation practices are the product of hard work and inspiration of all stakeholders at different levels. Implementation is too big for any single institution and too important to be left to one party only. Collaborative and concerted efforts are required to ascertain reasonable coverage, intake capacities, smooth promotion or transference of learners from NFBPE programs to formal schools or vice versa, allocate adequate resources, develop local-and program-specific curricula materials and supply adequately to each of the learning centers, and utilize the innovative approaches and initiatives of NGOs.

Successful implementation of NFBPE program, thus, requires perpetual fine-tuning. All NFBPE implementation stakeholders have to make vigorous efforts to change the precarious, ad hoc and inconsistent practices that have jeopardized quality and standard of the sub-sector. Particularly, government agents at different levels should be very much in the “driver's seat”. They need to focus on continuing policy development during implementation rather than rigidly sticking to the policy developed at one time. Much more is, thus, expected of them to regulate the sub-sector by developing workable

guidelines, defining curricula, setting standards and accrediting credentials. This, of course, requires concerted and multifarious efforts of all stakeholders.

Hence, on the basis of the discussions made, the major findings obtained, conclusions arrived at and justifications given above, the following are forwarded so as to initiate promotion of sustainable learning environment, which is the base for sustainable development.

1. Government and NGO agents should work hand in hand to expand the coverage and intake capacities of the NFBPE programs to enable those children who, for various reasons, are not served from the existing (formal or non-formal) educational provisions. To this end, needs assessments should be made at large and consequently, low-cost and flexible schedule learning centers should be made available at all the localities so that all the needy children can learn without being removed from where they live and work.
2. To bring sustainable literate environment and labor force for our rural-based economy, non-formal and formal basic education program implementation practices should be seen (by all concerned stakeholders) as mutually reinforcing partners, one indispensable to the other. To this end, Federal government and Regional States must develop clear and workable NFBPE program implementation guidelines that clearly stipulate anticipated participation of all stakeholders, the roles of formal and non-formal school personnel, and thusly sensitize for smooth promotion and transference of learners from NFBPE program to the comparable formal program or vice versa. Equivalent profiles of the learners should also be expected from both sub-sectors at

comparable levels. Consequently, the credentials received from both must also be given the same or equal values for comparable employment and further learning.

3. Practically, to wait to implement an innovation until we get unanimity is to wait forever. Nonetheless, needs identification, regular consultation with local people and orientation on the rationales for implementing the program, the commitments expected of the different level implementation stakeholders (government agents at different levels, community, NGOs, facilitators and learners) facilitate NFBPE program implementation. Thus, government agents at different levels should identify needs, then orient, train and mobilize all concerned stakeholders to ensure support and commitments for sustainable NFBPE program implementation practices that guarantee all out-of-school children, whose life circumstances and work times do not fit the existing provisions, learn while being engaged in their usual economic, social and cultural roles.
4. Program implementation with no clear directions or guidelines will be implemented, if at all, inconsistently and uncertainly. The availability and utilizations of curricula materials at almost all the NFBPE centers (mainly at government-implemented NFBPE centers) were proved to be scarce, inconsistent and not context-specific. It is therefore, recommended that the Federal government, in collaboration with the Regional States, should issue clear and specific guidelines as to how consistent, region, community and program-specific curricula materials that can also ensure quality and standard be developed and made available in reasonable quantity at all the NFBPE centers for use by facilitators and learners.
5. Mechanisms to make NFBPE facilitators permanent employees should be sought or their future employability should be guaranteed so that they can develop confidence to

stay at the learning centers and feel responsible for overall implementation practices of the NFBPE program.

6. Federal and Regional education planners and implementers should seek ways to adapt the flexible schedules, cost-effective, multi-grouping and multi-grading approaches, and beneficiary-based implementation practices of the NGO-implemented NFBPE program to their respective NFBPE program implementation. Based on the social, economic and cultural demands of the respective communities, and the current decentralization policy, these same practices should also be adapted and utilized for the comparable formal program implementation.
7. Finally, as this study was limited in some respects, the researcher would like to call up on everybody, who has the resources and the capabilities, to further carryout in-depth investigations to come up with more valid and/or comprehensive findings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmed Ali (1998). ACCESS Education Ethiopia: Some Indicators of Impact. AAE (Unpublished).
- Anbesu Biazen. (1999). "Issues of Resources For Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia" in Habtamu Wodnimu, H/G Berhane, and Wanna Leka (eds). **Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia**. A.A.U. Printing Press: Addis Ababa.
- BENE (2001). **Directory: Members of Basic Education Network Ethiopia**. Addis Ababa: Artistic Printing Press
- Best, John W.J. et al (1989). **Research in Education**. (6th ed.). London: Prentice Hall.
- Bishop, G. (1989). **Alternative Strategies for Education**. London & Basingstoke: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Bock, John C. & Papagiannis, George J. (eds). (1983). **Non-formal Education and National Development. A Critical Assessment of Policy, Research and Practice**. Praeger Publishers: USA
- Borg, Walter R. et al. (1983). **Educational Research: An Introduction**. (4th ed.) London: Longman Inc.
- Borich, Gary et al (1995). **Educational Psychology. A Contemporary Approach**. Britain: Harper C.C. Publishers
- Buchert, Lene. (ed.) (1998). **Education Reform in the South in the 1990s**. UNESCO Publishers: France
- Coffield, Frank (ed.). (2000). **The Necessity of Informal Learning**. Great Britain: Hobbs the Printers Ltd.
- Carron, G. & A. Bordia. (eds.). (1985). **Issues in planning and Implementing National Literacy Programs**. UNESCO: International Institute for Educational planning
- Courtney, W. and Kutsch, G. (1978). **Planning and Management of the Integrated Development of Formal and Non-Formal Education**. Parris : UNESCO
- CRDA (2001). **Christian Relief Development Association Data Base**. (Un published)
- Darkenwald, G.G and Merriam, S.B. (1992). **Adult Education: Foundation of Practice**. Harper Collins Publishers: New York.
- Dyyer, Jean Royer (1979). **Understanding and Evaluating Educational Research**. Addison, W.P. Company: U.S.A.
- ESSSR.(1998). **Provision of Non-formal Alternatives for the Expansion of Educational Services**. Berhanenna Selam Printing Enterprise: Addis Ababa
- FAWE NFE Project (2001). **Moving Beyond the Classroom: Expanding Learning Opportunities for Marginalized Population in Ethiopia**. A Draft Report. (UnPublished)
- FDRE (1995). **The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia**. First year, No.1. A.A
- Firdisa Jabessa(2000). "Impediments to do Satisfactory Educational Research work in Line With the New Education and Training Policy", in Amare Asgedom, Derebsa Dufera,

