

LOCAL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN  
ALTERNATIVE BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM IN  
NORTH WOLLO: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS



MASTER THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE  
STUDIES OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
FOR THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN  
EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

MARCH, 2007

Addis Ababa University  
School of Graduate Studies

LOCAL COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN ALTERNATIVE  
BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM IN NORTH WOLLO:  
CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

By: Samuel Tadesse Feleke

Approved by the Board of Examination:

Yekunoamlak Alemu (PhD) 09/04/07  
Chairman, Department Graduate  
Committee Date

[Signature]  
Signature

Yalew D. D. D. D. 08/04/07  
Advisor Date Signature

Fenese Baraki (Dr.) 05/04/07  
Internal Examiner Date Signature

Dessu Wirtu (Dr.) 08.04.07  
External Examiner Date Signature

## **Acknowledgments**

My sincere and profound thanks go to Dr.Yalew Ingdayehu, my thesis advisor, for his honest, unreserved guidance and encouragement that helped me so much to complete this study. I also want to express my very special thanks to Ato Abrha Asfaw for his deep concern and devotion of time in giving detail and useful comments. Moreover, I am very much obliged to express my gratitude to my friend, Sebsibe Abera, who provided me his lap top computer through out the time of writing this thesis.

My deepest thanks go to Save the Children Denmark Ethiopia Program for its support in allowing me time to join to the university and for its financial support to write this thesis. My warmest gratitude is extended to all staff members of Save the Children Denmark both at country office and program office (Woldia) for their unreserved encouragement through out the challenging days in the process of writing this thesis. Besides, sincere thanks go to those woreda education experts and heads, ABE facilitators, school cluster supervisors, ABE centre management committees, ABE students as well as parents of Kobo, Meket and Wadla who have rendered great contribution to this study. I am also indebted to Addis Ababa University for the financial support rendered me to cover some part of the expenses of this study.

My irreplaceable heartfelt gratitude goes to my wife Elisabeth Kiflu who supported me so much by shouldering all our family responsibility.

Above all, I thank the Almighty God who gave me the opportunity and helped me in giving health and vigour to do my study from the beginning to the end.

## *Table of Contents*

	<u>PAGE</u>
<i>Acknowledgments</i> .....	<i>i</i>
<i>List of Tables</i> .....	<i>iv</i>
<i>Abbreviations and Acronyms</i> .....	<i>v</i>
<i>ABSTRACT</i> .....	<i>vi</i>

### **CHAPTER - 1**

<b><i>1. The Problem and Its Approach</i></b> .....	<b><i>1</i></b>
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3. Significance of the Study.....	6
1.4. Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.5. Limitations of the Study.....	7
1.6. Research Methodology and Procedure of the Study.....	8
1.6.1 The Study Approach and the Study Model.....	8
1.6.2 Source of Data.....	10
1.6.3 Sampling Technique.....	10
1.6.4 Data Gathering Instruments and Pilot Test.....	11
1.6.5 Data Analysis.....	12
1.7 Operational Definition of Key Terms.....	13
1.8. Organization of the Study.....	14

### **CHAPTER -2**

<b><i>2. Review of Related Literature</i></b> .....	<b><i>15</i></b>
2.1. Community Participation: Concept and Definition.....	15
2.1.1 Community.....	15
2.1.2 Participation.....	17
2.1.3 Community Participation.....	19
2.2. Different Views to the Approach of Community Participation.....	20
2.2.1 Top Down and Bottom Up.....	20
2.2.2 Betting on the Strong Approach.....	21
2.2.3 Community Participation as a Means or an End in Itself.....	22

2.3. Community Participation, Governance and Basic Education .....	23
2.3.1 Interlinked Nature of Governance, Community Participation and Basic Education.....	23
2.3.2 Alternative Basic Education in Relation to Community Participation.....	25
2.3.4 The Role of Community in Basic Education .....	28
2.3.5 Alternative Basic Education and Community Participation: Importance and Forms .....	30
2.3.6 Challenges of Involving Communities in Education .....	35
2.3.7 Improving Practices of Community Participation in the Education Delivery.....	37
2.4. Policy and Government Directives in Community Participation and Alternative Basic Education in Ethiopia .....	40
2.4.1 Policies and Directives in Community Participation .....	40
2.4.2 Policies and Directives in Alternative Basic Education Approaches.....	41
2.5. The Alternative Basic Education in the Amhara Region .....	44
2.5.1 The Emergence of the Program .....	44
2.5.2 Policy Directives in Local Community Participation in the ABEP of the Region.....	46

### **CHAPTER-3**

<b>3. Presentation and Analyses of Data.....</b>	<b>49</b>
3.1. General Background of Respondents .....	49
3.2. Basic Findings of the Study .....	51
3.2.1 Input Related Findings.....	51
3.2.2 Process Related Findings .....	57
3.2.3 Output Related Findings .....	65
3.3 Challenges and Prospects .....	69
3.3.1 Challenges .....	69
3.3.2 Prospects .....	74

### **CHAPTER-4**

<b>4. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>76</b>
4.1. Summary .....	76
4.2. Conclusions .....	82
4.3. Recommendations .....	84
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	

## List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Sample Population of the Study .....	11
2 Respondents by Sex and Age Category .....	49
3 Educational Qualification of Respondents .....	50
4 Experience of Facilitators and Supervisors in Education .....	51
5 Areas and Extent of Local Community Participation in ABECs.....	52
6 Capacity of Supporters and the Local Communities to Provide Support to ABECs .....	53
7 Procedures/Guidelines and their Application to Enhance Local Community Participation .....	55
8 Focus Given to the Program as Indicated by Facilitators and School Cluster Supervisors .....	57
9 Forms and Level of Initiation of the Local Community Participation in ABEP .....	58
10 Approaches Used to let the Local Communities Participate in ABEP...	60
11 Frequency of Feedbacks to the Local Community .....	61
12 Additional Responsibilities of CMC Members .....	62
13 Level of Overlapping of Responsibilities between CMC Members and Kebele Officials .....	63
14 Views on Incentives for Participation .....	64
15 Opinions on Importance and Level of Local Community Participation in ABEP .....	65
16 Decision Power of Local Communities on Major Issues of ABE Centre..	68
17 Level of Interest of the Local Community towards Participating in the ABE Centres .....	69

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

ABE	Alternative Basic Education
ABEC	Alternative Basic Education Centres
ABEP	Alternative Basic Education Program
ANRS	Amhara National Regional State
ARSEB	Amhara Regional State Education Bureau
ATKLT	Amhara Timihirt Kililawi Limat Tibibir
BRAC	Bangladesh – Rural Action Committee
CMC	Centre Management Committee
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CYFWO	Children, Youth and Family Welfare Organization
EFA	Education For all
EPRDF	Ethiopian Peoples Revolutionary Democratic Front
ESDP	Education Sector Development Program
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GO	Government Organization
IPO	Input – Process – Output
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MOE	Ministry Of Education
NGO	Non Government organization
R.E.B.	Regional Education Bureau
SCD	Save the Children Denmark
SCN	Save the Children Norway
TGE	Transitional Government of Ethiopia
UNESCO	United Nations, Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UPE	Universal Primary Education
WCEFA	World Conference on Education For All

## ABSTRACT

*Basic education is a key element to development. Recognizing this, worldwide effort has been made to access basic education for all in a shortest time possible. Hence, alternative approaches such as alternative basic education program (ABEP) came into being. One of the purposes of introducing this alternative approach to basic education is to make a difference in regard to local community participation. It is to create a sense of ownership and to initiate the whole community to participate actively. However, in spite of physical proximity, flexibilities, facilities and other peculiarities of the program, the local communities' involvement in the ABEP seems unsatisfactory, limited and almost all problems that are related to local community participation in the formal program are still persisting. This motivates the researcher to assess the challenges and prospects of the local community participation in the ABEP in the study area (North Wollo).*

*To this end, a descriptive survey method was used as an appropriate methodology to reflect the intended purpose of the study. Besides, the Input – Process – Output (IPO) model was used to identify the available inputs, the nature of the process and the results to identify the challenges and prospects of the local community participation. Relevant data on a wide range of issues pertinent to the study were collected from three woredas of North Wollo namely Kobo, Meket and Wadla. The basic instruments used were questionnaire, focus group discussions and structured interviews. The respondents were education experts, school cluster supervisors, ABE facilitators, ABE centre management committees, ABE students, parents and other local community members.*

*Looking through the process, forms and extents of participation of the local communities, the study identified challenges of local community participation in ABEP and prospects for active participation. The major challenges identified are mismatch of interest and economic capacity of local communities to participate, low level of awareness of local communities on ABEP, lack of adequate and relevant procedures/guidelines, high expectation of external support (donation and other external support), lack of joint planning mechanisms among sectors of the woredas, absence of formal mechanisms to maintain and transform knowledge/information and documents. Consequently, the prospect seems blurred and active participation might not be obtained, unless those obstacles are removed timely.*

*Finally, the study includes recommendations. The major recommendations are: prepare user friendly and relevant procedures/guidelines specifically on ABEP and community participation, design formal mechanism to transfer knowledge/information and documents, provide detail orientation to the local community; and create mechanism to enable government sectors to plan their schedule jointly.*

# CHAPTER - 1

## 1. The Problem and Its Approach

### 1.1. *Background of the Study*

Education is a basis of human life as it is essential for both personal and social developments. It is an essential human virtue, a necessity for society, important for integration of separate entities, the means to reveal significance of life, sign of freedom and basis of good life. Due to this unquestionable and deep-rooted importance of education in life, all other sectors such as agriculture, industry and health highly rely on the outputs of education. As intrinsic behaviour of man, it is believed that education was born with the birth of the human race and shall continue to function as long as the human race lives (Bhatia, 1992: 5-6).

Education is also a core human right and basic education in particular is considered as a key element for fighting poverty. Positive change in quality of life indicators such as health, population growth, environmental protection and life expectancy are positively correlated with basic education. Basic education is also viewed as the great equalizer that would help reduce the wide disparities in conditions of living that existed between the rich and the poor and between rural and urban communities (Bishop 1989: 1). The level of education of citizens of a country, as well, influences political stability and democracy. Because of these key purposes of education, scholars suggested that education should be cared, updated, improved with accelerated pace of the world's demand. In this case, Bishop (1986: 49) states as follows:

The stakes are too great, the dimensions of under - development too staggering, the vicious circles it generates too implacable, for further patience and forbearance. In the life and death struggle against the interlocking strangle- hold of ignorance and poverty, the mission of education is clear. It is to awaken men and nations to the infinite possibilities of growth and change that exist with in them. But education must itself grow and change to carry out that mission. It must see its house in order.

Understanding the importance of basic education and the need to focus on education, international conferences and summits were held and big agreements were made in the last

decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In September 2000, member countries of the United Nations adopted what comes to be known as the Millennium declaration that was incorporated in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). One of these goals is achieving Universal Primary Education (ensuring that all boys and girls enrol and complete primary school) by the year 2015 (SCD, 2004: 4). The agreement made on the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) among nations, in which Ethiopia is one of the signatories, is one of the big treaties of the century. In Article 28 of this international document of the CRC, it is stated that primary education is compulsory and available free to all. In article 29 the development of the child's personality, talents and mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential are highly pronounced (CYFWO, 1992: 45-46).

Ethiopia, as one of the nations, which agreed to achieve goal two, is expected to access all primary school age children by 2015. Thus, creating access to basic education is now among the priority agenda of the government and supported by the education and training document (MOE, 1994:8). It is also stated in ESDP- II to realize the goal of achieving UPE with equity and improved quality (MOE, 2002: 21). That is, UPE is not only a question of access, but also a question of improving efficiency, equity and quality of primary education.

Based on the policy and the plan, the government of Ethiopia has committed itself in accessing basic education to its citizens. Great efforts were made and considerable achievements were recorded for the last ten years. MOE data shows that the GER of basic education of the country reached 79.8 % in 2004/05 (MOE, 2005:3). In spite of the endeavours made, it seems difficult for the country to achieve UPE by the year 2015 unless this country uses alternative strategies to access basic primary education. Because, there is still high regional disparity in enrolment, high dropout and repetition rates, low quality of education, etc.

Understanding this country level problem for accessing basic education vis a vis the international commitment of 2015, regional states of the country have taken strategic measures to accelerate the pace towards expanding basic education. Among the regions, the Amhara Regional State is the one and the pioneer to develop and introduce what is known as "Alternative Basic Education Program" (ABEP) and its zones have been applying the program. North Wollo, one of the 11 zones (apart from North Gondar) of the Amhara Region, is one of the two zones that started

implementing ABEP for the first time in the region in 1997 with the initiation and the support of NGOs.

ABEP is a program as alternative route to the formal basic education system. ABEP targets children who do not have access to basic education in the formal education system due to different economical, cultural, social and geographical problems. The peculiar characteristics of the program include its active local community participation, cost effectiveness, accessibility, and flexibility (in terms of time, place and target). It allows and encourages community participation in a better way than the formal and it is designed to complement the formal education program. The major aims of ABEP are maximizing the participation of out- of- school children in basic education program, increasing the participation of out-of- school girl child, using all means to provide cost effective quality learning and to prepare children to stay in the mainstream of learning (ARSEB, 2005: 1- 7).

The logic behind the alternative means of addressing accessibility in basic education is intended to be attached with the possibility of active local community participation. The effort of enhancing basic education needs to put the local community at the centre of the scene. If it is said that basic education is a ground for community development, it is the community participation that reflects the interest of the grassroots level. Cognizant of this reality, the strategic documents and manuals of basic education point out the demanding need of community participation. In support of this, UNESCO states that if education is to become meaningful, working with communities is demanding to make education relevant to their demands, values, and cultural traditions, as well as to consider social and economic realities at local levels (UNESCO, 2001: 44).

In the process of development, basic education and community participation are inseparable. The involvement of local community in educational management, therefore, was highlighted during global meetings on education. Governments, organizations, agencies, groups, and associations meeting at Dakar World Education Forum, (April 2000), pledged to develop responsive, participatory and accountable systems of educational governance and management and ensure the engagement and participation of civil society in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of strategies for educational development.

The principle of decentralized education system in Ethiopia is supposed to facilitate empowering the local community. Considering the negative effect of centralized management in education during the past, the government has decided to decentralize the education sector to the woreda level. Yodit and et.al., (2005: 22) described the importance of the shift that a decentralized education management system will encourage community participation in decision –making and increase accountability at lower levels. This implies that the community at the grassroots level (kebele) is empowered to administer ABE centres and primary schools. This strategy enables the local people to have a sense of ownership that leads them to maximize their level of participation and resource provision.

As informed by North Wollo Education Department, following the devolution of power to woredas and ABEP strategy to improve access in North Wollo, there are a total of 164 ABE centres, of which 115 or 70.12 percent are financed and managed by the government. The remaining 49 centres have got financial and technical support from NGOs. In 2004/5 the number of children in these ABE centres was 30261. Out of these children 19487 or 64 percent were in the 115 centres financed by the government (SCD, 2004:10).

To support the ABE centres and mobilize local communities, necessary strategy paper and administration manuals were developed and have been applied in the zone, CMCs comprising different members of the local community were established, responsibilities were identified in the manuals, and so on. Thus, this study is to assess the forms and extents of the local community and thereby to identify challenges and prospects of the local community participation in the specified area (North Wollo).

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Educational access is people's agenda. One of the purposes of introducing this alternative approach to basic education is to make a difference in regard to local community participation. It is to create a sense of ownership and to initiate the whole community towards active participation in basic education. North Wollo zone has made efforts in this regard: the zone has tried to apply the designed strategies, developed and used different manuals, set structures and provided trainings to the local communities.

Of course, improvements were observed. The local communities have been constructing classrooms and paying centre guards' salary. Local communities have been participating in annual or bi- annual centre meetings and appoint their people to represent them. However, several evaluation and monitoring reports such as Meket (2004), Kobo – Habru (2001, 2006) and Gidan (2002) Integrated Child Development Projects indicated that still people are not willing to participate as expected. Communities are tied with bi- laws (penalties, enforcements) and they left the whole loads on the shoulder of some committee members. The supervisors and the education office experts have been complaining that the community participation is limited to material contribution and always needs external pressure. Most of the time, the expected community contribution was delayed.

There are also problems even within the committee members. As shown in the monitoring reports of the woreda education offices of the zone, most of the members left the work to few members of the committees. The majority were not willing for planning review meetings unless the call was related with per diem or other personal benefits. Even some felt that they were working for kebele authorities than for his/her community.

In summary, in spite of physical proximity, flexibilities, better facilities provision and other peculiarities of the program, the local communities' involvement in the ABEP seems unsatisfactory and limited. Almost all problems that were related to local community participation in the formal education are still persisting. This makes the researcher curious to assess the challenges and prospects of the local community participation in the ABE centres. Thus, the specific objectives and basic research questions of the study include:

**a) Objectives:**

1. To identify the status of local community participation in alternative basic education.
  - To assess forms and types of local community participation in alternative basic education program.
  - To assess extent of local community participation in alternative basic education program.

2. To identify major challenges of local community participation in the alternative basic education program.
3. To uncover the prospects of active community participation in the ABEP and there by forward solutions.

**b) Basic research questions:**

1. How do the local communities of the zone in practical terms participate in the alternative basic education program?
2. What is the extent of community participation in the alternative basic education program?
3. What are the major challenges of community participation in alternative basic education program in the zone?
4. What is the prospect of local community participation in the alternative basic education program in the zone?

### ***1.3. Significance of the Study***

ABEP is a new approach that emphasizes on local community participation and on developing a sense of ownership to promote sustainability. The program is under replication regionally and nationally. Hence, it needs close follow up and regular updates based on actual practices and studies. Consequently, the findings of studies such as this might contribute greatly for the program's enhancement for the following major reasons:

1. The study may contribute to improve the level of local community participation in alternative basic education program of North Wollo.
2. It may help education supervisors, woreda and zone education officers, and NGOs working in the area to revisit their approaches towards local community participation.
3. The findings of the study may initiate the woreda offices and the zone office to give feed back to the Amhara Regional Education Bureau to design suitable model for local community participation.
4. The study would point out major gaps and challenges in the existing local community participation in the alternative basic education program of the zone and could highlight points to the local communities and grassroots level implementers for improvement.

5. Studies in ABEP in Ethiopia are very limited. This study, therefore, may reinforce others to take up further investigation.

#### ***1.4. Delimitation of the Study***

Since ABEP is a new approach, a thorough study is demanded to assess the elements of the program and come up with practical solutions. However, this study was delimited to a survey of the challenges and prospects of local community participation in the program because of availability of limited time and other resources for the study.

The ABEP has been replicated by the Amhara regional government through out the region (11 administration zones). About 1881 alternative basic education centres were established. However, this study was limited to rural area of North Wollo. It was so due to the zone's special features. The ABEP in the zone was begun in 1997 with the support of NGOs (Few years earlier than most other zones of the region). After some years, the zone education office also took over some ABE centres from NGOs and run them by its own. This relatively better experience of the zone is thought to be a fertile condition for the study. The presence of NGO supported and government run ABE centres in the zone would help the study to identify the challenges and prospects of local community participation in the two situations. Moreover, the government with active involvement of the local communities established 115 centres that cater the educational needs of more than 19,487 children. This actual situation of the area attracted the researcher to focus on North Wollo zone over the other zones.

#### ***1.5. Limitations of the Study***

In the study, it was attempted to collect data from Kebele Education and Training Board (KETB). However, the data collected was not as such satisfactory because the board members were not involved in the ABEP program as they expected to be. Hence, the study has encountered limitation in getting data which would help to crosscheck and to give additional power for the drawn findings.

## ***1.6. Research Methodology and Procedure of the Study***

### **1.6.1 The Study Approach and the Study Model**

This study set to identify the current challenges and prospects of local community participation in alternative basic education program. The local communities' participation in terms of its strength and weakness, gap and its approach was assessed. Thus, a descriptive survey method was used as an appropriate methodology to reflect the intended purpose of the study. Implicitly the study involves qualitative and quantitative approach. Besides, the Input – Process – Output/Outcome (IPO) model was used to identify the available inputs, the nature of the process and the results to evaluate the challenges and prospects of the local community participation in the study area.

## The IPO Model

Input	Process	Output
<p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p><i>Allocation of human power to support the ABE and working capacity</i></p> <p><i>Availability of committee to support ABECs and their capacities</i></p> <p><i>Availability of Procedures/guidelines/bi- laws</i></p> <p><i>Capacity building schemes</i></p> <p><i>(Awareness raising, trainings for committees community members and supporters)</i></p> <p><i>Technical support from the government</i></p> <p><i>Combination of committee members.</i></p> <p><i>Local level governance, decentralization and applications</i></p>	<p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p><i>Involvement of the community in decision making</i></p> <p><i>Structure and steps for community participation</i></p> <p><i>ABE – community partnership</i></p> <p><i>Areas and ways of community participation</i></p> <p><i>Frequency of participation</i></p> <p><i>Problems and challenges in the relationship</i></p> <p><i>Conditions for free and open participations.</i></p> <p><i>Ways of communication- feedbacks/ accountability</i></p> <p><i>Diversified people ( women, Children etc.),</i></p> <p><i>many centred</i></p> <p><i>Open and advertised ways of participation</i></p> <p><i>Open to all ideas</i></p>	<p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <p><i>Sense of ownership</i></p> <p><i>Self initiated support of the community</i></p> <p><i>Satisfaction of the ABE centre by the community Support</i></p> <p><i>Best practices in community participation</i></p> <p><i>Sustainability of contribution</i></p> <p><i>ABE centres constructed</i></p> <p><i>Children who have got access through ABE</i></p>

(Adopted from Jaap Scheerens (no date) Perspective on Educational Quality, Education Indicators and Benchmarking. University of Twente, The Netherlands)

### **1.6.2 Source of Data**

The study used data from both primary and secondary sources. For primary sources, ABE centre students, facilitators, centre management committee members, school cluster supervisors and parents/other local community members were the sources of data from ABE centres. Moreover, sample woredas' education officials were in the study. These data sources were directly or indirectly attached with and influenced by local community participation. Besides, statistical information was sourced from records/documentation such as regulations, procedures, strategy papers, working manuals, supervision and monitoring reports from the woreda education offices.

### **1.6.3 Sampling Technique**

North Wollo zone has nine woredas of which five are high land dominated and the remaining four are low land dominated. In six of the woredas, NGOs have been involved actively in supporting ABEP. Therefore, stratified, simple random and purposive sampling techniques were employed to select the data sources. That is:

- Stratified sampling technique was used to select woredas and then ABECs;
- Simple random sampling was used to determine the sample population at each stage (ABE students, parents and other community members);
- Purposive sampling was used to include CMC members, school cluster supervisors, woreda education officials and facilitators, for they were selected by their position and experience in the area.

As a result, the sample size included:

- Three woredas, two NGO supported ( one from high land and another from low land; and the third from high land with minimum NGO support);
- Seventeen ABE centres( 21.5% of the 79 available ABE centres in the three woredas);
- One hundred eighty seven ABE students from level two and three (assuring level one might have problem to give appropriate information);
- All available members of the 17 CMCs members which are 102;

- Fifty one facilitators which included all available facilitators from sampled ABE centres;
- Seventeen school cluster supervisors ( 90% of the school cluster supervisors of the three sampled woredas);
- One hundred sixty one parents and other community members ( about 10 parents and other community members from each selected ABE centres);
- Eight educational officers with the relevant job assignment.

Interviews were conducted with 8 woreda education experts (3 from Kobo, 3 from Meket and 2 from Wadla) and the information acquired from the interviews was included in the study.

Three group discussions were carried out – with 102 CMC members (19.6 % females) , 161 ABE students’ parents and other local community members (40.4 % females) and 187 ABE children (48.7% girls).

A total of 73 questionnaires had been distributed to those respondents: 54 for facilitators and 51 (94.4 %) were returned, 19 for cluster school supervisors and 17 (89.5%) were returned. The following table presents the characteristics of respondents.

**Table 1 - Sample Population of the Study**

Woreda	Location	Available ABE centres	Selected	Selected in %	CMC members	Educational Officers	Supervisors	Facilitators	ABE Student	Parent
Kobo	Low land	37	7	19	42	3	8	23	87	74
Meket	High land	29	6	20.7	33	3	6	17	63	49
Wadla	High land	13	4	30.8	27	2	3	11	37	38
	<b>Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>161</b>

## 1.6.4 Data Gathering Instruments and Pilot Test

### 1.6.4.1 Data Gathering Tools

The data was collected using open and close-ended questionnaire, structured interviews and focus group discussion guide. These tools are preferred because the respondents are at different

educational levels and so that the tools are convenient to gather information, opinion and attitudes from such diversified sample respondents.

Accordingly, a questionnaire that comprises of close- ended and open- ended question items were prepared and distributed to gather the relevant data. It was prepared and distributed to ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors.

One set of structured interview questions and two focus group discussion guides were prepared. The structured interview questions were to woreda education officials and the two focus group discussion guides were to CMC members and parents; and ABE students.

All tools were prepared in the English language and translated into Amharic.

#### **1.6.4.2 Pre- Testing**

For the purpose of testing the validity of the tools, the questionnaires were tested on unsampled respondents. Consequently, the following major amendments were made after the pre-testing.

- Previously, it was thought that ABE students (level two and three) could fill the questionnaire with close facilitation support. However, it was found that they couldn't fill the questioners properly. Hence, focus group discussion guide were prepared and applied to collect data from ABE students.
- A question which inquired CMC members to tell their additional responsibilities was cancelled out from the focus group discussion guide list and replaced by an assessment format to list their additional responsibilities. It was changed because raising the issue during the discussion seemed waste of time for the whole group and it looked also boring.

#### **1.6.5 Data Analysis**

The data was carefully tallied, structured and tabulated in order to make it manageable. Since the study gathered different types of data through different tools, the data analysis also incorporated different methods. However, the study was mainly qualitative and for the statistical analysis, statistical tools such as percentage to identify community contributions and Chi- Square to compare supporting and non-supporting ideas were applied. Information obtained through structured interview and open-ended items were considered in the analysis.

## **1.7 Operational Definition of Key Terms**

The following words and phrases are defined in the context of the study.

**Alternative Basic Education Program:** Alternative basic education program is a three levels cycle that is crafted to match the first cycle primary education in the formal school system. It is cost effective, flexible and more accessible to communities. The program allows students who complete ABE to automatically qualify as fifth grade students in the formal school (SCD, 2004:7)

**Challenge:** A contextual definition of a challenge as to this study is a higher level problem which couldn't be solved simply and with one go; and the sources of the challenge is related with other problems. Besides, it demands persistent and synergic efforts of several stakeholders to get solution.

**IPO- Model:** It is a model used to analysis the availability of inputs and the nature of the process and results in a system ; and the interaction among the three elements (in this study the system of local community participation). Hence, I stands for input – material or stimulate that enters into the system, P stands for processing – actions taken using input and O stands for output- results of the processing that then exit the system.

**Local Community:** The phrase local community in this study refers to the mass of community members other than CMC members, kebele officials and other leaders in kebeles.

**Non-formal Education:** It is any organized learning activity outside the structure of the formal education system that is consciously aimed at meeting specific learning needs of particular groups of children, youth or adults in the community. It includes various kinds of educational activity such as agriculture extension, skill training, health and family planning, educational work amongst youth and women and functional literacy. What is learned is structured, but not so obviously as in the case

of formal education and there is more flexibility as to the places and methods of learning (Farrant, 1980: 18-19).

**Participation:** Communities identify their own problems, assess their options, make decisions, and carry them out by contributing labour, skills, material, or funds (Wolf Joyce et.al., 1997: 83). Moreover, it is involvement characterized by jointly initiated monitoring and evaluated programs of organized groups and individuals in an effort to achieve set goals (Rahman in Zaudneh, 1989:7).

**Supporters:** Supporters in this study means persons who are responsible to facilitate and coordinate local community participation in ABEP and support local communities in the process. These include centre management committee members, kebele officials and facilitators (closer supporters) and woreda education experts and school cluster supervisors.

### ***1.8. Organization of the Study***

This study is organized in four chapters. The first chapter deals with the problem and its approach. This part comprises of background of the study and statement of the problem which point out the study objectives and basic research questions. It also contains significance, delimitation, limitation, and methodology of the study and definitions of key terms. Chapter two is concerned with review of literature that presents relevant views of researchers and different scholars in the area of community participation and alternative basic education. The analysis and interpretation of collected data and presentation of the results are treated under chapter three. It is to discuss the findings accordingly. The fourth chapter deals with giving summary, conclusions and identified recommendations.

## CHAPTER – 2

### 2. Review of Related Literature

#### 2.1. *Community Participation: Concept and Definition*

##### 2.1.1 Community

Since people are living in different contexts, the concept of community differs accordingly. Some focused on community as a geographical area; some on a group of people living in a particular place; others on community as an area of common life. And still others focused on ethnic, shared concern in development and the inter connection between individual and group. The term community would be seen in relation to physical proximity to others and the sharing of common experiences and perspectives. Community can also exist in other forms – for example, through professional, social, or spiritual relationships. The term also is associated with harmony and closeness of people with this harmony as described by (Elias 1974) and quoted by Hogget 1997:5:

Since the late nineteenth century, the use of the term community has remained to some extent associated with the hope and the wish of reviving once more the closer, warmer, more harmonious types of bonds between people vaguely attributed past age. Before 1910 there was little social science literature concerning community and it was really only in 1915 that the first clear sociological definitions emerged.

Zenter (1964) quoted in Uemura (1999: 1-2), for instance, pointed out three aspects of communities. First, community is the group of structure, whether formally and informally organized in which members play roles that are integrated around goals associated with the problems from collective occupation and utilization of habitation. Second, member of the community have some degree of collective identification with the occupied space. Lastly, the community has a degree of local common responsibility.

Three different types of communities are identified by Bray (1996) as cited in Uemura (1999:2). The first one is geographic community, which is defined according to its members' place of

residence, village or a district. The second type is ethnic, racial and religious community, in which memberships are based on ethnic, racial or religious identification, and commonly cuts across membership based on geographic location. The third one is community based on shared family or educational concerns, which includes and similar bodies that are based on families' shared concern for the welfare of students.

Tedla (1995: 30) defined community as a "thoroughly fused, collective 'we' in which an organic relation assumed between the individuals who compose the community. This fused; collective is captured in the dictum, 'I am because we are, and since we are, therefore I am'. Primarily consisting of self-interested individuals, they seek to be part of the group because they recognize that in doing that doing so, each can accomplish more than could be accomplished alone. Community then would be a means to an end, rather than an end in itself.

Communities can be defined by characteristics that the members share, such as culture language, tradition, law, geography classes, and race. As Shaeffer (1992), quoted in Uemura (1999:1), "some communities are homogeneous while others heterogeneous; and some united while others conflictive. Some communities are governed and managed by leaders chosen democratically, and some are governed by leaders imposed from above and represent central authorities."

From these definitions, one can understand that community comprises people who live in diversified relationship to one another and who share interests, values and resources. The community is made up of many people who have different roles; collectively they are making up the identity of the community and they have common goals in their particular surroundings. Generally, the definitions have common elements that they contain which include specific geographical areas, shared interests, identify characteristics (values, problems, responsibilities) and shared resources and shared governance.

As explained above, the word community could have different meanings in different contexts. For our purpose in this study and makes things more simple, community is defined as a concept comprising group of popular mass of rural people living in the same area and sharing the same values and organizations; and sharing the same basic interests at any given time.

## 2.1.2 Participation

Like that of the term community, participation can be interpreted in various ways, depending on the contexts. Norman (2000: 5), for example, defined participation by identifying with a heart that pumps the community's lifeblood – its citizens – into the communities business. It is a condition for success that leads communities' development raise more resources, achieve more results, and develop in more holistic and – ultimately – more beneficial way. So, the author considers participation as one of the key ingredients of an empowered community.

The concept of active participation is further elaborated by Shaeffer (1994:15) that active participation comprises of the idea of strengthening the power of local people to take the initiative in the decision of formulating and implementing the activities and programs pertaining to their own affairs. Participation in this connection recognizes that the people at the grassroots level can be creators and fruitful partners in development. The definition stated above evolves in active participation. In general terms, we can spell out that any involvement could be participation that may range from low to high. The idea of active participation, however, is some how the concept that should be treated differently. Active participation is related with the initiation of the local community in decision-making. In this regard Shaeffer (1994: 15) expressed that active participation is to take the initiative in the decision of formulating and implementing activities and programs relevant to their own affairs. Here, participation is sought as that the local people at the grassroots level can be creators and core partners in developing process of particular area. In line with this, Cohen and Uphoff 1977 as cited by Charlick (2000: 4) advised to be careful about “pseudo- participation”, participation which only involve ratifying decisions and goals made elsewhere. Here, there is the idea of focusing on the poor is one thing, bringing them together to actively participate in their own process of development is another thing.

If we see that active participation is very internal and closely attached with initiation of practitioners, it is fair to raise a question of how can one know when you have achieved active community participation? This idea directly leads us to look into the common elements of active participation. There is no one right way to achieve active community participation but there are some common elements to sound participation that will be found in all communities.

As stated by Norman (2000: 3) common elements include the following:

**Many people:** Participation to be active, the participants have to be many. The first and most obvious principle of sound participation is that many people are involved. If participation is in the hands of elite leadership in the community; if it could not be a business of every one, the interaction would be very minimal and it becomes absolutely out of the sphere of active participation.

**Many centred:** Participation is to be open to involvement by many groups. They divide up responsibilities in a way that draws on the special talents and interests of contributing organization by assigning responsibility in dependent action to these groups. In short, power and responsibility are decentralized in a participating community. If it is, the result is a community that has many centres of activity and that is capable of reaching deeply in to the natural enthusiasm and talents of its citizens.

**Open and Advertise:** The business of participating is to be open to all and widely – publicized. Citizens should be informed by a variety of means about the works that they are participating. Opportunities for community members to find meaningful roles have to be ready. Secrecy must be strictly avoided.

**Open to All Ideas:** To encourage and have active participation, there must not be such thing as a bad idea. All ideas are welcomed and treated with respect. Firstly, it honours the person whose idea is put forward and it initiates for further participation. Secondly, it gives a welcoming tone for fresh ideas and inspirations that might other wise be hidden due to fear of ridicule.

**Inclusive and Diverse:** Differences in age, colour, race, religion, appearance, prior community involvement, level of education , handicap, language, occupation, or any other factors have no place in participation or could not be a criteria to welcome or not welcome the participants into useful roles.

### **2.1.3 Community Participation**

Basing on the aforementioned concepts of community, participation and active participation; the phrase community participation is further discussed by different authorities.

According to Hedley, cited in Moyele Ponguluran (1992:8), community participation means that the community has the right to be part of the action, implying a much more active role, a role established by right. Community involvement, on the other hand, implies that the community is drawn into the action. Both emphasize the complete process that starts from identification of needs and goes through common decision and reaches to the extent of developing their own local mechanisms. The concept indicates also that elements of active participation such as many people, many centred and others are involved in it and without which the end result of getting shared needs would be non existence.

Community participation is a political process because members of the community may have a say in decision making about issues that affect them (Hailemichael Ligu, 1996: 8-9). He further noted that there would be an awakening of interest and the community would start to question how things are done, and why services have not been organized and managed effectively to meet their needs. They may point out new methods of solving the problem, other than the established ones, from practice and experience that might be easier to deal.

Community participation is defined as a process where by a group of people has gone beyond their differences to meet on equal terms in order to facilitate a participatory decision-making. In other words, it can be viewed as a process which begins a dialogue among members of the community to determine who, what and how issues are decided, and also to provide an avenue for every one to participate in decisions that affect her/his lives. Similarly, other authorities defined it as the coming together and collective action of a community to achieve common goals. So, it is a process through which action is stimulated by the community itself, or by others (school leaders), that is planned, carried, and evaluated by a community's, individuals, groups and organizations on a participatory and sustained basis to improve the school.

Arnstien (2004:2) defines community participation as a categorical for citizen power. The author continued to say that community participation is the redistribution of power that enables the

have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic process, to be deliberately included in the future. Here, community participation is looked as a strategy by which the have-nots join in determining how information is shared, goals and policies are set, tax resources are allocated, programs are operated, and benefits like contracts and patronage are parcelled out. It is the means by which they can induce significant social reform that enables them to share in the benefits of the affluent society. In this saying community participation is seen as the creation of opportunities to enable all members of a community to actively contribute to and influence the development process and to share equitably in the fruit of development.

Bichman, quoted by Hailemichael Ligu (1996:7-8) put community participation as a social process by which the specific groups of people living in the defined geographical area actively pursue identification of their needs and make decisions and establish mechanisms to meet their shared needs.

## ***2.2. Different Views to the Approach of Community Participation***

Since many years, there has been considerable debate about the most appropriate strategy to achieve active participation of local community in development activities. In most of the time, there are opponents and supporters siding one and negating the other. In both sides, justifications are listed. Some times; however, there are people who try to balance or oppose of taking extreme ends.

In regard to the approaches to community participation, there are different views and the most visible in development arguments are top down and bottom up, betting on the strong approach; and community participation as a means or an end in itself.

### **2.2.1 Top Down and Bottom Up**

Top - down and bottom- up approaches follow directly opposite mechanisms. In the top – down approach; for example, the administration is hold by the administrators or professionals at distance. In such an approach, people are expected to follow directives from above to improve services. The administrators and professionals are authorized to decide how the plan should progress. The people (representatives) may be called in and have the pre- formulated plans

explained without any consideration as to whether the community has adequate management structure to carry out the tasks (Zakus 1992, quoted in Hailemikael Ligu, 1996:7).

The bottom – up approach looks more appropriate with the modern development effort and in democratic governance. Community support is greater in the bottom – up approach because of the possibility that the community needs would be taken into consideration. On the other hand, in top- down planning officials of the Ministry are keen to see a policy implementation and may be more involved in the technical and logistical aspects of the programme than in community participation (Hailemikael Ligu, 1996:8).

Other studies, however, don't accept this extreme polarization by saying that considering top-down approach as bad and to be avoided; and bottom – up as good and to be promoted. It is commonly observed that most aspect of development, by their very nature, is to be disseminated from the top. New technology, education, modern health facilities rarely developed at the grassroots. The point is that policies programmes and / or projects implemented from above must be balanced of local and expert inputs. Exchange of information between the top and bottom is required. In democratic participation, communities will be served best when parents, civil societies and other parts of the communities participate directly in making decisions that concern them. In contrast to this view, there is an assumption that strong leaders with their expertise, technical know how and experience can solve administrative problems more efficiently than wasteful community participation in decision – making.

### **2.2.2 Betting on the Strong Approach**

Complement to the above two views on the approach to community participation, there is the one that advocates the “betting on the strong” approach. It is almost similar to top – down approach. “Betting on the strong” is an approach which intends to let involve community selectively. In this approach, possibility of involvement is given to the stronger. The approach basis its idea that the poor or the mass would be benefited with “trickle down” improvements. The disadvantage of this approach is that an important minority sector of the community can be actively involved but majority part is not represented and so that their needs and demands could not be addressed (Huizer, 1997:1). “Trickle down” approach like that of top – down approach is mostly anti-participatory and tends to benefit almost exclusively the better –off. Thus, this approach directly

or indirectly aggravates the contradictions between very minorities and majorities dwellers of a village.