- and Zenebe Baraki (eds.) **Proceedings of National Conference on Current Issues of Educational Research in Ethiopia.** IER: A.A.U Printing press.
- Firdisa Jabessa(2001). **Causes of Educational Inequity in Oromia Region: Focus on Primary Level.** A Research Paper presented at the National Conference on the Quality of Primary Education in Ethiopia, organized by IER, Addis Ababa University, 9-11 November 2001 (to be published)
- Francois, Lois. (1968). **The Right to Education. From Proclamation to Achievement, 1948-1908.** France: UNESCO/Berger Levrault
- Fullan, M. G (1982). **The Meaning of Educational Change.** New York: Teachers College Press
- Fullan, M. G with Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). **The New Meaning of Educational Change.** New York: Teachers College Press
- Gall, Meredith D. et al (1990). **Educational Research: An Introduction.** (6th ed.). London Publishing House.
- Gillette, Margaret (1969). **Readings in the History of Education.** McGraw-Hill: New York
- Habtam Wodnimu, Habtegiorgis Berhane, and wanna Leka (1999) ed. **Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** A.A.U. Printing Press.
- ICDR (1988 E.C). **Revised Adult Non-Formal Basic Education Syllabus.** Amharic version, (Unpublished)
- IIZ/DVV-ETH. (1998). **Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia,** News Letter No.4.
- _____ (1999). **Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** News Letter No.5.
- _____ (2000). **Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** News Letter No.6.
- _____ (2000). **Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** News Letter No.7.
- _____ (2000). **Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** News Letter No.8.
- _____ (2001). **Focus on Adult and Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** News Letter No.9.
- Knowles, M.S. (1980). **The Modern Practice of Adult Education.** Chicago: Folett Publishing Company.
- International Literacy Day, September, 2001 (pamphlate)
- Lockheed, Marlaine E. , Verspoor, Andriaan M., and associates (1991). **Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries.** Washington Dc: Oxford University Press
- Mamo Kebede (1999). “Nonformal Education; Its origins, Meanings and Significance to National Development” in Habtam, Habtegiorgis, and wanna Leka (eds.). **Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.** Addis Ababa: A.A.U. Printing Press.
- Mani, Gomathi. (1984). “Designing Curriculum for Non-formal Adult Education. ” In Mamidi, Malla Reddy and Ravishankar, S. (eds.). **Curriculum Development and Educational Technology.** New Delhi: Sterling Publishers

- Marew Zewdie (Ph.D) (2000). **Curriculum Implementation and Evaluation: A Course Material**. (Unpublished)
- MOE & Fine Arts (1961). **Education in Ethiopia**. Communications Media Center: Addis Ababa
- MOE (1979). **Status Report on Adult Education** (Unpublished).
- ____ (1989). **The Ethiopian National Literacy Campaign Retrospect and Prospects**. EMPDA: Addis Ababa
- ____ (1999). **Education Sector Development Program**. Central Printing Press: Addis Ababa:
- ____ (2001). **ESDP Consolidated National Performance Report: 1999/00 (1992 E.C.)**. (Unpublished)
- ____ (2000). **Alternate Routes to Basic Primary Education**. Addis Ababa: Commercial Printers
- MOE/ICDR (1999). **A Study on the Status of Non-Formal Education in Some Regions of Ethiopia**. Ourael Printing Press: Addis Ababa.
- MOE/ESAA (1999/2000). **Educational Statistics Annual Abstract**. MIS: Addis Abab.
- ____ (2001). **Educational Statistics Annual Abstract**. EMIS: Addis Ababa
- Mulusa, Tom (1990). **Evaluation Research for Beginners: A Practical Guide**. DSE: Bonn.
- NLCCC (1989). **The Ethiopian National Literacy Campaign Retrospects and Prospects, 1979-1989**. EMPDA: Addis Ababa.
- Ornstein, Allan C. and Hunkins, F. P. (1998). **Curriculum Foundations, Principles, and Issues**. (3rd ed.). USA: Allyn and Bacon
- Prakasha et al. (1986). **Extending Basic Learning Opportunities: Challenges And Responses**. Paris: UNESCO-UNICEF
- Prartt, David (1980). **Curriculum: Design and Development**. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Prartt, David (1994). **Curriculum Planning: A Handbook for Professionals**. USA/Florida: Harcourt Brace College Publishers
- Sadker, Mayre Pollac et al. (1988). **Teachers, Schools and Society**. New York: Random House
- Salavin, Rober E. (1984). **Research Methods in Education: A Practical Guide**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Savicevic, Dusan M. (1999). **Adult Education: From Practice to Theory Building** . Peterlang: Frankfurt am Main
- Sharma, Motila (1984). "Planning and Implementing Non-Formal Eduation: A Systems Model" In Mamidi, Malla Reddy and Ravishankar, S. (eds.). **Curriculum Development and Educational Technology**. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers
- Skager, Rodney and Dave, R.H. (eds.)(1877). **Curriculum Evaluation for Life long Education**. Great Britain: Pargamon Press