As the reaction to “betting on the strong”, there are a strong advocates of a grassroots oriented approach which is directly corresponded to bottom – up approach. This view relies on the justification of using the hidden potentials and creativity of the broad mass of the community (Huizer, 1997:1).

### **2.2.3 Community Participation as a Means or an End in Itself**

Some consider community participation only as a means not an end in itself in development. However, others argue that community participation is also an end. Most of the authorities, however, strongly agree that community participation is both a means and an end in itself.

African Charter strongly argues that popular participation is both a means and an end. They note that community participation as an instrument of development is the driving force for collective commitment for the determination of people – based development process and willingness by the people to undertake scarifies and extends their social energies for its execution. As an end in itself, popular participation is the fundamental right of the people to fully and effectively participate in the determination of the decisions that affect their lives at all levels and at all times (African Charter, 2006: 1).

Shaeffer, (1992: 8) supports the idea of practising community participation both as a means and an end. He clarifies putting reasons for both. Community participation as a means provides more resources and energy, facilitates the development process, enables development programmes become more relevant to local needs and conditions; and makes resources more effective and efficient through community inputs. Community participation as an end improves knowledge, attitudes, and skills; gives greater awareness, self reliance, efficiency and better practice, provides a chance to control over information and technologies, gives a chance to generate new ideas, effective management of local resources and it is also exercising basic rights.

The difference between community as a means and as an end is nicely put by Nicholas (1999:7-11), he states that the reality of community participation as a process whereby participation as a

means has the capacity to develop into participation as an end. When community participation is interpreted as a means, it generally becomes a form of mobilization to get things done. Where participation is identified as an end, it is a process whose outcome is meaningful participation in the development process. The real objective, as an end, is to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in a given social structure. This implies that the most important thing here is the identification of the process whereby participation as a means has the capacity to develop into participation as an end.

The view of community participation both as an end and a means is supported by Ethiopian program action plans. The ESDP – II states clearly that community participation is not only a means for development but it is also an end in itself (MOE, 2002:22).

In this study participation is not seen only as means or a management tool to execute education activities but also as a right and a core end for communities' involvement in education as a right.

### ***2.3. Community Participation, Governance and Basic Education***

#### **2.3.1 Interlinked Nature of Governance, Community Participation and Basic Education.**

Site-based governance has been introduced in connection with local community participation. Local community participation in many ways depends on the way of local governance and effectiveness of educational outputs and impacts also depends on local community participation. Generally, it is introduced to ensure easier participation of civil society i.e. people at the grassroots level in decision making, planning, mobilization of resources, implementation of their plans and monitoring. Civil society groups are to remain involved right from brainstorming the issues to development plans, and their monitoring so they will own them and contribute their mental, physical and monetary resource towards local development.

In regard to education and with in the African context, there are more special and basic reasons why the education system needs devolution of certain functions and responsibilities from central ministries to local community level. The arguments in favour of greater decentralization have to do with the characteristics of most African countries incorporates long distance between individual schools and centres , greater ethnic and linguistic diversity, and relatively poorly

developed systems of communication, an incomplete and frequently non working telephone system, and a slow and unreliable postal service. So, to reduce such frequent interruptions, an increased reliance on local organization might be necessary (World Bank, 1989: 82-83). The World Bank further stated that decentralization can, by supporting school autonomy, contribute significantly to the responsiveness of the school to the local community and of the community to the school.

In the recent years, educational governance has come to the forefront of educational policy and planning. Hence, it is important to first understand the legislative framework and policy discourse on governance in education to promote basic education to all sections of society.

There is a consensus among policy planners and practitioners that participation of community in decision-making is essential for decentralization of education at the local level. However, community participation as a means of power sharing and partnership in the formal sense is still in the emerging stage. For the state, decentralization of education at the local level has become a means of improving managerial efficiency of the system. However, efforts to decentralize education and empowering the community also contribute to the process of transforming the existing system of educational governance in the long run.

When governance is democratic or independent, community participation is very high in all the indicators. If the opposite happens, only few people speak at the community meetings. The outcome of such election is divisiveness and conflict of interest between individuals and supporters or silence. Hence, democratic governance has positive correlation with community participation. The more households see leadership as accountable the more they participate at community meetings (Nicholas, 1999: 48 – 51). The importance of governance in directing the activities and shaping the effectiveness of community cannot be overstated, to the extent that leaders shape the internal agendas of organization and invariably the key determinant of community participation effectiveness. It is important to note that governance patters in a community affect the attitude and capacities of members to initiate and get involved in community development activities.

All these importance of the three elements (governance, community participation and basic education) and their synergic effect to the betterment of one to the other and of them to the

development in general attracts the attention of the international community. As a result, the world biggest conferences on development raised issues of their inseparability.

Since the World Conference on Education for All, held at Jomtien, Thailand in 1990, there has been growing awareness among international agencies and national governments that the centralised administrative structures in education in developing countries lack adequate human, financial and material resources to provide education for all. Consequently, emphasis on decentralisation of educational administration and management is given to provide access to basic education to children, youth and adults who have been deprived of learning opportunities so far. The transfer of educational management from the central to the local level and local communities is considered as the effective way of reaching the remote mass.

The World Education Forum in Dakar convened in April 2000, to review and assess the progress that has been made towards education for all since Jomtien conference in 1990, reaffirms commitments to EFA goals and emphasized the importance of community involvement in educational planning and implementation. It is at this forum that the international community pledged itself to developing responsive, participatory and accountable systems of educational governance and management, and ensuring the engagement and participation of civil society in promoting educational development (Dakar framework for action, 2000:4).

### **2.3.2 Alternative Basic Education in Relation to Community Participation**

In 1948, based on the principles of human rights, education was declared as a “birth” right to every citizen. Then, several resolutions have been made for accessing basic education to all school age children (Cummings and Dales 1995 as quoted in Anbesu, 2002:4). Based on this basic principle, it is evident that formal primary schools have been expanded very rapidly. However, they couldn't satisfy the demand for basic education. There are still a lot of children who are out of the formal system. The position in 1990s was that about 130 million of school age children, youth and adults had no access to basic education (Little and et.al., 1994:1)

This rapid expansion of formal primary school led to a significant sacrifice in the quality and internal efficiency. At this juncture, education planners, policy makers and researchers as well as concerned international organizations began to seek innovative alternatives outside the conventional school system (MOE, 2000:7). In agreement to this Anbesu (2002:5) stated that governments and NGOs are making efforts to design less costly alternative approach to respond to the various international declarations and framework of action. Innovative alternative delivery modes are being adopted to complement the formal education system and so that to meet increasing demand of basic education. Due to the pressure of population growth, increasing interest for basic education and the escalating cost of building; compel the world to look for means to address the increasing demand. This effort of searching alternatives to formal mode of delivery was started before many years. The search for alternative delivery modes outside the conventional school system can be historically traced back to the period that followed the rapid expansion of formal education in many of the developing countries in the 1960s (MOE , 200:7).

This shows the coming into being of different alternative approaches to formal primary education. Most of the innovative approaches; however, are with in the non- formal education. Van Diesen and Walker 1999 as quoted in Beyene (2005: 23) put reasons why most of the innovations of finding alternatives to formal primary schools are highly attached to non –formal education:

Non- formal education responds effectively to the needs of various groups in their own terms with its flexible and adaptable approaches with regard to age –range; content of course, regularity of attendance, duration of courses, place of learning, modes of learning and evaluation. Community participation is high; programmes are flexible and adaptable; content is more locally relevant; learning centres are close to communities; facilitators are selected from among communities of beneficiaries; the instruction is in their language; the daily hours of instruction are short.

Alternative basic education is an alternative mode of delivery of basic education to complement formal primary basic education. It is a system to provide basic education for school children who don't have access to basic education in the formal basic education program due to different reasons which includes school distance, fixed school calendar of the formal, high demand of child labour and so on. This alternative approach has been practiced in different countries, with basically similar aims. The common aims of the approach include, as stated in different literature, the following:

- To provide basic education to rural children who never attend primary school or who dropped out of formal schools;
- To improve the internal efficiency of rural education
- To use all means to provide cost effective learning and increasing the participation rate of out-of-school children and putting special effort (Ahmed et. al., cited in Ayalew, 2002: 15-24; Amhara R.E.B., 2003:2).

Even though there are differences in using strategies to implement alternative basic education programmes from country to country, most of the authorities in the area agreed that the program has three basic strategies. These are: proximity of learning centres to the community, making the educational environment child friendly through making the program flexible and focus on community participation and community leadership (ARSEB, 2006: 10-11).

Concerning the importance of strategies, internationally held forums mainly the world education forum that held in April 2000 in Dakar, Senegal vowed to ensure the engagement and participation of civil society in the formulation, implementation and monitoring of strategies for educational development. This statement further elaborates that such participation, especially at the local level through partnerships between schools and communities, should not only be limited to endorsing decisions of, or financing programmes designed by the state. Rather, at all levels of decision-making, governments must put in place regular mechanisms for dialogue enabling citizens to participate (Dakar frame work for action, 2000:2-3: 16).

Based on the international commitments and as the need of the actual reality, community participation has been made the major component of those alternative approaches. Experiences of different countries confirm that their successes base highly on the active participation of local communities. In connection to this, Ayalew (2002: 18-19) states that the active involvement of parents and school community in program design and implementation is one of the major features of the program in BRAC. He further made clear that the parents even involve in discussing their children's progress, attendance, cleanliness and hygiene. Complement to this, the Escuela Nueva Program incorporates a number of innovative components, including participation of community in designing and supporting the school curriculum. There is high level of community participation. Parents are involved in building of desks and learning corners.

Libraries, the school grounds, and all cultural and recreational activities are also open to parents. These all are to involve parents as much as possible in support of the education of their children (Ayalew, 2002: 21-22, MOE, 2000:12-13, Colletta and Perkins, 1995: 4).

### **2.3.4 The Role of Community in Basic Education**

Nations cannot be built without the popular support and full participation of the people, nor can the economic crises be resolved and the human and the economic conditions improved without the full and effective contributions, creativity and popular enthusiasm of the vast majority of the people. The role of the people is central to the realization of community participation (African Charter, 2006: 1).

By its very nature, education as process needs the interaction of many things. Among the elements, parents, communities, and society take the major part for education to be effective. In connection to this Uemura (1999: 2) notes that education is not an event that takes place not only in schools or centres but also with in families, communities, and society. Despite the various degrees of responsibilities taken by each group, none can be the sole agent to take 100 % responsibility for educating children. Education must not be left for schools: teachers, facilitators and its administrative staff. Parents and families cannot be the only group of people for children's education as long as their children interact with and learn from the world outside their families and schools/centres. Practically, schools are the place where to equip children with knowledge and skills for the entire society. Schools cannot and should not operate as separate entities with in society. Uemura emphasised that communities and society must support parents and families in the upbringing, socializing, and educating of their children. Community has a major stake in the process of education. It ranges from sending children to school and centres to managing the educational institutions with participatory decision – making.

In some cases, the idea of community participation is limited to extraction and in other cases it has been perceived more than extraction. The second Educational conference held in Addis Ababa in September 1993 noted the role of community in improving educational facilities through equipping and furnishing schools, and by contributing finance, materials and labour. And the proclamation No. 260 of 1984 (Proclamation to provide for strengthening of the management and

administration of schools), however, has stipulated communities to involve in school affairs through its representatives – public school committees (Hailemikael, 1996: 11).

Heneveld and Craig (1996), Shaefer 1994 as quoted in Uemura (1999:3), recognizing parent and community support as one of the key factors to determine school effectiveness in Sub-Saharan African; they identified several categories of parent and community support: Collecting and analysing information, defining priorities and setting goals, assessing available resources, deciding on and planning programs, designing strategies and share responsibilities among participants, managing programs and play meaningful role in school governance, monitoring process and evaluating results.

Williams as quoted in Uemura (1999:2) pointed out that there are three models of education and community that show the different roles of communities in education. These models include traditional community – based education, government provided education and collaborative model. In the first model, there is a higher contribution of community and close linkage between community and schools. Communities provide new generation of young people with the education necessary for transmitting local norms and economic skills. In this model, education is deeply embedded in local social relations and government plays a minor role. In the second model, education becomes very formal and standardized, that of course needs high involvement of government. In this case, the government wants and attempts highly to reduce the participation of the community in education. In practical terms; however, lacks of resources and management incapability have proven that governments cannot provide the community with adequate inputs. This gap unquestionably demands the coming into being of other model which makes ready the platform for collaboration i.e., the emergence of the third model. The collaborative model (the third model) enables the community to play a supportive role in government provision of education. William's expression clearly showed that the role of the community in education is very great and mandatory.

### **2.3.5 Alternative Basic Education and Community Participation: Importance and Forms**

The importance of community participation in social development in general and in education in particular is tremendous. It has an impact, if it is used properly, in different areas: in politics, economics, capacity building, programs and so on.

In general and at the higher level, greater participation can achieve several goals. In the sphere of ideology, it helps to empower people in order to ensure their greater control over development and their greater influence over decisions that affect them. Economically, participation enables both to seek more resources from a wider range of actors (the communities). In regards to politics, from the government side, to strengthen the legitimacy of the current government and make people co-responsible for social problems; from the popular side to gain greater share of power in policy making and budget allocations. Programmatically, participation is to increase program or project demand, coverage, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, success and sustainability. Besides, participation can develop new knowledge, skills and attitudes and provide beneficiaries a useful share in management tasks, monitoring etc.

At the community level, participation has several core importances. It helps the community members become less marginal and powerless. On this, Hailemikael (1996:9) stated that the process of participation prepares the community members to be exposed to different interactions, contacts and so that they become rich in information. It creates for them a sense of ownership. These in turn give power to the local community for better action. Hailemikael pointed out also another importance which is related with self-reliance and independence. Participation has the power to fill confidence for participants and this provides them taking actions independently. That is because such communities can work toward the more efficient and effective management of local resources and in the longer term, greater ecological sustainability. Community participation helps the community to identify their needs accurately, to get more sensitive provision of services and programme by working together.

Particularly to education, participation is highly encouraged. Substantial evidence supports a conclusion that schools with active involvement by parents are marked by higher morale and better climate (Henderson 1982 quoted in Jones and Maloy 1988: 74). This is because basic

learning needs are complex, diverse and the process moves in inter-woven society that requires multi-sectoral strategies. It is as Uemura (1999:4) puts, "The goal of any kind of activity that attempts to involve community and families/ parents in education is to improve the educational delivery so that more children learn better and are well prepared for the changing world". This is again because basic education has several stakeholders that involve actively in the process. Education is the responsibility of the entire society. Many partners must join with the education authorities, teachers, and other education personnel in developing basic education. This implies the active involvement of a wide range of partners – families, teachers, communities, private enterprises (including those involved in information and communication), government and non-governmental organizations, institutions, etc. in planning, managing and evaluating the many forms of basic education is a very necessary strategy (WCEFA, 1990: 4)

Uemura (1999: 4-5) explains the importance of community participation in details. According to the author the following are the major rationale to do community participation in education.

**Maximizing limited resources:** Though most of the governments have been trying to keep the vow to provide basic education for all, they have found themselves incompetent to do so because of lack of resources and capacities. As the result, the governments, especially in developing countries, have no choice except using their limited resources efficiently and effectively.

**Developing relevant curriculum and learning materials:** Communities and parents involvement helps achieve curriculum and learning materials that reflect children's everyday lives in society. When children use textbooks and other materials that illustrate their own lives in their community, they can easily associate what they are learning with what they have already known.

**Identifying and addressing problems:** Since communities are with in the educational problems and their life is very much affected by it, they can help identify and address factors that contribute to educational problems, such as low participation and poor academic performance.

**Promoting girls' education:** Community participation can contribute to promoting girls' education. Through this process the community can learn that girls' education contributes to the improvement of various aspects of their lives namely increased productivity, improved family health and nutrition, reduce fertility rate, and reduced child mortality rate. It is quite related with the motto it says "educating girls is educating all". Moreover, it was stated that parents would get the chance to spell out the real problems that prevents them to send their daughters to school.

**Realizing democracy:** Involving communities in schools is a way of reaching democracy through identifying and addressing inequalities embedded in institutions and societies as a whole. It creates a favourable environment for parents for more participation. If schools are perceived as authoritarian institutions, parents and community members do not feel welcomed to participate in their children's education. They might not be willing to accept responsibilities in school issues and they develop a feeling that all school issues is to government.

**Increasing Accountability:** Parental involvement in education, particularly in school governance, is seen as a means of making schools more accountable to the society. Local community sense and feel proud of being recognized for the full responsibility in school affairs. Colleta and Perkins (1995: 11) similarly stated that the support of parents and other community members through voluntary contributions have to be motivated by their having a voice in such decisions and confidence in the value to them of the school program.

**Ensuring sustainability:** In schools, finance is one of the matter which to sustain the school process. Involving local communities in their own affaires, leads them to create self – reliance that in turn help them to sustain development activities. Concerning this Lovell as quoted in Uemura (1999: 8) argues, " Sustainability is dependent on the degree of self – reliance developed in target communities and the social and political commitment in the wider society to development programmes that support the continuation of newly self – reliance communities".

**Supporting Teachers:** Active participation of local communities help teachers by facilitating the situation for better schooling. For instance, community can provide, or construct house for teachers who are from outside of the community. This action of the local community, especially for very remote rural area, reduces the problem of not getting qualified teachers. In regard to classroom practice, members of the local communities can be very fresh resources for school and their children by helping them to understand about indigenous things to particular village.

Another authority called Epstein (1997) as cited in Uemura (1996: 4) visibly highlights the importance of local community participation particularly for inside- school process and its achievement. According to the researcher, this local people participation in schools helps to improve school programs and school climate, provide family services and support, increase parents' skills and leadership, connect families with others in the school and help teachers in their work. Similarly, community participation in an educational organization has functions for better planning of education systems, more meaningful contributions in determining the need for educational facilities, better recruitment procedures, employment practices, and the nature of financing and resource allocation ( Shaeffer, 1992; Monekosso, 1989; quoted in Hailemikael , 1996: 8 ).

Ayalew (2002:25) did not only stress on the importance of community participation in education but also a demanding need of participating the local community throughout the process. He said that if basic education programmes are to succeed and have a lasting effect on the lives of students, there should be a need to participate parents and the community right from the design of programmes to the final stages of implementation.

Colleta and Perkines (1995:1-3) identified several benefits of community participation. Some of which are to improve relevance and quality of education, building ownership and censuses, reaching disadvantaged groups and building institutional capacity.

In all the above arguments of the authorities, one can summarize and extract common reasons why local community participation is very essential. These include:

- The current administrative and political direction of most countries is towards decentralization and democratisation;
- It enables to reach remote and disadvantaged groups;
- It promotes equitable enrolment;
- It makes the curriculum, teaching materials and school calendar more appropriate to local conditions;
- It builds mechanisms and systems; builds planning, managing and implementation capacity of local communities for sustainability;
- It provides additional resource for educational sector;
- It gives opportunities for communities to exert political pressure for improving educational facilities.

There are several forms by which local communities charge their responsibilities in education. Some authorities put them in a very general term and some go further deep to very specific ways.

Colletta and Perkins as quoted in Uemura (1999: 3) illustrated various ways of community participation in a very general way. As to them community can participate through research and data collection , dialogue with policy makers, school management, curriculum design, development of learning materials; and school construction.

Uemura (1996: 9), however, put a long list of channels through which local community would participate to the education delivery. The list mainly and in focus to this study includes advocating enrolment and education benefits; boosting morale of school staff; raising money for schools; ensuring students' regular attendance and completion; constructing, repairing, and improving school facilities; contributing in labour, materials and land; recruiting and supporting teachers; making decisions about school locations and schedules; monitoring and following up teacher attendance and performance; forming village education committees to manage schools; providing skill instruction and local culture information; advocating and promoting girls' education; providing security for teachers by preparing adequate housing for them; scheduling school calendar; handling the budget to operate schools; identifying factors contributing to educational problems and preparing children's readiness for schooling by providing them with adequate nutrition and stimuli for their cognitive development.

Many literatures reveal the major ways in which people can participate and produce wholesome effects are grouped in to seven forms. These are in planning, in policy making, in communication, in problem solving, in developing the program, in financing; and in monitoring and evaluation.

### **2.3.6 Challenges of Involving Communities in Education**

Involving communities into education is not a simple matter, for there are a lot different things associated with it. The nature of education: demanding a very long process, keen to development, its close attachments to different sectors, demanding of huge resources, above all the involvement of heterogonous stakeholders and many others make participation of local communities in education very challenging (UNESCO, 2001). The process of community – based educational reform towards community participation involves building the capacity of communities and local stakeholders – parents, learners, education staff, local business men, chiefs, politicians, religious groups, and other members of the community to take part in decision making and involving these very diversified community members needs tolerance carefully designed mechanisms. In this regard, Uemura (1999:10) pointed out that:

Participatory approaches tend to overlook complexities and questions of power and conflicts with in the communities. They are designed based on the false assumption that the community, group, or household is homogenous, or has mutually compatible interests. Differences occur with respect to age, gender, wealth, ethnicity, language, culture, race and so on. Even though marginalized, or minority groups (such as female, landless, or lower-caste people) may be physically present during discussion, they are not necessarily given a chance to express their views to the same degree as others.

Culturally, socially and economically deep-rooted factors in the local communities that prevent them willingly to involve in education are another major challenge. Shaeffer as cited in Uemura (1999:10) indicated that the degree of community participation is particularly low in socially and economically marginal regions. For this, the authority put several justifications. Among them are lack of appreciation of the overall objectives of education, a mismatch between what parents expect of education and what the school is seen as providing, the belief that education is essentially the task of the state, the length of time required to realize the benefits of better schooling, and ignorance of the structure, function, and constraint of the school.

Presence of different groups with different interest in the process of education is the challenge for genuine community participation. Challenges vary from one stakeholder to another because each group has its own vision to achieve the common goal of increasing educational access and improving its quality. In relation to this study, the specific challenges around teachers, parents and community is going to be touched as indicated by Uemura (1999: 10-11) :

**Resistance among teachers:** It is clearly stated that not all teachers welcome parents' and communities' participation in education. The major reasons he put are the teachers tend to feel that they are losing authority within schools, as community and parents take power. Teachers feel threatened by parental involvement, believing that it will very much reduce public regard for their professional status. Due to this reason, teachers are encouraged to involve community members who sometimes are not willing to get involved in any school activities. In complement to this, Jones and Maloy (1988: 98) add on the challenge of community participation in relation to teachers as teachers want to participate when they see personal and professional advantages in shared activities.

**Parents and communities:** The degree of willingness of parents to involve in school activities depends on their actual life situation: their economical status, child labour, their past experience etc. Uemura stressed that, not all parents and community members are willing to get involved in school activities because some have had negative schooling experience, and some are illiterate and do not feel comfortable talking to teachers; and getting involved in any kind of school activities. Some don't want to lose their benefit from their child labour and opportunity costs are oftentimes too high to pay. In line with this, Tekeste (1990:93) expressed his fear that many parents may not be able to conceptualize and express what they want and expect. He further ratifies saying that it is easy to express a dissatisfaction but difficult to articulate the changes that would solve or neutralize the areas of dissatisfaction.

In identifying the difficulties of participation, Broughton and Hampshire (1987:605) highly relate it with human behaviour and skill. Some of the intended participants suspect on the use of participation. Some people who are involved may have less skill or knowledge in decision-making

and some are less accountable for what ever the outcomes might be. Some might have a more self-interest level of concern.

There is some risk that the allocation of costs may be inequitable, or place an excessive burden on the poor, in participatory projects where substantial community contributions are sought (Colleta and Perkins: 1995: 3-4). They also put delays in implementation and dependence on charismatic leaders, political conflict and raising unrealistic expectations as challenges in practicing community participation

Other challenges which limit greater participation, as spelt out by Shaeffer ( 1992:17-18), are lack of resource, in terms of finance , personnel, labour, and time; lack of experience and skill in encouraging participation; communities struggle for survival; the inertia of inflexible systems, bureaucracies and individuals; and organizational and administrative obstacles.

### **2.3.7 Improving Practices of Community Participation in the Education Delivery**

Based on the aforementioned importance of community participation in education, as indicated by different authorities in different times, it is deemed necessary to point out practices which enable us to improve community participation in education. Concerning this point, many authorities shared us what they got out of their studies. Among them is Uemura. This authority identified about four major practices to enhance active community participation.

The first one is to understand the nature of community. It must be so because no community, group, or household is homogenous. So, it is very demanding to examine and understand community context, including characteristics and power balance. It is also important to look into the level of community participation in some activities in societies. This helps to design mechanisms to approach different members of the local communities accordingly. Uemura (1996:11) strongly articulates, “Careful examination of communities is necessary to successfully carry out activities promoting community participation”. With in the education sector as part of community, it is important to understand the current formal structure and the function of schools/parent/ community organizations. According to Shaeffer (1994:21), various kinds of organizations exist in many countries in order to bring parents together. Some structures include only teachers and other school

staff; some children and the other not. Level of activities, mandates of memberships are also various from organization to organizations.

The second point Uemura raised is the assessment of capabilities of communities and responsible agencies, and provide assistance. Though willingness to assess capabilities to carry out participation. The capability assessment should include assessing institutional capability, technical capability, financial capability and political capability (Dos Santos as cited in Uemura, 1996:12). Here the association of financial knowledge, technical knowledge and skill to run schools; and political will are emphasised to have active participation in education.

The third point is to establish communication channels. Understanding among stakeholders is not created unless there is in placed communication channels to do their common educational issues. As indicated by Uemura (1996:13), reasons and benefits of community participation have to be clearly addressed and understood by people to secure genuine participation. The researcher's point at this spot predicts that regular feedback and two ways communication about the where about of their contributions in educational activities encourage them to have more responsibility.

The fourth point is related with conducting regular assessment on the changing demands of a community. The communities are always interacting with in and out side. Consequently, the strategies need to be modified and tailored accordingly and plans and designs need to be flexible enough to accommodate the ever-changing demands and needs of communities (Umera, 1996: 14-15). In complement to this, Shaeffer (1992:22-23) identified organizational norms ( the willingness of central government, the team work and multi sectoralism, high level commitment to change accepting the importance of community participation), resources and structure and procedure ( common vision, mission and strategies, guide line concerning participation, clear description of roles and responsibilities); and Knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Campfens (1997) as quoted in Uemura (1996:13), pointes out several factors which are adhere with good governance for effective community participation. Some of them as related with the study, includes an open and democratic environment, a decentralized policy with greater emphasis on local initiatives, democratisation of professional experts and officials, formation of self- managing organization of the poor excluded, training for community activism and leadership, local level leadership and creation of collective decision – making structure. The conditions for effective

participation which are noted by Nicholas (1999:53) are related with what Campfens puts. According to this authority, the conditions for effective participation are smallness of unit; strong leadership, homogeneity of the community, provision of framework by the government, positive experience with the past collective actions, similarities in perception of needs, information flow and trainings.

Community participation is not a one time happening rather it is a process which needs regular planning and follow up. In this regard Shaeffer pointed out that in participatory process, there should be a need of gradual, guided, step-by-step process. It doesn't just happen but must be carefully planned and governed by technical guidelines that present alternative approaches to participation. The authority further proposed four areas for greater participation that are contribution and management of resources; need assessment, program design and implementation; and monitoring and evaluation (Shaeffer 1992: 16).

Another issue which is frequently raised by some authorities in relation to applying or improving local community participation is how to know whether the community participation is improved or not. For this question, Nicholas (1999: 11-12), put some indicators that enable us to gauge the improvement levels of local community participation. These are:

- Households' consideration of themselves as members of community organizations. If so, they will be more committed;
- How often households' attend the collective meetings of the organization? The reason being that time is very precious to poor people;
- Whether or not head of household participants in the planning of community activities?
- Whether or not spouse participants in planning activities of the community?
- Whether or not many people participate in the deliberation of collective meetings of the community? Community can be hijacked by individuals or few core groups of the community members to champion their interest;
- Households' recognition of the active participation of women as compared to men in community collective activities.

## **2.4. Policy and Government Directives in Community Participation and Alternative Basic Education in Ethiopia**

### **2.4.1 Policies and Directives in Community Participation**

The history of community participation in Ethiopia is closely attached with its traditional education and its diversified culture. Yodit, et. al., (2005:12) put it that traditional education in Ethiopia is already intimately connected to the community and linked to local survival needs and the process of education closely align with the aspiration and desire of the local population.

When the TGE, in 1991, came to power, participation of local community members in the design of their local schools had become a key issue in educational reform policy. In 1994, the newly elected GFDRE proved its rejection of socialist ideas and showed its commitment to the democratic ideals of “equality, liberty, and justice” by promoting the involvement of communities in their own development process (Syoun, 1996:23). However, due to the actual situation where the country was in, political instability, dramatic increase in population, recurring famine and war with Eritrea, made difficult to implement the ideals. Therefore, the country in its education sector suffered highly with unbalanced move of quality and access. As Syoun (1996:25) states, “enrolment grew by geometric progression, resources increased only by arithmetic progression”. At this point, MOE realized that it needs new strategies to combat the challenge of scarcity of resources (both human and financial) and to engage important stakeholders in the decision making process. It was then that the GFDRE issued the new Education and Training policy (1994) with the emphasis of popular participation and participation of various organization and individuals in the country’s education system. Yodit, et.al., (2005:20) express this idea as the policy acknowledged the importance of the participation of the rural mass and the role of non- formal education and community-based education as a tool for expanding the reach of government of education.

In relation to letting the popular to participate in the educational system, the 1994 Education and Training policy clearly put its stand to follow the decentralized approach in its educational administration. The policy, MOE (1994: 29) says, “Educational management will be decentralized to create the necessary condition to expand, enrich and improve the relevance, quality, accessibility and equity of education and training”. Considering the past experience of

the country in its educational system, the way of global democracy and given the geographic dispersion with its over 80 ethnicities, the MOE courageously decided to extend power to the woreda level. According to Yodit, et al., (2005: 21- 22) two reasons are given for the decisions made by MOE on decentralization management. These are to less the burden of responsibility from GFDRE and to encourage community participation in decision making and so that to increase accountability at the lower level.

Complements to the policy's directives on decentralization management of education, the ESDPs ratify its commitment saying that the role of woredas in governance and educational management should be strengthened through decentralized process. More responsibilities in operational planning, budget allocation and budget control shall be devolved to the woredas (MOE, 2002:22). In support of this, the five year EPRDF program of development, peace and democracy sets that, "The local communities will be involved in the management of schools, administering the school budget and ensuring the adequacy of schools to provide appropriate education to children" (EPRDF 1995 quoted in Hailemikael 1996: 12-13).

In regard to community participation, the ESDP (II and III) emphasise on the need of high involvement of popular community as a strategy to implement the plans as an end in itself. The ESDP II states, "Empowerment of the community is not only a means for development but it is also an end in itself. Policies and programs to strengthen the role of the community in the management and financing the schools shall be implemented" (MOE 2002: 22). It shows that there is a full believe from the government side that community can influence the educational process in their surrounding through supervision, direct labour contribution, construction of additional classrooms, and supporting school maintenance.

#### **2.4.2 Policies and Directives in Alternative Basic Education Approaches**

A demand for basic education is increasing in the development process. However, the formal education system is overburdened through rapid population growth and tied up by many problems as it is indicated previously. The rising of total and unit costs of education, the relatively poor access to education for rural children, poor quality instruction, and slow response in providing education relevant to development goals are some of the problems. Authorities before two decades and FAO and UNESCO in very recent years tasted very similar problems

through the process of education in the formal primary school line. The massive investments in education have not made the contribution to either growth or development that had been expected. Many millions children remain unreached through primary schooling. For most developing countries the problems that constrained their formal educational systems twenty-five years ago have not been overcome (Bishop, 1986:50-51; FAO and UNESCO, 2003: 14-15).

Innovative non- formal education mode of delivery is very demanding and important to solve some of the problems mentioned on formal primary education. The innovative alternatives brings education to people who are not being reached by the formal educational establishment; it provides education at lower cost; and it directs educational objectives towards goals that are more practical or more closely related to the learners' needs within their society (Ward and et.al., in *New Strategies for Educational Development*: 1974: 111-112).

These all are realities that force countries to open eyes to look for alternatives to formal primary school system. Maruin Granstaff in *New Strategies for Educational Development* (1974: 54-55) states:

The current disillusionment with formal education may be due in part to our miss calculation about the capacity of formal education to perform a certain task. We overload the system by adding more. Then we blame the system. Perhaps we should be blaming ourselves for not knowing more about the stress capabilities of the educational tools with which we work. Presently, the assumption seems to be that formal education has fallen short: the task therefore is to develop non formal education.

The education system in Ethiopia is still characterized by wide regional disparities, low level of participation, high dropout rate, poor quality, low efficiency and lack of financial resource. Hence, MOE has attempted to solve those interwoven educational problems through developing what is known as ESDPs. It is a program action plan to serve as a framework to enable all stakeholders and development actors to rally for the implementation of the program through coordinated interventions and resource utilization (MOE, 2002:1).

In ESDPs, specially, in II and III; much consideration was given to recognize the involvement of popular community and the importance of having innovative alternatives to formal primary education in to the country's educational system. It is only recently that the GFRDE has begun

to openly recognize innovative approaches. In the past the government had tried to increase access and to enhance the coverage of primary education by the construction of relatively expensive schools. Here, at least two interlinked strategies would be sought which are to encourage popular participation and to look for cost- effective alternative approach to formal primary education. Cognizant of this, the government has included alternative approaches as a major strategy in the implementation of ESDP- II. In the plan alternative approaches such as low cost schools, one classroom and multi grade classrooms schools for the first cycle of primary education have been encouraged (MOE, 2002: 21).

In the non-formal education section, ABEPs as an innovative alternative approach are included in ESDP II and III. The government accepted that the program is critically important for achieving universal primary education by 2015 and to reach remote rural and dispersed communities, pastoralists and semi- agriculturalists (MOE, 2005: 43). The government also shows its commitment by clearly identifying strategies to make the program effective. MOE (2005: 43-44), therefore put the following strategies:

- Encourage communities, community based organizations and NGOs to expand ABECs in different localities to reach the un – reached children;
- Establish and run ABECs in areas where the involvement of NGOs is nonexistent.
- Have focused, sustained and targeted instructions to reflect learners’ local life.
- Conduct continuous monitoring of students’ progress towards the lesson they learn;
- Try facilitators through close supervision and support;
- Strength school cluster resource centres to benefit ABEPs;
- Condense the ABE curriculum so as to establish the horizontal and vertical link with the formal education system;
- Make the program flexible enough to accommodate local conditions and needs of learners and parents.

## **2.5. The Alternative Basic Education in the Amhara Region**

### **2.5.1 The Emergence of the Program**

In connection with international declarations to access basic education to all and considering access to basic education is fundamental human rights; governments have been doing their utmost efforts to expand access of basic education. The Amhara regional government, like other Ethiopian regional governments, confronted with multifaceted educational problems to access basic education. The problems comprise pupil's class repetitions, increase of dropouts, and lack of equity, poor quality of education and shortage of fund (Amhara R.E.B., 2003: 1).

In spite of the challenges, the region had made efforts to expand quality primary education. As stated in the Amhara National Regional State Children's Alternative Basic Education Program Strategy document; in 2001 the participation rate of basic education was 55.4%, which was only 28% in 1996. However, calculating the population growth rate; the regional state realized that it didn't go anywhere only through formal basic education system. So, the regional government decided to incorporate and to use ABEP with its formal education program (Amhara R.E.B 2003:1).

The ABEP in the region was initiated by some NGOs namely Save the Children Denmark and Save the Children Norway by the year 1997. SCD is an international NGO. The organization has implemented ABE projects in some woredas of North Wollo. Its target groups are children in the age group of 7- 14. The learning is given with three years of three levels and the program is run for ten months each year, five days a week and for about three hours each school day. Secondary school completers are recruited to be facilitators after 15- 20 days short-term training that might be followed on the job training. The program highly focuses on remote rural areas of the zone (Anbesu and Wossenu, 2002:7). SCN's ABE program is run in North Gonder Zone. It was launched in 1997. Classes are run in thatched roofed community built houses. Students sit on logs or tools brought from their homes. Classes are run five days a week for ten months. Parents and the community are involved in making decision about the learning time, daily activities of the centres and in monitoring and evaluation activities (ibid).

These ABE programmes in both zones of the region became effective and it had attracted the attention of the regional government as a timely solution to out of its challenges to access basic education to children. Thus, it appears that the regional education bureau could adapt or adopt the ABEP parallel to formal primary schools. Consequently, practical measures were being implemented. The two major outputs which contributed for the program to be realized are the ATKLT (Amhara Timihirt Kililawi Limat Tibiber) forum and strategy paper of ABEP.

**ATKLT forum:** This forum is a forum to discuss on the progress of ABEP and to share experiences especially on ABEP. It was established in 1999. The forum was to discuss educational goals and objectives, problems encountered and strategies in non- formal education programs. Moreover, the forum has been used a good platform to share experiences and to strengthen NGO-Bureau collaboration, to better resource mobilization and to create cooperation between stakeholders in the region. As stated in ANRSEB (2005:1) the broad objectives for creating the forum are:

- Empower and build the capacity of the society and provide services for sustainable development,
- Make education for all related activities as effective and efficient as possible
- Monitor and report regularly to address problems of access, equity and quality
- Promote and develop effective partnership relations by means of discussion, collaboration and coordination.

This forum has enabled the program to be operational in full scale through establishing and enriching guidelines and working documents, promoting community participation, enhancing facilitators' recruitment and continuous training, promoting the participation of girls, monitoring and evaluating the ABEP and tackling challenges and problems encountered (ANRSEB,2005:1-2).

**ABEP Strategy:** As indicated in Amhara R.E.B. (2003:1), this paper was designed to help children use their learning potential and enhance their active participation in the affairs of their local communities and to help stakeholders to be guided while they implement or prepare projects. Therefore, the paper incorporate objectives, principles, implementation strategies, program participants, pupil's profile, curriculum, assessment and examination,

recruitments and training of facilitators, organization of learning centres, reading room establishment, Management and financing; and Monitoring and evaluation.

Having all these initial preparations, by 2001 the regional state fully and formally accepted the ABEP as one of the innovative approach that to support the formal delivery system of basic education of the region. Finally about 1881 ABE centres were established and run through out the rural part of the region with minimal support of NGOs.

### **2.5.2 Policy Directives in Local Community Participation in the ABEP of the Region.**

Generally, ABEP of the region targets children who do not have access to basic education in the formal basic education line. As stated in the strategy paper, its aims are: to enhance the participation of out- of – school children; to increase the participation of girls; to provide cost effective quality learning and to encourage accessed children to make use of the acquired learning for the immediate benefit of themselves and their family members (Amhara R.E.B., 2003:2).

Evaluating the nature of the program and its demand, the regional education bureau put certain basic guiding principles for ABEP to follow. These are:

**Ascertain community participation and program ownership:** The program’s strategy strongly points out that the community is the major stakeholder of the program. It also urges every body to understand that involving the communities in all stages (planning, organizing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) is a primary focus for the program. (Amhara R.E.B.2003: 2-3).