- Solomon Inquai (1968). "Adult Education in Ethiopia" in Dag hammarskjold Foundation (1969). **Studies in Adult Education in Africa**. Sweden, Uppsala
- Sukhia, P.S, Methrotra, V.P, and Methrotra, R.N. (1974). **Elements of Educational Research**. (3rd ed.). New Delhi: Allied Publishers
- Tekestre Nagash (1996). **Rethinking Education in Ethiopia**. Sweden: Reprocentralen HSC, Upsala.
- TGE/ETP (1994). **Education and Training Policy**. EMPDA: Addis Ababa
- TGE/ESS (1994). **Education Sector Strategy**. EMPDA: Addis Ababa
- Tietjen, Karen. (1991). **Educating Girls: Strategies to Increase Access, Persistence, and Achievement**. Washington Dc. Creative Associates International
- Tilahun Workneh et al. (1997). **Studies of Education in Ethiopi: 1994-1997**. European Union, UNESCO
- Tilahun Workneh (1997). **An English Amharic Glossary of Adult & Non-formal Education Terms**. Addis Ababa: IIZ/DVV (First draft)
- UNESCO (2001). **Literacy and Non-formal Education in the E-9 countries**. France: Grapho print
- _____(2000). **The Right to Education. Towards Education for all through out life**. France: Darantiere.
- _____(1997). **Basic Education for All African Children. Modality for Cooperation**. France, Education sector Brochure
- _____(1977). **Handbook of Curriculum Evaluation**. New York: Long man Inc.
- UNESCO/DF. (2000). **Education for All: Meeting our collective commitments**. France, UNESCO
- United Nations (1991). **Encyclopedia of Human Rights**. Taylor & Francis Inc. New York: Philadelphia. Washington Dc. London.
- Vandycke, Nancy (2001). **Access for the Poor in Europe and Central Asia. Preliminary evidence and Policy Implications. World Bank Technical Paper No. 511**. Washington Dc. : The World Bank
- WCEFA (1990). **Meeting basic Learning Needs: A Vision for the 1990s**. New York: Inter-agency Commission for World Conference on Education for All
- World Bank (1995). **Priorities and Strategies for Education: Development in Practice**. U.S.A: The International bank for Reconstruction and Development
- _____(1998). **Ethiopia Social Sector Report. A World Bank Country Study**. U.S.A: The World Bank
- _____(1999). **Education Sector Strategy**. Washington DC: The World Bank Group
- _____(2000). **Learning programs and Partnerships for Capacity Building in Sub-Saharan Africa**. Washington DC. : The World bank Institute
- ZED/DSE. (1992). **Non-formal Basic Education Program**. German Foundation for International Development, Brochure

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: NGO-implemented NFBE Programs in Different Regions of the Country

No.	NGOs	Region	Program a. Pre-school, b. NFBE for OSc, c. FAL	Curriculum Development	<u>BEN-E</u> <u>Member/partnership</u>
1	Action Aid	A.A, Amhara. Oromia, SNNPR, Tigray, Afar	b & c	Own (MLC)	Supporter and partner
2	AFD	Oromia	b & c	Adapted Gov't Curriculum; Intending to use that of RCWDA	Member
3	APDA	Afar	b & c	Adopted Gov't Curriculum	
4	CDI	Oromia	b & c	Own	
5	EMRDA	Oromia, Afar	b & c	Adapted Gov't NFE curriculum	Member
6	IIZ/DVV	Oromia	b & c	Adapted Gov't Curriculum	
7	Ireland Aid	SNNPR, Tigray	b & c	● Own for grade 3 ● Adapted Gov't Curriculum	
8	KCYDS	Oromia	a, b, & c	● Adapted Gov't Curriculum. ● Recently using; RCWDA's curriculum	Member
9	Progynist	A.A.	a	● From Redd Barna	
10	Propride	A.A.	a & b	Adapted from Action Aid	Member
11	Redd Barna Ethiopia-Norway	Amhara	b & c	Own	
12	RCWDA	Oromia	b & c	Own	Member
13	SCh. USA	A.A. Oromia SNNPR	a, b & c	Adapted Gov't curriculum	Supporter & Partner
14	SOS-Sahel	Amhara	c	Formal curriculum	
15	EDA	Addis Ababa	a, c	From SCh. Sweden; Designed its own	Member
16	ANFEAE	A.A & Oromia	b,c	Govt NFBE; Recently that of RCWDA	Member
17	KCADO	Oromia	a,b,c	Govt FEC; Recently that of RCWDA	Member
18	ADAA	Oromia	b	Govt NFBE; Recently that of RCWDA	Member
19	GANBCWDA	Oromia	b	Govt NFBE; recently that of RCWDA	Member
20	GPSDO	SNNPR	a & c		Member
21	HPDO	Addis Ababa	Disabled and persons with special needs	Adapted, borrowed	Member
22	PCAE	Somalia	b (nomads)		Member
23	VCH	Addis Ababa	b, disabled & persons with special needs		Member

Source: *Adapted from IIZ/DVV-ETH. (2000:20 and 24. No.7); BENE (2001); and primary and secondary sources via telephone from the respective NGOs and government agents.*

APPENDIX B-1: Summary Report of the Reliability calculations

Report	Question No.1	Question No.2	Question No.4 Govt	Question No. 4 NGO	Question No.5	Question No.7	Total
Responded No.	15	14	15	10	14	14	15
Sum	59	56	56	42	35	39	286
Mean	3.9	4.0	3.7	4.2	2.5	2.8	19.1
Stdd	.43	.96	.65	.42	1.04	.69	2.8
Variance	.2	.9	.4	.2	1.07	.5	7.7
$\sum S_i^2$	22	.92	10.23	6.12	15.18	17.06	3.25
S^2	215.92	.92	108.73	33.73	59.34	47.32	7.72
j	21	9	9	7	10	6	62

APPENDIX B-2: Reliability Calculations Using Chronback Alpha Procedures

Question No.	$\frac{j}{j-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum S_i^2}{S^2} \right) \text{ (Chronback Alpha Formula)}$
1	$\frac{21}{20} \left(1 - \frac{22}{215.92} \right) = \frac{21}{20} (0.9) = \underline{0.95}$

4 Govt.	$\frac{9}{8} \left(1 - \frac{10.23}{33.73} \right) = \frac{9}{8} (0.90) = 1.01$
4 NGO	$\frac{9}{8} \left(1 - \frac{6.12}{33.73} \right) = \frac{9}{8} (0.82) = 0.92$
5	$\frac{7}{6} \left(1 - \frac{15.18}{59.35} \right) = \frac{7}{6} (0.74) = 0.86$
7	$\frac{10}{9} \left(1 - \frac{17.06}{47.32} \right) = \frac{10}{9} (0.64) = 0.71$
Total	$\frac{6}{5} \left(1 - \frac{3.25}{7.72} \right) = \frac{6}{5} (0.58) = \underline{0.7}$

Key:- α = reliability; j = number of questions or parts into which the test is divide;

S_i^2 = Variance of the jth part; S^2 = Variance of the total

APPENDIX C: Respondents' Ratings of The Extent of the NFBPE Program Implementation in Fulfilling the Listed Practices Pertaining to the Learners' Learning Needs and the Demands of the Parents/Community

No.	NFBPE Program Implementation practices	Respondents		Mean	Stdd	t-calculated	Significance
		Implementing Agents	No				
1.1	The NFBPE program implementation has provided quality education to learners	Govt	42	3.26	.77	-2.3*	.024
		NGO	35	3.63	.60		
		Sum	77	3.4	.69		
1.2	The NFBPE program implementation has reduced direct cost (e.g. for books, uniform, etc) of schooling	Govt	43	3.05	1.09	.20	.840
		NGO	36	3.00	.93		
		Sum	79	3.02	1.01		
1.3	The NFBPE program implementation has minimized the years of schooling without quality reduction	Govt	43	3.16	.92	-1.5	.140
		NGO	36	3.47	.91		
		Sum	79	3.3	1.92		
1.4	The implementation of NFBPE program has resolved the home-school distance problems	Govt	42	3.43	.91	-1.7	.1000
		NGO	36	3.75	.77		
		Sum	78	3.6	.84		
1.5	The flexibility of the NFBPE program	Govt	43	3.42	.82	-1.7	.1

No.	NFBPE Program Implementation practices	Respondents		Mean	Std	t-calculated	Significance
		Implementing Agents	No				
	implementation has effectively solved dropout problem	NGO	36	3.69	.62		
		Sum	79	3.60	.72		
1.6	The NFBPE program implementation has addressed the needs of girls who were deprived of schooling due to involvement in domestic work and culture	Govt	42	3.76	.58	.35	.729
		NGO	35	3.71	.62		
		Sum	77	3.74	.60		
1.7	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to improve literacy skills	Govt	42	3.61	.53	.84	.404
		NGO	36	3.50	.64		
		Sum	78	3.56	.59		
1.8	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners get basic learning contents (knowledge, skills, values, attitudes)	Govt	43	3.01	.58	1.02	.310
		NGO	36	3.40	.81		
		Sum	79	3.21	.67		
1.9	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to understand their social environment	Govt	43	3.00	.70	.07	.944
		NGO	36	3.50	.77		
		Sum	79	3.20	.74		
1.10	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to understand their physical environment	Govt	43	3.01	.70	-.24	.809
		NGO	35	3.26	.70		
		Sum	78	3.14	.70		
Total/Average		Govt	43	3.20	.77	.99	.44
		NGO	35	3.40	.91		
		Sum	78	3.30	.84		

* There is significant difference

APPENDIX D: Quantity of Curricula Materials available at the NFBPE Centers Observed

centers/ NFBPE Schools	Phases	Text Books					Facilitators' Guide					Syllabus
		Amharic	English	Local Language	Environ- mental Science	Mathe- matics	Amharic	English	Local Lang	Environm- ental Science	Mathe- matics	
Kebele 08	I	15	21	NR	34	27	NR	No	NR	-	-	1
	II	5	5	NR	5	5			NR			1
	III	-	-	NR	-	-	-	-	NR	-	-	1
Kebele 19	I	30	30	NR	30	30			NR			
	II	10	10	NR	10	10			NR			
	III	10	10	NR	10	10			NR			
Entoto Amba	I	*4	*2	NR	1			1	NR	1	4	-
	II	*1	*1	NR	1			1	NR	1	1	-
	III	*1	*1	NR	1			1	NR	1	1	-
Anano	I	NR	4	4	4	4	NR	1	1	1	1	1
	II	NR	4	4	4	4	NR	1	1	1	1	
	III	NR	7	7	7	7	NR	1	1		1	
Wayiso No.1	I	NR	4	4	4	4	NR	-	-	-	-	1
	II	NR	4	4	4	4	NR	1	1	1	1	
	III	NR	7	7	7	7	NR	1	1	1	1	
Batu No.2	I	NR	-	*16	*13	*14	NR	-	-	-	-	1
	II	NR		*17	*2	*1	NR	-	-	-	-	
	III	NR		*17			NR	-	-	-	-	
Kuke	I	NR	2	1	2	1	NR			1	1	
	II	NR	1	1	2	-	NR			1	1	
	III	-	1	1	1	1				1	1	
Wabera	I	NR	4	1	1	1	NR					1
	II	NR	1	1	2	-	NR					1
	III	1	1	1	1	-						1
Worabet shama	I	NR	-	*1	1	1	NR	1	1	1	1	-
	II	NR	*1	*1	1	1	NR	1	1	1	1	-
	III	1	*20	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-

NR= Not Relevant; *Developed for adult program

APPENDIX E: Respondents' Ratings of the Degree to which the Factors listed in the left side column inhibit the Implementation Practices of the NFBPE program