**Accessibility:** Here, the region states the negative effect of distance from home to school on the quality of education. So, the region takes constructing learning centres close to the walking distance of children as one of the programme’s principle. The third principle is to make the program flexible to the need and situation of the local community. This flexibility nature contains the idea of time, place and target flexibilities.

**Cost effectiveness:** The cost effectiveness is one of the major characteristics of the ABEP. The main challenge the region has faced to access basic education is attached to scarcity of resources. The ABEP program, therefore, is to mitigate this outstanding problem through its low cost construction, short and localized trainings and the like.

**Integration of ABEP to formal school:** This principle is envisaged to create both link, serve as feeder and complementarities the second cycle of the primary education. On the additional importance of this principle, the regional education bureau, says, “ Such complementarities are known to help both ABEP and formal education programmes share and cross fertilize best practices and useful experiences and systematize these in school cluster catchment’s areas”, (Amhara R.E.B.2003: 5).

**Appropriateness and relevance:** The inclusion of this principle is likely to magnify the importance of making learning in line with the day to day life of the local community and to overcome the problem of irrelevancy faced by the formal system. In this principle, the region emphasise on harmonizing the teaching learning process with physical, psychological and social development of children.

**Gender Equity:** The coming into being of the ABEP to the region is perceived as a solution for gender inequalities. The strategy paper of the region states that ABEP is based on the belief to overcome the inequalities and create just and equality of gender (Amhara R.E.B.2003: 6).

The source of regional policies and strategies necessarily emanate from the national educational policies and strategies with their regional peculiarities. The Education and training policy (1994) and its plan of operations (ESDPs) are the grounds. Hence, the Amhara regional state education bureau followed those general guidelines and develops its own policies, strategies and procedures for its programs including ABEP.

In ABEP, for it is relatively a new program, the regional education bureau has developed different new strategy papers such as the Amhara National Regional State Children’s Alternative Basic Education Program strategy (2005) and procedures such as ABEP Implementation procedure (2005). Correlating with one of the aims of ABEP; that is to allow and maximize local community participation (Amhara R.E.B, 2005:2), those major working documents and others

emphasise on the key nature of local community participation in ABEP. The Amhara education bureau, through its procedures, vividly announced that building the capacity of the local community to participate in educational planning, management, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and active decision making is the main mechanism to access quality basic education through ABEP (ANRS Education Bureau 2005:6; Amhara R.E.B.2003:).

The local community; therefore, is given major responsibilities in planning, managing and monitoring and evaluating the ABEP. Among the responsibilities given to the local community, the major once, as stated in Amhara R.E.B. (2003: 2) and ANRS Education Bureau (2005:8) are:

- Select and make an approval of all necessary recruitment, for example the recruitment of facilitators;
- Evaluate facilitators and provide feed backs to the concerned bodies;
- Provide leadership through kebele education and training board;
- Over all responsibility of the learning centres through local community elected learning centre education committee that can be responsible for issues of ABEP;
- Construct learning centres through developing sense of ownership and organizing learning centre education committee.

The Amhara regional state set direction to use local resources and it appreciated local potentials that demand genuine participation of the local community. In this regard the region in its ABEP strategy paper Amhara R.E.B. (2003:4-5) indicated that the construction of learning centres, preparation and organization of learning – teaching materials and facilitators require using locally available material and resources. The region has committed itself to assist parents and community members to actively participate in the learning teaching process and so that to teach the children the good value assets of their communities and thereby to enrich the curriculum.

Specifically, the working procedure of the ABEP of the region identified sets of responsibilities for local community. According to the region, these responsibilities which are directly in charge of the local communities are selection and provision of construction sites, provision of labour and local materials, decision on learning schedules, selection of facilitators, preparation of residences for facilitators, safeguarded the properties of centres and send children to the centres.

## CHAPTER- 3

### 3. Presentation and Analyses of Data

This part of the study deals with the presentation and analyses of the data gathered through questionnaire, interviews and group discussions. The data collected was organized in tables, described in percentage, analyzed using chi-square, or described qualitatively based on the nature of the data to interpret the meanings implied.

#### 3. 1. General Background of Respondents

**Table 2 – Respondents by Sex and Age Category**

Respondents	Sex	Age							Total	
		7-14	15- 19	20-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40 >	N.	%
ABE facilitators	M	-	-	17	9	4	2	-	32	62.7
	F	-	2	13	4	-	-	-	19	37.3
	<b>T</b>	-	<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	-	<b>51</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>%</b>	-	<b>3.9</b>	<b>58.8</b>	<b>25.5</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	-	<b>100</b>	-
School cluster supervisors	M	-	-	-	-	5	2	9	16	94.1
	F	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	4.9
	<b>T</b>	-	-	-	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100</b>
	<b>%</b>	-	-	-	<b>5.9</b>	<b>29.4</b>	<b>11.8</b>	<b>52.9</b>	<b>100</b>	

As can be observable from Table - 2, among the total number of the respondents (supervisors and facilitators) of the questionnaire, the female respondents account 29.4 percent of whom only 1 is school cluster supervisor. The rest 16 (91.1%) of the school cluster supervisors were males.

The sex composition of ABE student respondents was almost equal. It was 96 (51.3 %) boys and 91(48.7%) girls. Female discussants in the CMC group were only 20 (19.6 %) and 82 (80.4%) respondents were males. CMCs were greatly male dominated. In the parents' group, satisfactory number of females participated in the group discussion, which was 65 (40.6%). No female interviewees, for there was no female education experts in any of the sampled woreda education offices.

In regard to age, 43 (84.3%) of facilitators were found to be very young with age ranging from 20 to 29 years. This was so because the ABE as a program began functioning in 2003/2004 and new secondary school graduates joined to the program as ABE facilitators. On the contrary, majority of the supervisor – respondents 11(64.7%) were close and above 40 years of age. It is

common that supervisors need to have longer service years. It is obvious that the ABEP is to address the first cycle primary school age population. So, 178 (95.9%) out of 187 student respondents of the study were in age range of 7 to 14. CMC members and parents\other local community members were not asked to tell their age. It was difficult to record ages of discussants individually during the group discussion and it was simply observed that all were adults and in old age.

**Table 3 - Educational Qualification of Respondents**

Respondents	Sex	Educational Level					Total
		< grade 12 ( 10 new curriculum)	12 ( 10 new curriculum)	12/10+ TTI	Level two	Level three	
ABE facilitator	M	1	12	19	-	-	32
	F	1	13	5	-	-	19
	<b>T</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>24</b>	-	-	<b>51</b>
	<b>%</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>47</b>	-	-	<b>100</b>
ABE students	M	-	-	-	31	65	96
	F	-	-	-	29	62	91
	<b>T</b>	-	-	-	<b>60</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>187</b>
	<b>%</b>	-	-	-	<b>32.1</b>	<b>67.9</b>	<b>100</b>

As shown in Table -3, all facilitator respondents were to and above the standard to the ABE program in terms of their qualification. Only 2 (3.9 %) out of 51 were below grade 12 or grade 10 (new curriculum) and 25 (49 %) were twelve complete and 24 (47 %) were graduates from Teachers Training Institute (TTI). Only level two and three ABE students were included as respondents, for level one students were new to the centre. Majority of the respondents were level three students (67. 9 %). It was done intentionally that level three ABE students would be in a better position to provide information than the students in the other levels.

In regard to cluster school supervisors, 17 (100 %) of the respondents were diploma holders. This level is the minimum requirement to be school cluster supervisor. This shows that how the regional government is giving due attention to improve the quality of basic education. Only one of the 8<sup>th</sup> respondents from sampled woreda education office had first degree and the rest were diploma holder.

**Table 4 – Experience of Facilitators and Supervisors in Education Sector**

Years of service	Respondents					
	Facilitators		Supervisors		Total	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
1 year	1	2	-	0	1	1.5
2 years	3	5.9	-	0	3	4.4
3 years	38	74.5	1	5.9	39	57.4
4 to 8 years	8	15.9	1	5.9	9	13.2
9 to 13	1	2	5	29.4	6	8.8
14 to 18	-	0	3	17.6	3	4.4
19 years and above	-	0	7	41.2	7	10.8
Total	51	100	17	100	68	100

Table – 4 displays that a great number of facilitators (82.4%) have no long years of experience in education. Only 9 (17.9 %) out of 51 facilitators indicated have more than 3 years of experience. It was so because the ABEP is relatively new in the education stream of the region. Among 17 supervisor respondents 15 (88.2 %) had more than 8 years experience in education related activities. As it is usually known in the system of education, the positions of supervisors must be filled with people who have adequate experiences that enable them to provide quality supervision to educational institutions.

### **3.2. Basic Findings of the Study**

#### **3.2.1 Input Related Findings**

##### **Areas and Extent of Local Community Participation**

In the study, it was attempted to know in which areas the local communities participate and at what level they provide inputs to the ABEP. In relation to this, all respondents of the study were asked to indicate the types and status of the contribution; and participation made by the local community to the ABEP.

Both the interviewees and group discussants explained that the local communities provided labour and local materials to establish the ABE centres. The respondents further indicated that the local communities contributed money in a lesser degree. Concerning decision making on the issues of ABE centres, the respondents said that the local community participated in deciding ABE centres' construction sites, fixing school calendar, areas and amount of contributions to ABECs and electing CMC members.

Table 5 below also summarizes the data collected from ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors on the issue.

**Table 5 - Areas and Extent of Local Community Participation in ABECs**

Type of contribution	Respondents – Facilitators and supervisor : N. 68			
	High		Low	
	N.	%	N.	%
Money	22	32.4	46	67.6
Labour	55	80.9	13	19.1
Local materials	43	63.2	25	36.8
Provide information	34	50	34	50
Provide advice	34	50	34	50
Decision making	41	60.3	27	39.7
Coordination and leadership	35	51.5	33	48.5

As presented in Table - 5, most of the questionnaire respondents, 55 (80.9%), said that the provision of labour was the most preferred area to contribute, followed by provision of local materials – 43 (63.2%). Participation in decision making stands third. That is, 41 (60.3%) of the respondents said that local communities participation in decision making was high. About 46 (67.6%) of the respondents agreed that the participation of the local communities by contributing money is at the lower level. The potentials of the local communities to contribute for ABEP highly rely on its local resources which are labour and local materials provisions.

From Table – 5, it can be understood that local communities participate in various areas such as labour, local materials, money, decision making and coordination of ABE centres. The participation of the local communities become higher in physical contribution such as labour, 55 respondents (80.9%), local materials 43 respondents (62.3%); and becomes lower in the soft components such as coordination and leadership; and provision of advice and information.

### **Capacity of Supporters and Local Communities**

Capacity (Knowledge, skills, time, money, and human power) of supporters and local communities was also seen in the study as necessary inputs that influence local communities’ participation. To that end, few basic questions were presented for discussion.

Interviews and group discussions made with woreda education offices and grassroots level communities indicated the following points as major problems in relation to capacity:

- Very low economic capacity of the local people to cover financial contributions or mismatch with interest and economic capacity.
- Overlap of demands from different sectors at the same time which results in shortage of time and other resources to participate.
- Shortage of supervisors (worse in Wadla) to facilitate as demanded from the ABE centres.
- Low level of professional knowledge of facilitators, supervisors and the local communities on the ABE program.

The responses of ABE facilitators and supervisors on the issue are summarized in Table- 6 below.

**Table 6- Capacity of Supporters and the Local Communities to Provide Support to ABECs**

Items	Respondents- ABE facilitators (N. 51) and School cluster supervisors (N. 17)= Total N.68=100%					
	Degree of the problem					
	High		Medium		Low	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Financial capacity of the local community	37	54	21	30.9	10	14.7
Shortage of time for the local community to participate	5	7.4	28	41.2	35	51.5
Knowledge and skills of facilitators and supervisors to apply community participation principles	5	7.4	13	19.1	50	73.5
Shortage of human power in the woreda education office	16	23.5	24	35.3	28	41.2
Capacity of CMC to mobilize the local community	39	57.4	15	22.1	14	20.6
Demanding contributions/ participation beyond the capacity of the local community	8	11.8	10	14.7	51	75

As depicted in Table- 6, most of the respondents identified prominently two problems which influence the local communities' participation negatively. Levelling high and medium, 58 respondents (84.9 % of the total) said that low financial capacity of the local communities is the

most challenging problem. Moreover, 54 (79.5%) respondents rated high and medium which implies that low capacity of CMC to mobilize the local community is the major problem in the process of coordinating local communities' participation in ABEP. The rest four items were not identified as serious problems to local community participation.

### **Procedures/Guidelines and their Applications**

Other influential factor to local community participation in ABEP is the level of knowledge and understanding of the local communities and their supporters on ABEP. This level of knowledge and understanding varies with the availability and practicality of pertinent inputs such as procedures, guidelines, systematic arrangements and organizations; and its application throughout the government and local communities' relevant structures. Hence, it is quite fair for the one to ask about the availability of such procedures, systems and their applications.

The information obtained from woreda education office experts through interview indicated that there were only very few copies of the procedures/guidelines which have not been well documented and distributed to the education experts, school cluster supervisors and ABE facilitators. All interviewees said that they have no organized system of documentation and follow up in the structure of the woreda education offices. However, efforts indicated in all sample woredas to record community participation through developed formats. The problem here was that the follow up format completely focused on physical contribution of local community such as labour, local materials and money. Participation in decision making was almost ignored by the current format. Though there seems very slight difference among the woreda education offices, it was found that the education experts have no strong habit of reading and referring those very few procedures/guidelines in implementing the ABEP.

Having informed the complete absence of procedures of ABE at their hand, the CMC members, especially at government established ABE centres, entirely agreed that the CMCs have no adequate knowledge on ABE basic principles. This shortcoming might prevent the committees to provide deep orientation to the local communities. The discussion made with parents and other local community members also revealed that the whole community didn't get formally organized orientation on ABE principles and the need of local community involvement in establishing ABE centres.

Similar questions were raised for ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors. So, the data collected are summarized in Table – 7 below.

**Table 7 - Guidelines and their Application to Enhance Local Community Participation**

Problems	Respondents- ABE facilitators and School cluster supervisors.							
	Degree of the problem							
	High		Medium		Low		Total respondents	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Presence clear role and responsibilities for CMC to facilitate local community participation	10	14.7	15	22.1	43	63.2	68	100
Extent of availability of ready made Procedures for facilitators/supervisors to facilitate local community participation in ABE	40	58.8	15	22.1	13	19.1	68	100
The local communities are not aware of ABE procedures and principles	43	63.2	17	25	8	11.8	68	100
No systematic approaches and formats to facilitate and measure real local community participation	41	60.3	21	30.9	6	8.8	68	100

Table 7 reveals that there was no ready made procedure/guideline for the facilitators and supervisors to mobilize the local communities towards the ABEP. Among the respondents, 40 (58.8 %) were agreed that absence of procedures/guidelines was found to be the major obstacle for their work. Besides, 15 (22.1%) respondents also supported the idea that it was a problem. Only 13 (19.1%) of the respondents agreed that the absence of procedures/guidelines was not a major problem in the program. They said so, for they might consider the ABE strategic paper as adequate tool to mobilize the community towards ABEP. About 91 percent of the respondents identified the absence of systematic approach towards local community participation as a problem. Only 6 (8.8 %) respondents considered it as a lower level problem.

The knowledge/awareness level of the local communities on the principles of ABEP was raised as question to the respondents of the questionnaire. Consequently, 43 of the 68 (88.2%) believed that the knowledge level of the local community on ABE principles was found to be very low and they confirmed that it was a problem to facilitate local community participation in the area. In this case, the findings seem to go in line with Uemura's (1996) argument which says that reasons and benefits of community participation have to be clearly addressed and understood by people to secure genuine participation.

### **Level of Focus Given to the ABEP by Kebele Officials and Woreda Education Offices**

Along with the other inputs such as procedures and technical support focuses given to the program itself could be seen as one of the factors to influence the level of local community participation. The focus given by kebele officials and the woreda education offices were assessed. Hence, all respondents of the study were asked to identify whether the lack of proper attention of the kebele officials and the woreda education offices to ABEP are their problems or not.

The discussants indicated strongly that the kebele officials ignored ABE program because of their interest on external incentives. During the data collection period of the study, safety net program was providing financial incentives for development works which were related to health and agricultural activities. It was pointed out that safety net program completely diverted the attention of kebele officials, CMC members and the local communities towards health and agriculture works. Another reason for the case but not profoundly stated by the respondents as that of external incentive was lower underestimating of the ABEP comparing to the primary school program.

On the other hand, the discussion made with CMC members indicated that ABEP was given much attention by kebele officials. The contradiction of findings between these two grassroots level groups of respondents might be due to mix up of kebele officials and CMC members. As indicated in Table- 13 finding, about 90 percent of CMC members were kebele officials. In such cases, the members of CMC who were at the same time kebele officials may not be honest to show their weaknesses. Thus, the findings from children and parent discussants seem having better grain of truth.

Table - 8 below provides summary data on the attention of kebele officials and woreda education offices as indicated by ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors.

**Table 8 - Focus Given to the Program as Indicated by Facilitators and School Cluster Supervisors**

Items	Respondents – ABE facilitators and School cluster supervisors. N. 68					
	The degree of the problem					
	High		Medium		Low	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Focus of the kebele officials to the ABE centres	39	57.4	17	25	12	17.6
Attention of the woreda education offices to the ABE program	11	16.2	9	13.2	48	70.6

The data incorporated in Table - 8 shows that only 12 out of 68 (17.6%) questionnaire respondents didn't consider lack of attention from the kebele officials as a problem. On the contrary, more than 56 (82.4%) agreed that lack of attention of kebele officials to the ABEP is a major problem to mobilize the local communities towards the ABEP. Further more, 70.6 percent of the respondents agreed that the woreda education offices gave focus to the program as much as they could. Hence, the study revealed that kebele officials seem not giving proper focus to ABEP and this finding strongly agree to the responses of parents and ABE students.

### 3.2.2 Process Related Findings

#### Forms and Approaches of Participation

The level of participation of the local community could also be measured through the ways and the mechanisms through which participation is conducted. In relation to this, parents, other community members, education experts as well as ABE students were asked to indicate whether the local communities were participating with initiation or not and how the communities self initiation was followed up and monitored to establish ABE centres.

Interviews with the woreda education officials and group discussions made with CMC members, parents and ABE students confirmed that the local communities participated mostly through their supporters. Further more, the local communities need very frequent push from CMC,

kebele officials, facilitators and cluster supervisors. Strong bi-law that incorporates penalty and incentives for the contributions they rendered to the ABE centres were used as a form of mechanisms to make them participate in ABEP. During the discussion, the discussants were also asked the reasons why the local community needs push and why the initiation was very low. Accordingly, they put some major reasons. These include:

- Lack of deep-rooted orientation to the local community about the ABE program;
- Low confidence to the ABE program;
- Arbitrarily prepared schedule for participation;
- Overload of work from different sectors at the same time;
- The culture of leaving every thing to the CMC and to other supporters.

It was learned, especially from the discussion of parents and CMC members that high initiation of local communities was seen only when there was donation and competition with other “gots” (sub kebeles) or neighbouring kebeles in establishing and expanding education institutions.

Similar questions were forwarded to ABE facilitators and school supervisors. Table – 9 below summarizes the data.