Inhibiting Factors	Respondent (Agents of)	Degree of Impact										Of the Total	
		Very Greatly		Greatly		Low		Very Low		No Inhibiting Impact			
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Separation of the planning and implementation activities of the NFBPE program	Govt	4	9	14	33	11	26	7	16	7	16	43	54
	NGO	3	8	3	8	3	8	5	13	22	61	36	46
	Sum	7	9	17	22	14	18	12	15	29	37	79	100
Lack of trust among different stakeholders of the NFBPE program implementation	Govt	3	7	12	29	10	24	8	19	9	21	42	53
	NGO	3	9	3	1	5	14	9	25	16	144	36	46
	Sum	6	8	15	19	15	19	17	22	25	32	78	99
NFBE program implementation stakeholders' lack of awareness about government strategies or guidelines to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement the program	Govt	6	14	7	17	18	45	8	19	3	7	42	53
	NGO	6	17	1	3	8	23	10	27	10	27	35	44
	Sum	12	16	8	10	26	39	18	23	13	17	77	97
Lack of government implementation strategies or guidelines that are clearly or precisely indicated to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement NFBE program	Govt	10	23	8	10	10	23	8	19	2	4	43	54
	NGO	9	25	13	30	6	17	5	13	9	25	36	46
	Sum	19	24	7	19	16	20	13	17	11	14	79	100
Lack of clear and uniform implementation guidelines to maintain	Govt	7	17	12	29	11	26	5	12	7	16	42	53

	NGO	10	28	7	19	4	11	6	17	9	25	36	46
	Sum	17	22	19	4	15	13	11	14	16	21	78	99
Inhibiting Factors	Respondent (Agents of)	Degree of Impact										Of the Total	
		Very Greatly		Grea tly		Low		Very Low		No Inhibit ing Impact			
		Co unt	%	Co unt	%	Co unt	%	Co unt	%	Co unt	%		
NFBPE program implementation still suffers from lack of appropriate recognition from the: • Parents	Govt	7	17	5	12	16	38	7	17	7	17	42	53
	NGO	4	11	5	14	9	26	6	17	11	31	35	44
	Sum	11	14	10	1	25	34	13	17	18	23	77	97
• Government agents	Govt	3	7	4	9	15	34	9	21	12	28	43	54
	NGO	3	9	6	18	13	38	9	27	3	9	34	43
	Sum	6	8	10	1	28	37	18	23	15	20	77	97
• NGOS	Govt	3	7	3	7	5	12	15	35	17	40	43	54
	NGO	2	7	1	3	2	7	5	19	24	65	31	39
	Sum	5	7	4	5	7	10	21	28	37	50	74	94
Time from planning to implementation of the NFBPE program is too short	Govt	1	2	13	30	13	30	8	19	8	19	43	54
	NGO	7	22	3	10	3	10	5	16	14	44	32	41
	Sum	8	11	16	21	16	21	13	17	22	29	75	95
Total (Average)	Govt	5	13	10	24	8	18	12	29	7	17	42	53
	NGO	5	14	4	11	6	17	6	17	15	42	36	46
	Sum	10	13	14	18	14	18	18	23	22	28	78	99

APPENDICES F1-9: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

APPENDIX F-1: QUESTIONNAIRE

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE FILLED BY FACILITATORS (TEACHERS), OFFICIALS AT WOREDA EDUCATION OFFICES,
ZONAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENTS, AND REGIONAL EDUCATION BUREAUS

Purpose

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather data on the implementation practices of Non-formal Basic Primary Education (NFBPE) Programs for out-of-school children. It intends to examine the value of NFBPE program implementation in fulfilling learners' learning needs and the demands of the community; its linkage (in terms of promotion/transference) to the formal Program; NGO-implemented versus government-implemented NFBPE; availability of curricula materials; facilitating and/or inhibiting factors; and recommendable or best implementation practices of the NFBPE program to that of the formal program. The success of this study, thus, depends on the honesty, earnestness and frankness of your response. The researcher would like to assure you that your responses are strictly confidential.

Thank you!

Student, School of Graduate Studies, Addis Ababa University

Part one: Personal Information

Directions

- i. Please do not write your name.
- ii. Where alternatives are given, please encircle the letter of your choice.
- iii. Where you are required to write specific data, please do so precisely on the spaces provided.

I. To be filled by all

1. You are: A. Facilitator B. Woreda Education Worker C. Zonal Education worker D. Regional Education Bureau worker E. Other (if any) _____
2. Your age: A. Below 20 B. 21-25 C. 26-30 D. 31-35 E. 36-40 F. Above 40 years.
3. Sex A. Male B. Female
4. Your Region: A. Addis Ababa B. Oromia C. SNNPR
5. Your Zone: A. A.A Zone 4 B. East Shewa C. Silte D. _____
6. Your Woreda: A. A.A Woreda 11 B. Adami Tullu C. Dalocha D. _____
7. Your Qualification: A. Below grade 9 B. Grade 10-12 C. 12 and TTI/Equivalent D. Diploma E. B.A/ B.Sc. F. M.A/M.Sc. G. Other(s) _____
8. Your Service years _____

II. To be filled only by Woreda, Zonal and Regional Education Officials

9. Your Current position _____, Since _____ (year)
10. Number of NFBPE Centers for Children that you/your office implement, is funded by: A. Government _____ B. NGOs _____

III. To be filled only by Teachers (Facilitators)

11. Length of training (s) you have got to implement (teach) the NFBPE program: 11.1 Initial
____ days; 11.2 On job ____ days; 11.3 Others (if any)

12 If you are paid A. Monthly salary Birr ____; Other Benefit(s) _____

13. If you are not paid, you are A. Volunteer B. Other Reason(s)

14. Name of Non-Formal Basic Education Center where you are now working

15. Your teaching load per week_____ Periods; length of one period in minutes_____

Part Two: General Questions (To be filled by all)

Directions:

- Where you are required to show your reactions (ratings) by following rating scales, please put an "X" below the number of your choice opposite (parallel) to each statement.
- Where alternative answers are given, please encircle the letter of your choice.
- In answering the open-ended questions, please be as brief as possible. In case you have additional comments, use the back side of the question paper by clearly indicating the number(s).

- Please rate your valuing/assessment of the NFBPE program implementation in fulfilling the practices listed in the left column of the following table.

Response Rating: 4=Very Satisfactorily; 3 = Some what More than satisfactorily; 2= Satisfactorily; 1 = Barely Satisfactorily; 0= Not satisfactorily

No.	NFBPE Program Implementation practices	4	3	2	1	0
1.1	The NFBPE program implementation has provided quality education to learners					
1.2	The NFBPE program implementation has reduced direct cost (e.g. for books, uniform, etc) of schooling					
1.3	The NFBPE program implementation has minimized the years of schooling without quality reduction					
1.4	The implementation of NFBPE program has resolved the home-school distance problems					
1.5	The flexibility of the NFBPE program implementation has effectively solved dropout problem					
1.6	The NFBPE program implementation has addressed the needs of girls who were deprived of schooling due to involvement in domestic work and culture					
1.7	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to improve Literacy skills					
1.8	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to get the basic learning contents (Knowledge, skills, Values, and Attitudes)					
1.9	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to understand their social environment					
1.10	The NFBPE program implementation has enabled the learners to understand their physical environment					

- Is there linkage between the implementation practices of the Non-Formal and the formal basic education programs? A. Yes B. No

3. If your answer to question number 2 was “Yes”, to what extent does the linkage promote smooth promotion and transference of learners (without any difficulty) from the NFBPE program to the formal program or vice versa?

A. Very greatly B. Greatly C. Medium D. Small E. Very small

4. If your answer to question number 3 was “Small” or “Very Small”, please indicate the difficulties/problems resulted (due to lack of appropriate linkage) and suggest what you think to be solutions on the spaces provided below.

Problems/difficulties

Suggested solutions

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

5. Please rate the degree of your agreement showing the differences and similarities that exist between NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs in terms of the statements given in the left side column. Please note that if you know both NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs, fill both columns (under NFBPE implemented by NGOs and Government) comparatively; if not, fill the one that you know.

Response Rating: 4 = Strongly agree; 3 = Agree; 2= Average; 1 = Disagree; 0 = Strongly disagree

No.	Points of comparison	NFBPE Implemented by									
		I. NGOs					II. Government				
		4	3	2	1	0	4	3	2	1	0
5.1	Facilitators are recruited from the community where the NFBPE programs are being implemented										
5.2	Facilitators have got adequate trainings and experiences to promote learning										
5.3	There are adequate textbooks at the NFBPE centers to promote learning										
5.4	The program implementation has promoted learner time utilization										
5.5	The program implementation enables the learners to join and continue formal education programs										
5.6	The NFBPE program implementation has promoted girls' participation										
5.7	The NFBPE program implementation is flexible enough and locally adoptable										
5.8	The NFBPE program implementation promotes actions to fulfill the demands of the local community										

No.	Points of comparison	NFBPE Implemented by									
		I. NGOs					II. Government				
		4	3	2	1	0	4	3	2	1	0
5.9	The NFBPE program implementation promotes actions to fulfill the learning needs of children										
5.10	Other(s)										

6. Please rate the **extent of the availability** of the listed curricula materials per each subject at the NFBPE centers. Please note that if you know both NGO-and government-implemented NFBPE programs, fill both columns (under NGO and Government) comparatively; if not, fill the one that you know.

Response Rating: 4= More than adequate; 3= Adequate; 2= Undecided; 1= Not Adequate; 0= Not available

No.		NFBPE program Implemented by									
		I. NGOs					II. Government				
		4	3	2	1	0	4	3	2	1	0
6.1	Textbooks (overall)										
6.2	Textbooks for the following subjects:										
	• Amharic										
	• English										
	• Mother tongue (_____)										
	• Mathematics										
	• Environmental Science										
	Other(s)										
6.3	Facilitator's/Teacher's Guide (overall)										
6.4	Facilitator's/Teacher's Guide for:										
	• Amharic										
	• English										
	• Mother tongue (_____)										
	• Mathematics										
	• Environmental Science										
	Other(s)										
6.5	Syllabi										
6.6	Flow Chart										
6.7	Workbook										
6.8	Minimum Learning Competency										

No.		NFBPE program Implemented by									
		I. NGOs					II. Government				
		4	3	2	1	0	4	3	2	1	0
6.9	Other(s)										

7. Please write five prominent factors that you think have facilitated the NFBPE program implementation.

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

7. Please rate the degree to which the following factors inhibit the implementation practices of the NFBPE program (both by NGOs and Government).

Response Rating: 4 = Very greatly; 3 = Greatly; 2 = Low; 1= Very low; 0 = No any inhibiting impact

No.	Inhibiting factors	Degree of influence				
		4	3	2	1	0
8.1	Separation of the planning and implementation activities of the NFBPE program					
8.2	Lack of trust among different stakeholders of the NFBE program implementation					
8.3	NFBPE program implementation stakeholders' lack of awareness about government strategies to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement the program					
8.4	Lack of government implementation strategies that are clearly or precisely indicated to utilize the potentials and initiatives of NGOs to implement NFBPE program					
8.5	Lack of clear-cut implementation guidelines to maintain the linkage of Non-formal and Formal education programs in terms of promotion and transference					
8.6	NFBPE program implementation still suffers from lack of appropriate recognition from the:					
	• Parents					
	• Government agents					
	• NGOS					
8.7	Time from planning to implementation of the NFBPE program is too short					
8.8	Other(s)					

9. Please write five major NFBE program implementation problems/inhibiting factors and their possible solutions.

Problems/inhibiting factors

Suggested solutions

- a. _____ a. _____
- _____

- b. _____ b. _____

c. _____ c. _____

d. _____ d. _____
e. _____ e. _____

10. Please list down at least five best implementation practices of the non-formal basic education program for out-of-school children that can be recommended for the formal program implementation.

- 10.1 _____
10.2 _____
10.3 _____
10.4. _____
10.5 _____

APPENDIX F-2: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE- I: WITH LEARNERS

Purpose

The purpose of this guide is to gather information on the implementation practices of Non-Formal Basic Education Program (NFBEP) for out-of-school children. In so doing, learners' valuations of the implementation practices, linkage of NFBEP (in terms of certification, promotion/transference) to the comparable formal programs and availability of curricula materials will be thoroughly discussed. You are requested to give your honest and earnest reactions to the questions. The researcher would like to assure you that your reactions and opinions are strictly confidential. Thank you!