**Table 9 – Forms and Level of Initiation of the Local Community Participation in ABEP.**

Items ( Indicators)	Respondents – ABE facilitators and School supervisors. N. 68					
	Level of initiation of local communities					
	High		Medium		Low	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Most of the times through push from representatives	48	70.9	20	29.1	-	0
Most of the times through direct participation	6	8.8	16	23.5	46	67.7
Most of the times through few community meetings	37	54.4	20	29.4	11	16.1
Through their self initiations	4	5.9	12	17.6	52	76.5

The two items (most of the times through their representatives and most of the times through few community meetings) shown in Table - 9 are indicators of low initiation of the local community and the other two items (Most of the times through direct participation and through their self initiations) are to indicate high level of and sense of ownership. In relation to these

indicators, Table - 9 clearly shows that majority of the respondents 48 or (70.9 %) believed that local community participation in ABE program run through community representatives (CMC and kebele officials). Moreover, 37 (54.4 %) and 20 (29.4%) respondents marked high and medium respectively that the local community participated through few community meetings. Only very few respondents agreed that local communities participated in the ABE program through direct participation 6 (8.8%) and through self initiation 4 (5.9%).

Though one of the principles of ABE program is to increase self initiation of the local community; as indicate in the ABE strategy paper (ARSEB, 2003) , the study finding revealed that currently the local communities might participate in ABE program with low self initiation that may emanate from low sense of ownership.

There are major approaches identified in chapter two of this study. These are bottom up, top down and betting on the strong approaches (Hilemikael Liqu, 1996 and Huizer, 1997). Based on this, the study attempted to identify which of these approaches is applied to let the local community participate in the ABE program in the area.

The issue of approaches to local community was raised during interviews and the group discussions. In both occasions, the interviewees and the discussants said that the used approaches vary in accordance with the nature of activities. The respondents identified two types of flows. The first type begins from woreda education office (cluster supervisors) passed to CMC and through kebele officials to development units and then reaches to the local community. This flow is for the activities such as constructions, establishment of committees and the like. The second type is initiated from with in (from local communities and kebele level supporters). The parents and other local communities informally discuss the ABE centres' issues and that reaches to the CMC, and the CMC plans it and discussed it with kebele officials and orders pass to development units and to local communities for implementation. According to this result, the first flow matches with top down and the later with bottom up approaches. Structurally, the approaches and mechanisms used to let the communities to participate seem viable. This finding is likely to go in line with the global agreement during Dakar frame work for action (2000) which states that governments must put in place regular mechanisms for dialogue enabling citizens to participate.

ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors were asked to choose the level and the types of approach used in the ABE centre activities. Hence, Table- 10 summarizes the data.

**Table 10 - Approaches Used to let the Local Communities Participate in ABEP.**

Approaches		Respondents	
		Facilitators	Supervisors
Bottom up		20 (39.2%)	8 (47%)
Top down		24(47%)	7(41.2)
Betting on the strong ( select influential people only )		7(13.7%)	2 (11. 8%)
Total		51	17
X <sup>2</sup> analysis	Obtained	9.2941*	3.6449
	Critical (df=2)	5.9914	5.9914

\* Significant at 0.05 level.

As illustrated in Table - 10, 29 (42.6%) of the Questionnaire respondents said that bottom up approach was being used and almost similar number of respondents 30 (44.1%) said top down. In such cases both top down and bottom up approaches seem appropriate. This finding agrees with the idea of Hailemikael Liqu (1996) which says top –down approach is necessary in case to see a policy implementation and higher official technical support. The third approach, betting on the strong, by far was not applicable, only 9 out of 68 (13.2%) said that the approach was in practice.

The Chi- square calculated for the significance of the obtained results also showed that there is a significant (at 0.05 levels) difference in the frequencies obtained for facilitators, but not for the supervisors. Thus, there seems a significant application of the top-down approach in implementing activities.

### **Frequency of Feedbacks, Communications and Relationships**

The discussants and interviewees of the study were asked as how frequent the local community gets feedbacks on the performance. On this point, two contradictory findings were obtained from the two groups. The first group includes woreda education office and CMC members. This group strongly agreed that the local community got feedbacks through frequent meetings at church ceremonies and during development works. The second group comprises of parents/other

local community members and ABE students. Parents and ABE students said that the frequency of the feedbacks is very few, mostly once in a year. In some sample ABE centres, parents pointed out that there were no organized feedbacks especially on financial matters of the centres. It is true that education offices are relatively far from the local community and more reliant on principles. Because, CMC members are directly accountable to give frequent feedbacks to the local community, they might not be open to give the right picture. On the other hand, children (ABE students) naturally are open to give reliable information; and their parents/other local community members are the direct owner of the issue and primary sources for such information. Therefore, the second group's response seems reliable.

**Table 11 – Frequency of Feedbacks to the Local Community**

Frequency		Respondents		Total
		Facilitators	Supervisors	
Always		2 (3.9%)	1 (5.9%)	3
Most of the times		10 (19.6%)	4 (23.5%)	14
Sometimes		37 (72.5%)	10 (58.8%)	47
Rarely		2 (3.9%)	2 (11.8%)	4
Total		51	17	68
X <sup>2</sup> analysis	Obtained	55.7794*	11.4706*	
	Critical (df=3)	7.8147	7.8147	

\* Significant at 0.05 level.

As shown in Table 11, only 25 percent of the total respondents said feedback is provided always or most of the times. The great majority of the respondents 47 out of 68 (69.1%) said the frequency of feedbacks were sometimes and 5.9 percent said that the feedbacks were given rarely. The finding reveals that the provision of feedbacks on the performance of the local community as well as on the performance of CMC/ABE centres doesn't seem frequent. The majority from facilitators and cluster supervisors agreed that the frequency of feedback from CMC and Kebele officials was sometimes, which is also statistically significant at 0.05 level. This result agreed with the finding obtained from discussants and interviewees' response.

### **Responsibilities of CMC Members and Kebele Officials**

It was one of the interests of this study to identify factors which affect the attention and capacity of close supporter (CMC members) of the local community in participating in the ABEP. To this

end, 132 CMC members were requested to list out the number of additional responsibilities they have in their kebele development work. The data are summarized and presented in Table – 12.

**Table 12 - Additional Responsibilities of CMC Members**

Woredas	Number of additional responsibilities of CMC members in their kebeles. Respondents - CMC members ( N. 132 )					Summary	
	0	1	2	3	4 >	No additional	One or more additional
Meket	6(10.9%)	12(21.8%)	13(23.3%)	18(32.3%)	6(10.9%)	6	49
Kobo	2(4.3%)	5(10.6%)	15(31.9%)	14(29.8%)	11(23.4%)	2	45
Wdala	2(6.7%)	3(10%)	8(26.7%)	12(40%)	5(16.7%)	2	28
Total	10	20	36	44	22	10	122

Table-12 illustrates clearly that a great majority of CMC members have many additional responsibilities in the development work of their kebeles. Surprisingly enough, it is found that 102 (87.3%) members have at least two or more responsibilities, and half of them have three or more responsibilities. It is only very insignificant number 10(7.1%) members who have been responsible to ABEP as a member of CMC.

Interviews made with education experts of the woreda education offices also revealed similar result. The interviewee said that most of the CMC members have two and more than two additional responsibilities in the kebele development work and that seems beyond their capacity to focus on ABEP. In accordance to this idea, the parents and other community members were asked why very few members take so many responsibilities while there are many people to share. The discussants of the group identified two major reasons. First, because the local people wrongly believe that those few people are the only dwellers who have tested personalities to execute many kebele development works and so that the local communities have no courage to elect others. Second, because those few people don't seem to leave the position, if it is so, they might lose external incentives (Per diem, for example).

The process of mobilizing the local community to participate in the ABEP is related to the free and fair movement of the local community representatives in the process. That could be influenced by the number of kebele officials in the CMC. To this end, data were collected to

know how many of the CMC members were at the same time kebele officials and how many of the CMC members were not. Table 13- summarizes the data.

**Table 13 – Level of Overlap of Responsibilities between CMC Members and Kebele Officials**

Woredas	Do you serve in kebele management positions? Respondents – CMC members (N.132)				Chi- Square Test	
	yes	%	no	%	obtained	Critical (df=1)
Meket	45	81.8	10	18.2	22.2727*	3.8314
Kobo	28	59.6	19	40.4	1.7234	3.8314
Wdala	22	73.3	8	26.7	6.5333*	3.8314
Total	95	72	37	28	25.4848*	3.8314

\* Significant at 0.05 level.

Table - 13 shows that about 72 percent of the CMC members, that is, 95 out of 132 were kebele officials. This overlapping might lead kebele officials to be dominant over CMC members and create competing attention from other responsibilities to use the existing capacity of the members. It also creates fear on the local community to participate freely, for the power is monopolized by few and the chi-square test showed a significant difference in favour of having both CMC and Kebele administration responsibilities. A Woreda specific analysis too showed similar findings, except that of Kobo woreda. The finding doesn't mach with Norman's (2000) idea which said that many groups should divide up responsibilities and power, and responsibilities are decentralized in a participating community. Besides, such concentration of power on few individuals hinders wider participation at the grassroots level.

### **Look for External Incentives**

Incentives are good to motivate people to work hard. But, social responsibilities can not be viewed in terms of incentives. What is more important and a priority is the social values of activities. In this regard, an attempt was made to collect data on how the CMC members, kebele officials and the local communities view incentives in relation to their social responsibilities.

Almost all the discussants and interviewees agreed that active participation could be secured from the sides of supporters and among the local communities only when there is either external

incentive (relief handout, per diem and the like) or there is competition with neighbouring “got” or kebeles. The discussants were also asked to indicate the reasons why the local community is persistently demanding incentives for its own plan and benefits. They put the following reasons:

- Because the majority of the local people have no financial capacity to establish and construct ABE centres.
- The local people get incentives (e.g., safety net- a support given to low income and other vulnerable population by bi- lateral organizations- in health and agriculture activities), which has an impact on educational activities.
- External support through NGOs and other programs have been given to the local community for the past several years and through time the local communities are, these days, perceiving incentives as obligations of the government or NGO demanding participation.

**Table 14 – Views of ABE Facilitators and School Cluster Supervisors on Incentives for Participation**

Items	Degree of interest of CMC, Kebele officials and local communities for external incentives							
	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
CMC members look for incentives ( per diem)	41	60.3	15	22.1	11	16.2	68	100
Kebele officials look for incentives	49	72.1	12	17.5	7	10.3	68	100
Local communities high attention for incentives	37	54.4	22	32.4	9	13.2	68	100

The three items included in Table - 14 are to test the level of local community’s demand and its closer supporters on external incentives. About 41 (60 %) and 49 (72 %) of the respondents said that the search for incentives of CMC members and kebele officials is a great problem affecting local community participation process in the ABEP. This finding shows that there doesn’t seem sustainability in facilitating and coordinating local communities. More than half number of the respondents, 37 (54.4%) responded that the search for external incentives to participate in their own ABEP is a problem in the process of local participation. The local communities, for whom all the outcomes of active participation would go and benefit, also demand external incentives.

### 3.2.3 Output Related Findings

#### Level of Local Community Participation and Sense of Ownership

In the review of literature of the study indicated that the level of attitude of the communities on the importance of participation matters the level of their support and participation. In other words, variations in attitude level (input) might results in the variation of level of participation (output).In this regard, questions were forwarded for the respondents.

The information obtained through interviews from the woreda education offices as well as from the group discussion at the kebele level indicated that local community participation in ABEP is beneficial and a must to make the program successful. The interviewees and the discussants identified the following major benefits of local community participation for the program. As they said, local community participation –

- Creates sense of ownership;
- Assures sustainability;
- Shares and lessens financial burden of the government;
- Decreases dependency;

This finding seems to go with Uemura’s (1999) and Colleta and Perkin’s ( 1995 ) ideas on importance of local community participation in education which includes maximizing limited resources, ensuring sustainability , improving home environment, building ownership and building capacity.

**Table 15 - Opinions on Importance and Level of Local Community Participation in ABEP**

Alternatives	Respondents – ABE Facilitators (N. 51)											
	Importance of local community participation						Level of local community participation					
	NGOs’ ABE centres		GOs’ ABE centres		Total		NGOs’ ABE centres		GOs’ ABE centres		Total	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Very high	17	73.9	13	46.4	30	58.8	11	47.8	4	14.3	15	29.4
High	4	17.3	5	17.9	9	17.6	8	34.8	7	25	15	29.4
Medium	1	4.3	9	32.1	10	19.6	1	4.3	10	35.7	11	21.6
Low	1	4.3	1	3.6	2	3.9	3	13	7	25	10	19.6
Very low	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	23	100	28	100	51	100	23	100	28	100	51	100

As can be seen also from Table 15, larger proportion of the respondents, 39 (76.4%), indicated that the local community participation has been understood as it has high importance in the ABEP. The number of respondents who rated medium is not significant, that is 10 (19.6%). Facilitators who rated low is very few 2 (3.6%) and none of the facilitators rated very low. Hence, it is likely that the local community has good understanding on the importance of local community participation in the ABEP. Local communities around NGOs' established centres have better attitude on the importance of local community participation. That is, 73.9 percent of respondents from the NGOs established centres said very high whereas it is only 46.4 percent of the respondents in government established ABE centres said similarly. This difference might be due to the efforts of NGOs- orientations, trainings in the area to enhance the local community participation.

In connection with the benefit of the local communities in participating in the ABEP, both the discussants and interviewees were inquired to list major achievements. Accordingly, both respondents identified similar achievements which mainly include:

- Adequate ABE centres were established. A total of about 56 ABE centres were constructed through community participation in sampled woredas of the study with in the past three years.
- The share of ABEP in the basic education participation rate increases from about 3% to 7.3 % due to local community participation in accessing basic education through ABEP.
- As a result the local communities could get very accessible educational institutes to its locality.

However, the interviewees from woreda education offices were not hesitant to spell out the disadvantages of local community participation. They pointed out that low quality output, time taking, and high expenses and open to biasness during decision making are major disadvantages of local community participation.

There is also difference between NGOs established and government established ABE centres in regard to the level of community participation as indicated in Table-16. Among the facilitators

of NGOs established centres, 19 out of 23 (82.6 %) agreed that there is high and very high level of community participation. In the contrary, the facilitators in the government established ABE centres 17 out of 28 (60.7%) agreed that there is low and medium level of local community participation. This negative correlation most probably is due to the impact of the intervention of NGOs in the areas.

Level of local community participation could also be measured through the decision power of the community in major areas. Norman (2000) considered participation as one of the key ingredients of an empowered community; decision power will be one of the ways of measuring participation level. In relation to this point, respondents were asked whether the local community could decide on major areas of ABE centres in its locality. The major areas on ABE program as put in the strategy paper of ABE program (2003) in the Amhara Regional state are: site selection for ABE construction, fixing learning days, electing their representatives (CMC), deciding on the dates for meetings and amount of contributions. In Table 16 below, an attempt was made to show whether the local communities have decision power or not on those major areas of the ABE program.

According to the interviewees, in much stronger way and more depending on principles, explained that local communities are the one to decide and approve on major issues of ABE centres such as site selection, fixing meeting days and amount and kinds of materials/money for contribution. Similarly, group discussions made with parents, CMC and children ascertained that the final decisions and approvals on major issues of the ABE centres were passed by local communities. The parents' group, however, highlighted that the proposals with alternatives mostly came from either kebele officials or CMC. They also indicated that the participation for decisions is dominated by males.

**Table 16 - Decision Power of Local Communities on Major Issues of ABE Centres.**

The Decision Making Bodies	Respondents – ABE Facilitators and School cluster supervisors					
	Yes		No		Total	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%
Kebele Officials	9	13.2	59	86.8	68	100
CMCs	12	17.6	56	82.4	68	100
Parents and other community members	47	69.1	21	30.9	68	100
Kebele education and training Boards	0	0	68	100	68	100
Facilitators	0	0	68	100	68	100
Supervisors	0	0	68	100	68	100

It is quiet clear from Table- 16 that among the 68 respondents, 47 (69.1%) confirmed that local community members decide on major issues of the ABE centres. Significant numbers of the respondents (30.8 %) also said that those major issues of the ABE centres were decided either by kebele officials or by CMC. Similar to the opinions of parents and other community members, this may imply that there would be dominance of those bodies in some sampled areas. Cluster supervisors and facilitators have no power to decide on any one of major issues. Kebele education and training board also has no power to decide, for it was inactive almost in all sampled ABE centres. Table- 16’s findings strongly agree with interview and group discussion results.

Level of interest of local communities to participate in ABEP as an output might be influenced by the level of inputs and process. To measure the level of interest, ABE facilitators and school supervisors were asked to indicate whether the absence of practical actions and low focus to the CMC and other supporters’ effort to the ABE centres could be a problem or not.

Both the discussants and interviewees agreed fully that the local communities, most of the times, vow but too late to make it practical. They also confirmed that local communities have low focus to CMCs and other supporters’ efforts. However, the interviews and discussions’ result showed that the reasons of these problems are not because of low interest but it is due to other factors such as low economic capacity and shortage of time.

**Table 17 – Level of Interest of the Local Community towards Participating in the ABE Centres**

Indicators of interest	Respondents – ABE facilitators and School cluster supervisors (N. 68)							
	Degree of the problem							
	High		Medium		Low		Total	
	N.	%	N.	%	N.	%	No.	%
Promise but no practical action	37	54.4	16	23.5	14	20.6	68	100
Low focus to the CMC and other supporters effort to the ABE center	16	23.5	30	44.1	21	30.9	68	100

As shown in Table – 17, out of 68 respondents for the first indicator, 37 (54.4 %) problem and significant number of respondents 16 (23.5%) also put the indicator of absence of practical action in participation as a problem. Entirely 53 respondents which is 77.9 percent indicated the case as problem in the process of community participation. As Table- 17 indicates, most of the respondents of the questionnaire in both cases said that absence of practical actions and lack of focuses are problems. The findings revealed that the local communities might have low interest to participate towards ABE centres. However, that might be due to other burdens they have in life.

### **3.3 Challenges and Prospects**

#### **3.3.1 Challenges**

##### ***Mismatch of Interest and Economic Capacity***

The sustainability issue is dependent on the active participation of the community at large. However, there seems a conflict between the economic capacity of the local communities and the resource (including time) demands of the ABEP. The communities commonly give priority to their daily routines to fill their needs though they have interest and believe on the importance of other communal based participation. They want to give almost all their time, labour and attention and every thing for their basic need-food. The communities as such had no problems to understand the benefit of basic education and importance of their participation to the ABEP (See Table -6 and related interviews and group discussions). The low level of their living pushes them to hesitate not to participate actively in the process. The interviews, focus group discussions and Table – 6 results identified very low economic capacity of the local

communities as one and major problems of the community to participate in the program. Therefore, the gap between what community can provide and the support required by the ABEP is one of the challenges for the achievement of the intended objectives.

### ***Very Low Capacity to Make Effective Contribution on ABEP***

Very low level of awareness of the local communities on ABEP as a serious problem was frequently raised during focus group discussions and interviews. The local communities haven't got adequate and deep orientation on the principles, skills and other necessary issues of ABEP and community participation. This issue was, therefore, said to be forcing the local communities to ignore the program and it became a big challenge to the local community to involve in a program in which they don't know and understand well. It was also indicated as a challenge for the coordinators at the grassroots level to mobilize communities who don't have the awareness to make effective contributions.

The challenge occurred because there are no mechanisms and organized formal steps placed to introduce and disseminate information and knowledge from CMC, kebele officials and woreda education offices to the local communities.

This gap affected the process of local communities' participation in many ways. It reduced sense of ownership and self initiation of the local communities and exposed the whole process of local community participation to be pseudo- participation- false participation - that bases on force, penalty and strong command. Local communities have given lower value to the ABEP than to the formal basic education and tried to change the ABE centers to primary school. In addition, the challenge minimized the sustainability of achievements attained through such local community participation. (See results of Table – 7 and related results of interviews and focus group discussions).

### ***Dependency on External Incentives to Participate***

The local communities, CMC members and kebele officials have very strong interest to get gifts/incentives in terms of cash and kind while working for its own children and locality. This interest was reducing the initiation of the local participation, distorted the idea of sense of

ownership and aggravated dependency. As a result, it became challenging- expensive, time taking and exhaustive – to mobilize the local communities with out payment and external support.

According to interviews and group discussions, (See Table 14 and related interviews and group discussion results), the source of this challenge seems to be low economic level of the communities and external incentives became common and deep rooted in the area from different external sources such as NGOs and other programs like safety net. The mechanisms of such external support to approach the local people haven't based well organized studies that could predict the positive and negative effects on sectors and lasting social life of the local communities.

### *Absence of Joint Planning Mechanism among Sectors*

Local communities as well as local level supporters namely CMC, kebele officials, facilitators and education supervisors expressed their complaints on government sectors that they came with their individual plans to the local communities at the same time. During the focus group discussion, discussants indicated that the sectors namely agriculture, education and health had no joint planning mechanism to rearrange schedules for better mobilization of the communities. They came to the people any time they want with out discussing among themselves to set proper time. This was a big challenge in the process of enhancing active participation of the local community in the ABEP. It was because the local communities might be overloaded with too many disintegrated activities and meetings. That in turn results in confusion; lose of interest and complaints among the communities to participate. In such situations it seems very difficult for the community to involve actively and it seems very difficult for the supporters to facilitate active local community participation as well. The woreda education offices also admitted that there was no joint planning and scheduling at the woreda level to mobilize the local communities (See page 58).

### ***The Available Documents, the Acquired knowledge and Information are not Systematically Transferred***

Though there were few documents, trainings and workshops on the ABEP and local community participation, there was no formal mechanism to transfer such knowledge, documents and information among existing experts, facilitators and local communities; and newly assigned workers. The trained actors have no formal ways ready to disseminate their knowledge to the concerned.

Hence, it looks a challenge for the whole educational structure of the education office to maintain and transform the acquired knowledge, information and documents on ABEP/ community participation among supporters and the local communities. This is said to be a challenge because it cuts off the bridge between the supporters and the local communities who are the key actor and the owner of local participation. In such condition, relevant knowledge and information couldn't properly reach to the local communities and they become ignorant of the ABEP and its community participation. Consequently, it seems extraordinarily difficult to enhance local communities to participate genuinely and actively with their own initiation. Of course, there might be pseudo- participation that would come through press – penalties and fear of penalties.

The major sources of this challenge might be two. First the transfer and follow up plan are mostly not part of the development of documents and trainings. After the trainings, workshops and meetings are being conducted, the trainees and the participants have been left. There is no means placed to check whether the trainees could pass the knowledge and documents to the pertinent targets. Second, most of the trainees have no interest and habit to handover the documents and render information to others. It is commonly accepted in the area that the documents are to the trainees themselves. (See Table -7 and related findings of interviews and discussions).

### ***Monopoly of Responsibilities on the Part of CMCs***

The assessment results on the overload of responsibilities of ABE centre management committees and duplication of responsibilities between kebele officials and centre management

committees showed that responsibilities were not fairly distributed among the local communities. Most of the kebele officials are also the members of centre management committees. In some sampled kebeles it could be very difficult to make a demarcation between CMC members and kebele officials. Kebele officials are CMC members, which is resulting overlapping of responsibilities and thereby lack of time to make effective contribution to the improvement of the ABEP (See Table – 13 and related interview and discussion results).

So, it seems a challenge for CMC members and kebele officials; and the whole process of local community participation in ABEP to render effective, quality and timely coordination and mobilization. This duplication of responsibilities or monopolizing responsibilities has bad effects on the process of participation in the ABEP. It led to overload of work and so that the CMC members didn't use their responsibilities effectively and efficiently to facilitate participation.

The local communities' biasness, only very few people of the community could effectively execute the given responsibilities, might be one of the sources of overloading responsibilities to very few people of the kebeles. Moreover, kebele officials are eager to have incentives like per diem by being CMC members and so that they don't like to leave the position.

### ***Lack of Interest of Facilitators for Community Participation***

The interview made with woreda education officials clearly spelt out that ABE centre facilitators has no strong interest to mobilize the local community to participate in the ABE centres. If the local communities participate fully in the ABE centres, the facilitators feel that they could be structurally detached from the government (woreda education offices) and they would not be permanent employee of the government. This feeling and calculation minimizes the interest of the key actor very greatly (ABE facilitators) to facilitate the local community participation. Therefore, it is a likely challenge to make believe the facilitators to act heartily towards local community participation. Some times it is unwise to have active participation of local communities through the coordination and facilitation of such dissatisfied and unsettled facilitators.

### 3.3.2 Prospects

The prospects of the local community participation in the ABEP depend on and could be seen in the present situations (inputs, process, outputs and drawn challenges). As shown in the findings, there are areas which have better prospects and need close follow up to keep on. However, there are other areas which may threaten the sustainability. The green lights are on the focus of the education offices, the presence of well organized structural flows for local community participation and relatively better interest of the local community towards basic education. On the other hand, mismatch of interest and economic capacity, low level of awareness on ABEP, interests on external incentives, absence of joint planning mechanisms at the woreda level, lack of adequate documents and guidelines, absence of mechanisms to transfer knowledge and documents, monopoly of leadership responsibilities and lack of interest of facilitators for local community participation were found to be the major bottlenecks to think of better future for active community participation in the ABEP.

The study findings indicated that those obstacles/challenges are interlinked and it is unlikely for the local communities to participate actively in the ABEP unless those obstacles are removed timely. It seems that unless the local community has got deep orientation on the principles and benefits of ABEP, local communities' interest might side with the formal educational stream and the prospects to enhance the local community participation in the ABE program would diminish in the near future.

Besides, external incentives should not be a driving force for both the local communities and the supporters to enhance the participation of the local communities in ABEP. If it continues like this, the participation level could be very inconsistent and the whole process keeps on producing unsustainable outputs and as a result the mobilization of local communities may decrease radically when the external incentives vanish.

Joint planning and scheduling among government sectors and NGOs to approach the local communities, too is vital. If the trend of individual sector scheduling continues, the activities of local communities might be disintegrated and weaken effectiveness of contributions In this case,

the community might become challenging not to have meetings, not to participate in development campaigns and so on.

Similarly, the low level interest of ABE facilitators towards ABEP also cast a shadow on the continuity of active participation. The present and immediate target of the ABE facilitators seems to join the formal stream. Therefore, there would not be a case for them to align with the ABEP and worry of its continuity through active local community participation.

## CHAPTER – 4

### 4. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

#### 4.1. Summary

As vividly stated in chapter one, the major purpose of this study was to assess the current challenges and prospects of local community participation in alternative basic education program and eventually come up with feasible recommendations.

To this end, a descriptive survey method was used as an appropriate methodology to reflect the intended purpose of the study. Besides, the Input – Process – Output/Outcome (IPO) model was used to identify the available inputs, the nature of the process and the results to test the challenges and prospects of the local community participation in the study area.

Stratified, random sampling and purposive sampling techniques were employed to select the data sources. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select woredas, then ABECs, students and community representatives. Purposive sampling was used to include CMC members, school cluster supervisors, woreda education officials and ABE facilitators.

Relevant data on a wide range of issues pertinent to the study were collected from three woredas of North Wollo namely Kobo, Meket and Wadla. The basic instruments used were questionnaires, focus group discussions and structured interviews. The respondents were woreda education experts, school cluster supervisors, ABE facilitators, ABE centre management committees, ABE students, parents and other local community members. Interviews were conducted with 8 education officials. Group discussions were carried out – with 102 CMC members, 161 ABE students' parents and other local community members and 187 ABE students. Moreover, a total of 68 questionnaires were filled by ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors. Thus, the total number of the respondents was 526.

The major findings of the study (under input, process, output, and challenges and prospects) were the following.

#### 4.1.1 Summary of Major Findings Pertinent to Input

1. In regard to the types and levels of participation of local communities, the study reveals that the local communities participated in various areas (labour, local materials, money, decision making and coordination of ABE centres). However, the degree of participation increases when it is community resource contributions (labour and local materials) and decreases in the area of decision making and leadership. Nearly 81 percent of the questionnaire respondents agreed with this idea and it was also confirmed by focus group discussants and interviewees.
2. The assessment made on the capacity of supporters and local communities shows that local communities have very low economic capacity to contribute and consequently there is mismatch of interest and economic capacity. About 80 percent of the questionnaire respondents of the study agreed on this point and this was also confirmed by interviews and group discussion results.
3. As far as the findings pertinent to the issues was concerned of procedures/guidelines and its applications to enhance local community participation, the following specific findings are revealed by the study.
  - There were no adequate procedures/guidelines for ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors. About 90 percent questionnaire respondents, almost all focus group discussants and the majority of interviewees asserted that there were no ready made and formally organized procedures/guidelines for the facilitators and supervisors to mobilize the local communities. Only some of the interviewed education officials said that there were very few procedures at the hands of the individuals.
  - The approaches to local community participation in the program are not designed in a systematic way to enable the community to initiate itself to the program and enable the supporters to gauge and follow up the participation and the outputs. It was confirmed by 91 percent of the questionnaire respondents and supported by

focus group discussants that the absence of systematic approach towards local community participation is a problem.

4. As indicated by more than 75 percent of the questionnaire respondents and as strongly agreed by parents' group discussions, lack of attention of kebele officials to the ABEP is a major problem to mobilize the local communities towards the ABEP. The core reason for their lack of attention seems their interest for external incentives. Regardless of weak financial and human resource capacity, woreda education offices gave focus to the program as much as they could (70.6% of the questionnaire respondents agreed with this point).

#### **4.1.2 Summary of Major Findings Pertinent to Process**

1. The findings related to the issues of forms and approaches of participation reveal that:
  - Only 8.8 percent of the questionnaire respondents said that the local communities didn't participate directly (in planning, evaluating and monitoring). As confirmed by the remaining questionnaire respondents (about 91%), the local communities rather participated through their representatives and in few general meetings- mostly once in a year during ABE centres' academic year closing.
  - Interviews conducted with the woreda education officials and group discussions with CMC members and parents confirmed that the local communities need very frequent push from CMC, kebele officials, facilitators and cluster supervisors to participate on the ABEP activities.
  - It is also found that, especially from the discussion of parents and CMC members, high initiation of local communities was seen only when there were external donation and competition with other "gots" (sub kebele) or neighbouring kebeles in establishing and expanding education institutions.
  - Regarding approaches used during participation of local communities, the findings witnessed that both the bottom – up and top- down approaches were applied according to the nature of tasks/activities.

2. The survey study reveals that the provision of feedbacks on the performance of the local community as well as the performance of CMC/ABE centres is not frequent. The great majority of the respondents of the questionnaires (69.1%) said the frequency of feedbacks was sometimes and parents and children strongly agree with this finding.
3. The major problem identified concerning communication and relation was that workshops and training results on ABEP were not frequently well communicated to the local communities. Almost all interviewees, focus group discussants and 84 percent of questionnaire respondents verified this finding.
4. The findings of the study attest that CMC members shoulder too many responsibilities in the kebele development work that diminish their focus to ABEP. Nearly, 90 percent of questionnaire respondents, almost all interviewees and discussants ratified that CMC members bear responsibilities more than their capacities. The assessment made on this issue also revealed that close to 93 percent of the CMC members have two or more additional responsibilities in the kebele.
5. The assessment made on the overlap of CMC membership and kebele official shows that more than 75 percent of the CMC members are kebele officials. In relation to this finding, the parents indicated that the overlapping create high dominance of kebele officials to CMC members, competing attention from other responsibilities to use the capacity of the members as an input to the ABEP. It also creates fear on the local community to participate freely, for the power is monopolized by very few.
6. The study reveals that both kebele officials, CMC members and the local communities themselves were not initiated unless there is external support or incentive- per diem and donations from external sources like NGOs and bi- lateral organizations. About 45 (70%) of questionnaire respondents and majority of interviewees and discussants said that the search of incentives of CMC members and kebele officials is a great problem affecting local community participation process in the ABEP. The study also shows that the major reasons for such interest are: low financial capacity of the local communities and diversion of attention to other areas for incentives like the safety net.

### 4.1.3 Summary of Major Findings Pertinent to Output

1. The study discovers that so far there are achievements through local community participations.
  - ABE centres dramatically increased. 56 number of ABE centres were established through community participation in the sampled woredas with in the past three years;
  - From the document review (North Wollo, 2005/06 yearly statistical document) it was learnt that, the basic education participation rate boosted to 92% (ABEP shares 7.2 %);
  - Local communities have got very accessible educational institutions so as to enrol girls.
2. Normally, the level of attitude of local community on the importance of local community participation and the level of community participation correlate positively. The respondents have no doubt to put clearly the importance of community participation to the program. They could identify major benefits of local community participation. However, the study reveals that the level of participation of the local community in the ABE program is not as such strong as their attitude towards the benefits of local community participation. About 76 percent of the respondents of the questionnaires agreed with this finding.
3. The study ascertains that the final decisions and approvals on major issues of the ABE centres such as site selection, fixing meeting days and amount and kinds of materials/money for contribution were passed by local communities. Among the 68 respondents of the questionnaires, 47 (69.1%), confirmed that major issues of the ABE centres were decided and approved by the local communities. The parents' group, however, highlighted that the proposals with alternatives mostly came from either kebele officials or CMC. Significant numbers of the respondents 30.8 % also said that those major issues of the ABE centres were decided either by kebele officials or by CMC.

#### 4.1.4. Summary of Major Findings Pertinent to Challenges

1. The responses obtained from respondents, interviewees and focus group discussants assert that the following are basic challenges.
  - The local communities believe in the paramount importance of local communities' participation in the ABEP and they have good interest to do so. However, they are in very poor economic situations that do not allow them to participate actively, as of their interest and as of the expectation of the ABEP. So, it looks that it is a very great challenge to maximize the economic status of the local communities in order to match their interest to participate with their economic capacity.
  - The awareness level of the local communities on the ABEP is very low due to lack of systematic and organized orientation about the program. It might be a challenge (financially, in coordinating) to orient the mass community to aware about the program.
  - The local communities, CMC members and kebele officials have very deep rooted interest to get external incentive to participate in the ABEP. This expectation highly damaged the initiation power of the local communities to involve and supporters to facilitate local community participation. So, it seems a challenge either to satisfy up to the expectation or uproot this deep rooted behaviour within a very short period of time.
  - Lack of joint planning mechanism of government sectors at the woreda level to mobilize the local communities created a very serious problem on both the local level supporters and the local communities to participate in the ABEP. Hence, it seems a challenge to coordinate sectors to approach the local community with joint planning.
  - Almost all of the supporters and the local communities misconceived local community participation as only and mainly as physical contributions (labour,

local materials and money). Hence, the status of local communities' participation remains at the stage of community extractions and it looks a challenge to minimize or avoid such misconceptions.

- It was found that there were no adequate documents/guidelines on ABEP and community participation, no ways to apply the existing few documents and no formal mechanism to transfer information and knowledge. Hence, it might be a challenge for the whole educational structure of the education office to maintain and transform the acquired knowledge, information and documents on ABEP/ community participation among supporters and the local communities.
- It was found that 90 percent of CMC members are kebele officials and political cadres. Consequently, CMC members were overloaded with too many responsibilities. So, it seems a challenge for CMC members and kebele officials; and the whole process of local community participation in ABEP to render effective, quality and timely coordination. It might be impossible to get genuine and active participation.

## **4.2. Conclusions**

Education is a means of capacity building for the human being. As a result, it is suggested that it would serve its purpose when it is owned by the community at large. Alternative basic education program (ABEP) is, therefore, to provide accessible quality education to the children and requires active participation of the society to improve both relevance and quality of education.

This study was aimed at uncovering the challenges and prospects of local community participation in the ABEP in North Wollo zone (Amhara Regional State). To this end, the following basic questions were formulated:

- How do the local communities of the zone practically participate in the alternative basic education program?
- What is the extent of community participation in the alternative basic education program?
- What are the major challenges of community participation in alternative basic education program in the zone?

- What are the prospects for active local community participation in the alternative basic education program in the zone?

Therefore, based on the study findings the following conclusions were drawn.

The local community of North Wollo zone has well structured participation machine from the government side through which the local community could participate in the ABEP. The structural flow is adequate to obtain active local community participation. To use the structural machine, however, other external, unsustainable and push mechanisms have been employed to let the local communities to participate in the ABEP. Those mechanisms mainly include incentives through donation, unhealthy competitions, penalties and fear of penalties, pressure from very few people who have led the centre management committee and the kebele as well.

Regarding the extent of local community participation in ABEP, the study asserts that the degree of local community participation is at its lower stage. The participation is at the stage of community involvement which inclines to community extraction (provision of labour, local materials and money). Besides, there is no active community participation in the area, for the diversification of participants are limited to household leaders, no self initiation, and low sense of ownership and push factors used persistently. This implies that community participation is used only as a means and not as an end; and the connection between the two was found to be weak.

The study discovered the following major challenges: Hence, the identified challenges are the following as of their order of seriousness.

- Low economic standard of the local community ( mismatch of interest to participate and low economic standard);
- High expectation of external support (donation and other external incentives) to participate actively to facilitate local community participation;
- Lack of joint planning mechanisms among sectors to facilitate local community participation;

- Low awareness and skill level of local community and supporters (CMC, kebele officials, ABE facilitators, school cluster supervisors and education experts) on ABEP and community participation;
- Poor documentation and absence of formal mechanism to maintain and transform knowledge/information/documents through the structure;
- Lack of adequate and relevant procedures on ABEP and local community participation.

The study asserted that in the prevailing situation of the zone, the prospects for active community participation in the ABEP seems somehow blurred and very difficult to obtain active community participation unless the aforementioned challenges and problems are minimized timely. This implies that the program seems losing local community support and there would not be sustainable outputs; and the ABEP in the specified zone would diminish and then collapse. To sum up, solving the challenges is not impossible but difficult in terms of the time and resources required to overcome the challenges and improve the prospect.

### **4.3 Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings obtained and the conclusions reached the following suggestions were forwarded.

1. It is obvious that education is a key element in development and it needs participation of local community. The question here is how to initiate local communities for active participation in education programs (ABEP) with in the current low economic standard to ensure sustainability and relevance and improve the relative quality. Thus,
  - a. Kebele based situational assessment must be done in order to understand the social, cultural and economical aspects of the local communities to regulate demands for participation.
  - b. Local communities with out exceptions (women, men, youth and children) should practically involve in identifying their top development priorities and limiting types and amount of contributions, participation times etc., according to their current situation.

2. The availability of relevant documents/guidelines and the mechanism of transferring knowledge/information and documents maximize the capacity of supporters. This could enable the supporters to orient local community for better initiations to participate. Hence it is vital to:
  - a. Prepare user friendly and relevant procedures/guidelines specifically on ABEP and community participation at the region level. Further more, those materials need to be adopted to fit with the capacity of ABE facilitators, CMC members, Kebele officials and local communities.
  - b. The zone education department should design formal procedure from woreda education offices to kebeles to document and transfer guidelines, manuals and other training materials.
  - c. Establish resource centre at the woreda education office level to document copies of training/workshop materials for further reference.
3. Better understanding of the ABEP is very crucial for both local communities and the supporters. However, the study reveals that local communities' as well as facilitators/supervisors' understanding on the program is very low. Thus,
  - a. ABE facilitators and school cluster supervisors shall be given deep orientation training on different manuals related to the ABEP and community participation.
  - b. Having adopted the guidelines/procedures and ABEP strategic paper, local community orientation must be given. That could be through conducting preliminary training to some of CMC members, ABE facilitators and kebele officials at FTC (Farmers Training Centres) by woreda education offices.
  - c. Children of ABE centres should get orientation about ABEP and community participation and so that they could disseminate enough information to their parents.
4. Facilitating and coordinating community participation has its own skills. Supporters, therefore, need facilitation/coordination skills to change community participation principles into practical actions. Hence, it is essential to train supporters – woreda education experts, school cluster supervisors and ABE facilitators on facilitation skills.