Part I Preliminary Data

1. Region A. Addis Ababa B. Oromia C. SNNPR

2. Zone: A. A.A Zone 4 B. East Shewa C. Jimma D. Silte

3. Woreda: A. A.A Woreda 11 B. Adami Tullu C. Gomma D. Dalocha

9. NFBE center _____

10. Implementer _____

6. Discussants' 6.1 Sex: A. Male ____ B. Female ____ C. Total ____

6.2 Age range: A. Under 7 ____; B. 7 - 9 ____; C. 10 - 12 ____;

D. 13-15; E. Above 15 ____

6.3 Parents' occupation/livelihood (to be listed down):

6. Date _____

7. Place of the Discussion _____

Part II Guiding Questions

1. What are your learning needs that have made you come to this learning center/school?

2. How and from where could you get information to join this program?

3. Do you think that the implementation practices of the NFBE program you are attending fulfill your learning needs? A. Yes B. No

5. If you say, "Yes" how? To what extent?

6. If you say "No" Why?

7. How do you value the implementation practices of the NFBE program in fulfilling the demands of the community/your parents? How?

8. Are there difficulties to join and continue the formal program before or after completion of the different phases of the NFBE program? If you say there are, please mention the difficulties.

9. Are you aware of any similarities and differences that may exist between NGO-and government-implemented NFBE programs? Please mention.

10. To what extent are curricula materials (books & others) available at your learning center?

11. Please tell those curricula materials shared by many learners and those privately owned by each one of the learners. How many students share one book and other curricula materials?

APPENDIX F-3: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION GUIDE-II: WITH PARENTS/REPRESENTATIVES

Purpose

The purpose of this guide question is to gather information on the implementation practices of Non-Formal Basic Education program (NFBEP) for out-of-school children. In so doing, the discussants' valuations of the implementation practices; linkage of NFBEP to the comparable formal programs; impressions on the NGO-and government-implemented NFBEP; facilitating and/or inhibiting factors; and recommendable practices of the NFBEP to the formal program will be thoroughly discussed. You are requested to give your honest and earnest reactions to the questions. The researcher would like to assure you that your reactions and opinions are strictly confidential. Thank you!

Part I: Preliminary Data

1. Region A. Addis Ababa B. Oromia C. SNNPR

2. Zone: A. A.A Zone 4 B. East Shewa C. Jimma D. Silte

3. Woreda: A. A.A Woreda 11 B. Adami Tullu C. Gomma D. Dalocha

4. NFBEP center _____

5. Implementer _____

6. Discussants' 6.1 Sex: A. Male____, B. Female____, C. Total _____

6.2 Age range A. Under 18=____, B. 18__25=____, C. 26__33=____, D. 34__41=____, E. 42__49=____, F. Above 50 ____

6.3 Occupation/livelihood (to be listed):

6.4 Level of education (of each) _____

6.5 Role (reason to be a discussant--committee, parent or Community representative)

7. Date _____

8. Place where the discussion held _____

Part II. Guiding Questions

1. Please tell me the demands of the community/parents (including yours) that are expected from education of their (your) children?
2. How and from where could you get information to enroll your children in this NFBEP program?
3. How do you value the implementation practices of the NFBEP Program at this center in fulfilling your demands? How?
4. Do you think that the implementation of the NFBEP program takes place at convenient time and place (flexibly/adaptably) for you and your children?

5. If you say “yes” has that enabled you and other parents keep your (their) children in the center?
 6. To what extent has the NFBE program implementation practices resolved:
The home-school distance problem?
Parents’ fear of their daughter’s harassment?
Direct cost of schooling?
Any other, please specify.
 7. Have you ever noticed any difficulty to promote/transfer learners from the NFBE center to the formal school program or vice versa? Please mention.
 8. Are you aware of any similarities and differences that may exist between NGO-and government-implemented NFBE programs? Please mention.
 9. What factors do you think have facilitated the NFBE program implementation? How?
 10. Please mention some problems inhibiting the successful implementation of the NFBE program? Also suggest solutions to overcome the problems.
 11. If you have overall comment(s) pertaining to the implementation practices of the NFBE program for out-of-school children? What are they?
- Thank you!

APPENDIX F-4: INTERVIEW GUIDE QUESTIONS I- WITH MOE EDUCATION OFFICIALS

Purpose

The purpose of this Interview is to gather information on the implementation practices of Non-Formal Basic Education Program (NFBEP) for out-of-school children. In so doing, valuations and policy issues of the implementation practices; linkage of NFBEP to the comparable formal programs; impressions on the NGO-and government-implemented NFBEP; facilitating and/or inhibiting factors; and recommendable implementation practices of the NFBEP to that of the formal program will be thoroughly discussed. The success of this study, thus, depends on the honesty, earnestness and frankness of your response. The researcher would like to assure you that your responses are strictly confidential.

Thank you!

Part I: Personal Data

1. Work place _____, 2. Department _____ 3. Panel/Team _____, 4. Your current position _____, since _____ (year), 5. Age _____, 6. Sex _____

7. Qualification _____

8. Year of experience: 8.1. as a teacher _____, 8.2 as a director _____, 8.3 as an educational official _____, others _____

Part II. Guiding Questions

1. How do you value the implementation practices of the NFBE program in fulfilling the: a) learners' learning needs and b) demands of the community/parents? How?

2. To what extent does the linkage of the NFBE program implementation to that of the formal program promote appropriate certification, smooth promotion and transference of learners from one to the other program?

A. Very greatly B. Greatly C. Medium D. Small E. Very small

3. Please tell me your comparison of the differences and similarities that exist between NGO-and government-implemented NFBE programs in terms of those give in the left side column.

Points of comparison	Differences Between the NFBE		Similarities between them
	Implemented by NGO	Implemented by Government	
3.1 Source of Facilitators			
3.2 Training of Facilitators			
3.3 Source of Curricula materials			
3.4 Flexibility of the programs			

3.5 Promoting Retention rates			
3.6 Promoting girls' participation			
3.7 Management and Monitoring practices			
3.8 Linkage to the formal program in terms of transference or promotion			
3.9 other(s) _____			

4. To what extent are the curricula materials available for implementing the NFBE program at all the centers?

5. What program-related factors do you think facilitate NFBE program implementation both by NGOs and government Agents?

6. Please tell me at least five program-related factors that you think inhibit NFBE program implementation both by NGOs and government. Suggest possible solutions to overcome the inhibiting factors

7. Do you think the current implementation practices of the NFBE program ascertain sustainability? A. Yes B. No

8. If your answer to question number 7 was "yes", to what extent?

9. If your answer was "No", please mention any reason(s) you may know and suggest solutions.

10. Please tell me any major implementation practices of the NFBE programs that can be recommended for that of the comparable formal program.

APPENDIX F-5: INTERVIEW GUIDE QUESTIONS II- WITH NGO REPRESENTATIVES

Purpose

The purpose of this Interview is to gather information on the implementation practices of Non-Formal Basic Education Program (NFBEP) for out-of-school children. In so doing, valuations of the NFBE program implementation practices; linkage of NFBEP to the comparable formal programs; impressions on the NGO-and government-implemented NFBEP; facilitating and/or inhibiting factors; and recommendable implementation practices of the NFBEP to that of the formal program will be thoroughly discussed. The success of this study, thus, depends on the honesty, earnestness and frankness of your response. The researcher would like to assure you that your responses are strictly confidential.

Thank you!

Part I: Preliminary Data

Age _____, Sex _____, Qualification _____,
Year of experience--as a teacher____, as a director____, as an educational official____,
others _____
Your current Responsibility (position) _____, at _____,
since _____(year)

Over all operational areas of the educational Project of your organization:

Region(s)____, Zone(s)____, Woreda(s)____, Sites____, NFBECenters____, Total Children learning now _____

Major donor (source of Fund) _____

Part II. Guiding Questions

1. How do you value the implementation practices of the NFBE program in fulfilling the learners' learning needs and demands of the community/parents? Why?
2. Do you think the community has a chance to decide on the NFBE program implementation practices according to its demands? How?
3. To what extent is the NFBE program implementation linked to that of the formal program in terms of certification, smooth promotion and transference of learners from one to the other program? A. Very greatly B. Greatly C. Medium D. Small E. Very small
4. If your answer to question number 3 was "D" or "E", what do you think could be the reason(s)? And what problems have been resulted? Please suggest possible solutions to the problems.

5. Please tell me your comparisons of the differences and similarities that exist between NGO-and government-implemented NFBE programs in terms of the statements given in the left side column.

Points of comparison	Differences Between the NFBE		Similarities between them
	Implemented by NGO	Implemented by Government	
5.1 Source of Facilitators			
5.2 Training of Facilitators			
5.3 Source of Curricula materials			
5.4 Flexibility of the programs			
5.5 Promoting Retention rates			
5.6 Promoting girls' participation			
5.7 Management and Monitoring practices			
5.8 Linkage to the formal program in terms of transference or promotion			
5.9 other(s)_____			

6. To what extent are the curricula materials available for implementing the NFBE program at all the centers?
7. What program-related factors do you think facilitate NFBE program implementation both by NGOs and government Agents?
8. Please tell me 5 major program-related factors that you think inhibit NFBE program implementation both by NGOs and government. Suggest possible solutions to overcome the inhibiting factors.
9. Do you think the current implementation practices of the NFBE program ascertain sustainability?
A. Yes B. No
10. If your answer to question number 9 was “yes”, to what extent?
11. If your answer was “No”, please mention any reason(s) you may know and suggest solutions.

12. Please tell me any major implementation practices of the NFBE programs that can be recommended for that of the comparable formal program.

APPENDIX F-6: CHECKLIST/OBSERVATION GUIDE

1. NFBE Center_____; 1.1 Year of its establishment_____; 1.2 Funded by_____; 1.3 Implemented by_____; 1.4 Location: 1.4.1 Region_____; 1.4.2 Zone_____,; 1.4.3 Woreda_____ 1.4.4 Kebele_____
2. Enrollment, persistence, and transference of learners by Phase, sex and class size at the center (1992-1994)

Year E.C	Learners	Phases						Average Class Size		
		I		II		III		Size		
		Male (M)	Female (F)	M	F	M	F	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III
1994	Enrolled									
	Still learning									
	Transferred to formal school									
	Dropped out									
1993	Enrolled									
	Graduated									
	Transferred to formal school									
	Dropped out									
1992	Enrolled									
	Graduated									
	Transferred to formal school									
	Dropped out									
Total	Enrolled									
	Graduated									
	Transferred to formal school									
	Dropped out									

3. Subjects taught at the NFBE center

Phases	Subjects						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I							
II							
III							

4. Availability of Curricula materials per each phase at the centers

No.	Curricula materials	Available Quantity			Distribution Mechanism	
		Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Purchased	Provided
5.1	Textbooks for the following subjects:					
	• Amharic					
	• English					
	• Regional Language (_____)					
	• Mathematics					
	• Environmental Sci.					
	Other(s)					
5.2	Facilitator's/Teacher's Guide for the subjects					
	• Amharic					
	• English					
	• Regional Language (_____)					
	• Mathematics					
	• Environmental Science					
	Other(s)					
5.3	Flow Chart					
5.4	Facilitator's Guide					
5.5	Syllabi					
5.6	Minimum Learning Competency/continuum					
5.7	Work book					
5.8	Training manual					
5.9	Others (if any)					

4. These Curricula materials were developed by _____ for:

4.1 The formal education program A. Yes B. No

4.2 Children NFBE (this) program A. Yes B. No

4.3 Adult NFE program A. Yes B. No

4.4 Other(s) _____

5. Schedule of the NFBE Program

No.	Parts of the Day	Weekly learning days (M,T, W, Th, F, Sa, Su)		
		Phase I	Phase II	Phase III

1	Early Morning			
2	Late Morning			
3	Early afternoon			
4	Late afternoon			
5	In the Evening			
6	Full Day			
7	Shift			

6. Duration of one period/one day learning time _____hours.