So, it should be the responsibility of zone education department to press the region to get such trainings.

5. Local community participation should be followed up and measured with appropriate instruments and indicators. Though there is an instrument (format to collect data) to gauge local community participation at the woreda level, the format fully relies on measuring physical outputs in terms of money. Hence,
  - a. The format currently used by the woreda education offices to assess the extent of local community participation in the ABEP should be amended by the zone education department. So that it will be possible to measure not only the physical outputs but also the level of direct involvement, extent of participation with ownership feeling in decision making and other activities.
  - b. The monitoring and supervision check list of the cluster school supervisors and woreda education office experts ought to include specifically and clearly the issues of local community participation in relation to ABEP into their supervision check list.
6. Development efforts of stakeholders should be well organized to be efficient and effective. Sectors must have joint planning and should schedule activities considering the current situations like lower living standard of the local communities. Thus, it is essential to establish joint committee to enable government sectors (especially health, agriculture and education) to plan their schedule jointly and exchange schedule information constantly to the local communities. Further more, they ought to inform their schedule to the kebele administration beforehand.
7. Searching of external incentives namely donation and other external incentives predominantly prevails in the area under discussion. This has made focuses of kebele officials inconsistent and initiation of local communities for participation became very weak. Thus, NGOs should do impact analysis on negative effects that would happen to other sectors' program due to their sector specific donation and other support. The woreda administration through its extended structure should design regular follow up mechanism to check the existence of such negative effects.

8. One of the indicators of the existence of active participation is the diversification of participants. If leadership is monopolized by few members of the community (kebele officials and cadres) for a longer time, local communities terrified, they don't involve freely and there wouldn't be active participation as well as the leaders become busy to provide necessary focus to particular areas. Thus,
  - a. The structure of CMC must be reframed to include children representatives, women representative, elders from local dwellers who have better initiation for education and other social structures.
  - b. Kebele officials who, most of the times, are busy of many other responsibilities need not take the majority place in the CMC. They, except the chair person, need to be replaced by other local community members. Further more, the CMC must not be led by kebele chairman/woman because he/she is very busy of other responsibilities. Kebele capacity building head should be the chair of the CMC.
  - c. The CMC members should be elected in every two years in order to use potentials of the local people and to give a room for others to participate in leadership.
9. Further research should be conducted to substantiate and exhaust the factors affecting local community participation in ABEP.

## REFERENCES

### Books

- Andrsen, B.M. (1992) **Education for All: What are we waiting for?** New York: United Nations Children's Fund Program Publications, U.S.A.
- Bishop, G. (1986) **Innovation in Education.** London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1989) **Alternative Strategies for Education.** London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Bhatia, K. K. (1992) **Principles of Education.** India: Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi-Ludhiana.
- Bray, M (1996) **Decentralization of Education: Community Financing.** Washington D.C.: 1818 H street, N.W.
- Brembeck and Thompson, J. (1974) **New Strategies for Educational Development.** United States of America: Lexington Books, Massachusetts.
- Craft, Anna (1996) **Primary Education Assessing and Planning Learning.** USA and Canada: Biddles Ltd.
- Delors, Jacques (1998) **Education for the Twenty- first Century.** France : Presses University de France,41700 Vendome.
- FAO and UNESCO, (2003) **Education for Rural People.** Italy: IIEP.
- Farrant, J. S. (1980) **Principle and Practice of Education.** London and Edinburgh: Morrison and Gibb Ltd.
- Glasman S. and Nevo, (1988) **Evaluation in Decision Making.** Boston: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Hailemikael Liqu (1996) **Community Consultation and Participatory Development.** Addis Ababa.
- Hawes Hugh and David Stephens, (1990) **Questions of Quality Primary Education and Development.** Malaysia : Commercial press Sdn.Bhd.
- Jones L. and Maloy W. (1988) **Partnerships for Improving Schools.** New York Westport: Greenwood Press.

- Mbamba, A. M. (1992) **Book of Reading in Educational Management**. Harare: UNESCO Sub-Regional Office for South Africa.
- MOE,1994.**Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia Education and Training Policy**. Addis Ababa : St. George Printing Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002) **The Federal Democratic Republic Government of Ethiopia**. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999) **Education Sector Development Program-I** .Addis Ababa: EMPDA.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2002) **Education Sector Development Program (ESDP-II)**. Addis Ababa: United Printers Plc.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005) **Education Sector Development Program (ESDP-III)**. Addis Ababa:
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005) **Educational Statistics Annual Abstract**. Addis Ababa: Orion printing press.
- Morrissey, (1995) **Effective Governors for Effective Schools: Roles and Relationships**. England: PITMAN Publishing.
- Rugh, Anrea and Bessert, Heather (1993) **Involving Communities: Participation in the Delivery of Education Programs**. U.S.A. : Creative Associates International, Inc., Washington, DC.
- SCD, (2004) **Alternative Basic Education in Ethiopia**. Addis Ababa: ALPHA printers.
- Shaeffer, S. (1994) **Participation for Educational Change: A Synthesis of Experience**. France :UNESCO/HEP.
- Shaeffer, F. (1992) **Collaborating for Educational Change in Non-Formal Basic Education**. France: Delacroix, 75116 Paris.
- Tekeste, n.(1996) **Rethinking Educational System in Ethiopia**. Sweden: Nodriska afrikanstitutit.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1990) **The Crisis of Ethiopian Education, Some Implications for Nation-Building**. Sweden: Development of Education – Uppsala University.
- Thomas, et al., (1978) **International Dictionary of Education**. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- UNESCO, (2001) **International Consultation on Educational Governance at Local Levels**. France: UNESCO.
- UNICEF, (2006) **The State of the World Children 2006**. New York: Brodock Press

The World Bank, (1989) **Education in Sub-Saharan Africa, Policies for Adjustment, Revitalization, and Expansion.** U.S.A.: H street,N.W., Washington,D.C. 20433.

### **Journals**

Nata Colletta and Gilliana Perkins, (1995) "Participation in Education and Training Sector Social Development Notes," Note No.01.

Oakley, P.(1988) "Conceptual Problems of Monitoring and Evaluation of Qualitative Objectives of Rural Development," **Community Development Journal**, Vol.23, No.1.

White, A.T. (1992) "Why Community Participation?" Assignment Children, UNICEF, **Journal of Community participation** 59/60.

### **Unpublished Materials**

Anbesu Biazen, (2005) "Proceedings of ATKLT Forum." Bahir Dar. Save the Children Denmark and Norway.

Anbesu Biazen and Wossenu Yimam, (2002) "Factors Contributing for the Success of the ACCESS program in Koysha RDA." Action AID- Ethiopia : Addis Ababa.

Anbesu Biazen, et. al., (2002) "Learning for Life Save the Children Experience in Alternative Basic Education in Ethiopia." Addis Ababa.

ARSEB, (2003) "The Amhara National Regional State Children's Alternative Basic Education Program Strategy." Bahir Dar. Save the Children Norway.

\_\_\_\_\_ (2006) "Education Sector Development Program III (first draft)." Bahir Dar.

Ayalew Shibeshi, (1991) "Approach to Educational Organization and Management." AAU.

\_\_\_\_\_ et.al. , (2002) "A Study on Non Formal Primary Education Development Program in Amhara Development Association Areas." Addis Ababa University.

Baltzersen Johnny, (2003) "Review of Save the Children Denmark's Ethiopia Program on Alternative Basic Education: Challenges and Strategic Options." International Centre for Educational Development ,Copenhagen.

CYFWO, (1992) "Convention on the Rights of the Child."

Joint Review Mission, (2004) "Ethiopia Education Sector Programme II Joint Review Mission Report."

- Michael Daniel, (2003) "Proceedings of the Experience of Save the Children Alliance Members in Ethiopia on Alternative Basic Education." Addis Ababa. Save the Children Alliance.
- Nicholas Awortw, (1999) "The Riddle of Community Development: Factors Influencing Organization, Participation and Self Management in 29 African and Latin American Communities." The Netherlands.
- Norman J. (2000) "Community Participation – How People Power Brings Sustainable Benefits to Communities."
- Uemura Mitsue, (1999) "Community Participation in Education: What do we know?" HDNED, The World Bank.
- Yodit Beyene et.al., (2005) "Stimulating Community Participation in Primary Schools: Perspectives on the BESO II project in Bahir Dar, Ethiopia." Bahir Dar
- Zaudneh Yimtatu, (1994) "Change and Innovation in Education." A.A.U.

### **Internet Sources**

- African Charter, (2006). **African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation.** <http://www.africaaction.org/african-initiatives/charter1.htm>
- Arnstein, R. (2004). **A Ladder of Citizen Participation.** <http://www.lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-ofcitizen-participation.html>
- Basic Education Coalition, (2004). **Why Basic Education** <http://www.basiced.php>
- Charlick, Robert B. (2006). **Popular Participation and Local Government Reform.** Cleveland State University. <http://www.csuohio.edu/polisci/bob/Partgov.htm>
- Huizer Gerrit, (1997). **Participatory Action Research and People's Participation: Introduction and Case Study.** <http://www.fao.org/sd/Ppre0029.htm>
- Infed, (2006). **Community.** <http://www.infed.org/community/community.htm>
- UNESCO, (2001). **International Consultation on Educational Governance at Local Levels.** Paris: <http://www.unesco.org/education/highlights/governance.html>

# APPENDICES

## *Appendix -1*

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**  
**SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE STUDIES, FACULTY OF EDUCATION**  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONNAL PLANING AND MANAGEMENT**

### **Questionnaire Set for ABE Learning Center Facilitators and School Cluster Supervisors**

Dear Facilitators and School Cluster Supervisors,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect primary data for the work of master's thesis on the title "Local Community Participation in Alternative Basic Education Program in North Wollo: Challenges and Prospects. Please, cooperate in filling this questionnaire and your objective and honest information would be of high value for the study.

Thank you in advance.

#### **General Direction:**

1. It is unnecessary to write your name on the questionnaire.
2. Please, follow the relevant instruction when filling out the questionnaire.
3. Please, write short answers in the space provided for question items that require opinion or completion.

#### ***Direction for close – ended questions***

1. These are questions in which two or more options are provided. For such types of questions, choose what you think is the correct answer by circling the letters.
2. If your answer is different from the given options, there is a possibility to put your answer just after the phrase "others (specify)".
3. There are also questions that request you to rank order. In this case, you put a ✓ mark according to levels.

#### **Directions for open-ended questions**

1. These are questions that should be responded by writing the correct answers. So, read each of these questions carefully and then write what you believe is the correct answer in the blank space provided at the end of the question.

2. Write your answers at the back page of the questionnaire if you find the provided space is insufficient. In doing so, don't forget to put the corresponding number.

### **Background Data**

1. Woreda: \_\_\_\_\_
2. ABE center or Sub Woreda : \_\_\_\_\_
3. Age \_\_\_\_\_
4. Sex
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
5. Marital Status
  - a. Married
  - b. Single(Never married)
  - c. Divorced
  - d. Widowed
  - e. Separated
  - f. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Level of Education
  - a. Below grade 12
  - b. 12 (10) grade complete
  - c. 12 +TTI
  - d. 12+2
  - e. 12+4
7. Years of service in education related activities \_\_\_\_\_

### **I. Questions related to ways and degrees of local community participation**

1. To what extent do you think local community participation is necessary and beneficial for the improvement of the ABE learning center in your working area?
  - a. Very high
  - b. High
  - c. Medium
  - d. Low
  - e. Very low
2. Does the local community in your area provide support to ABE learning center?
  - a. Yes, it does always
  - b. Yes, it does most of the time
  - c. Yes, it does sometimes
  - d. Yes, it does rarely
  - e. Never

3. If your answer to question number 2 is yes ( a- d), please rank order the degree of contributions of local communities to the ABE learning center in your local working areas. Please put ✓ mark.

Contributions	Degree of contributions			
	Very high	High	Low	Very Low
Financial contributions				
Labor contributions				
Local materials contributions				
Provision of information				
Consultation (giving advisory support)				
Decision making				
Coordination or leadership				

4. In what way do you support the local community to participate in ABEP? Show your agreement by putting ✓ mark.

	Mode of support	Agreement	
		Yes	No
a.	Provide orientation		
b.	Distributing guidelines and procedures		
c.	Giving advice about the importance of community participation		
d.	Prepare drama and pomes		
e.	Showing the practical results of community participation in other areas		

5. How do the local communities in your area participate in decision making the ABE program? Show your agreement by putting ✓ mark.

	Ways of participation	Agreement	
		Yes	No
a.	Mostly through its representatives (CMC, KETB)		
b.	During their general meeting ( Quarterly and other meetings)		
c.	Direct participation is rare		
d.	No direct participation		

e. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

6. How frequent is the direct involvement of the local community in supporting ABE learning center?
- Once in a year
  - Twice in a year
  - Three to four times in a year
  - Four to six times in a year
  - Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_
7. As you can observe, do the local community representatives (CMC/ KETB and kebele officials), advertise discussion issues and give feed backs openly to the local community members about the progress of ABE learning centers' activities in your locality?
- Yes, always
  - Yes, most of the time
  - Yes, sometimes
  - Very rarely
  - Never

8. If your answer to question number 7 is yes- always, most of the times and sometimes; in what way are the beneficiaries communicated? Show your agreement by putting ✓ mark.

	Ways of communication	Agreement	
		Yes	No
a.	Through general meetings – quarterly meetings		
b.	Through their children		
c.	Through paper notice		
d.	During religious ceremonies		
e.			
f.			

- g. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

9. Please rank orders the following stages of activities concerning the degrees of participation of the community. Please put ✓ mark.

Activities	Degree of participation			
	Very high	High	Low	Very low
Need assessment				
Planning				
Implementation				
Monitoring and evaluation				

10. Who does practically decide and approve on major areas of the ABE learning centers such as site selection, fixing learning time, budget and types and amounts of contributions?
- Kebele officials
  - Center management committee
  - The beneficiaries (parents and local communities)

- d. Kebele Education Training Board
- e. Facilitators/supervisors
- f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

11. Please show your level of agreement by putting ✓ mark concerning the applied approach to let the local community to participate in the ABE learning center.

Approach	Level of agreement			
	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Bottom up (community initiates by itself)				
Top – down – the local community get orders from above				
Betting the strong – letting very few strong members of the community participate				
Community never initiate themselves				

12. Which of the following are the main problems affecting the active participation of the local community in the alternative basic education program? Show your level of agreement by putting ✓ mark.

S/n	Problems	Criticality of the problem			
		High	Medium	Low	I don't know
1.	Local communities do not listen when told to participate				
2	Communities have no capacity to contribute and participate in the ABE learning centers' activities				
3	Efforts supporters (facilitators, kebele officials, supervisors, CMC, KETB members) are ignored by the community.				
4	The local communities don't agree with ABE center management.				
5	Communities have low awareness on children's education				
6	The local communities don't satisfied with the result of ABE learning center education				
7	Women and children don't participate in ABE learning decision making				

8	The local communities participate with no interest and with no sense of ownership				
9	The local communities have no enough time to participate				
10	The local communities are ignorant of ABE manuals and ABE strategy papers.				
11	Overload of work and a lot of additional responsibility of CMC, KETB members.				
12	CMC members look for incentives				
13	CMC members have no adequate capacity to mobilize the local community to participate				
14	CMC and KETB members are dominated/highly influenced by kebele officials.				
15	The CMC has no clearly set roles and responsibilities to facilitate local community participation				
16	CMC and KETB has no power to do what it planes to mobilize the local community				
17	CMC members have no enough knowledge on ABE programs and they have no ABE guiding papers and manuals.				
18	ABE(CMC and KETB) wait commands from woreda education office to let local communities to participate in ABE learning centers' activities				
19	ABE centers are not transparent to the local communities how do they use their contributions effectively and efficiently				
20	ABE centers demand excessive contributions and participation beyond the capacity of the local communities				
21	In appropriate location of the ABE center to mobilize the entire local community				
22	Inappropriate time to let the local community to participate.				
23	Irrelevant areas for the local communities to participate actively				
24	Kebele administrators don't give adequate attention to mobilize the local community on the issue of ABE learning center				
25	Absence of local guiding manual that enable local supporters at the kebele level( CMC, KETB, facilitators and supervisors ) to coordinate local community participation				
26	You (facilitators and supervisors) have no				

	adequate knowledge and skills to apply local community participation principles.				
27	You face shortage of guiding manuals on facilitating local community participation in the ABE learning center				
28	The woreda education office has shortage of human power to direct and facilitate local community participation				
29	The woreda education office has no capacity and doesn't focus to train and equip supporters ( facilitators and supervisors) to mobilize the local community in ABE learning centers				
30	Unnecessary dominance of woreda administrators to mobilize local community to participate in the ABE learning center				
31	Overload of work on the woreda education office education experts and supervisors				
32	The woreda education office doesn't give attention for ABE program at all				
33	Very weak relation between the ABE learning center and the local community				
34	Lack of openness, trust, freedom, transparency and good governance in general to let the local community to participate actively and with full sense of ownership				
35	Lack of organized and systematized mechanisms, structures to initiate the local community and follow up the effect of participation in the ABE learning center				
36	The given orientations, trainings and directions given to CMC,KETB don't properly reach to the local communities.				
37	Results of local community participation lack sustainability				
38	Poor communication between supporters and the local community in ABE learning participation				
39	Dominance of very few elites and political leaders in the ABE learning center leadership and management.				
40	Local community participation is very difficult task and time taking.				

13. What other problems did you face and observed in relation to mobilize the local community in the ABE learning center activities?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

14. What types of solutions do you propose to avoid or minimize the problems or challenges that you identified on ABEP?

a. In regard to local communities' problems:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

b. In regard to facilitators' problems:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

c. In regard to supervisors' problems:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

d. In regard to woreda education office's problems:

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

e. In regard to Center management committees':

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

f. In regard to kebele education and training board

---

---

---

---

---

15. Do you specify who does what for your suggestions shown above?

---

---

---

---

---

---

16. What are the practical mechanisms to implement your proposed solutions

---

---

---

---

## Appendix - 2

*ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY*  
*SCHOOL OF POST GRADUATE STUDIES, FACULTY OF EDUCATION*  
*DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONNAL PLANINING AND MANAGEMENT*

### **Focus Group Discussion Guide to ABE students of level two and three.**

#### **General Information**

Number of the group

Male \_\_\_\_\_

Female \_\_\_\_\_

1. What are your contributions and participations in your ABE centers in addition to the teaching – learning process? Do you support your ABE centers?
2. Do you have student representatives who participate in center management committee? If you have, who select them, what did they do so far? How do they gather issues from you and how do they give you feedbacks? Do you have carried out meetings with your representatives and you parents to discuss the issues of ABE center? If not why?
3. Have your parents discussed about your ABE centers? How frequent? Why did they meet? Who participate among your family members?
4. In what areas do your parents participate in supporting your ABE centers? Do they participate and contribute to the ABE centers as expected of them? Do they complain if they are requested to contribute and participate for the ABE centers?
5. What are the major problems for you to participate actively in supporting your ABE centers? What do you think of the possible solutions?
6. What are the major problems do your parents and other community members encountered to participate actively in the process of supporting and coordinating ABE centers? Do you suggest solutions to improve the situations?

### Appendix - 3

ADISS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

## Interview Guide for Woreda Education Experts.

Name of the woreda \_\_\_\_\_

Career Position \_\_\_\_\_

Years of service in education related field \_\_\_\_\_

Level of Education \_\_\_\_\_

1. How far do you believe in the benefit of local community participation in ABE learning center? What do you think of the cons and prone of involving local community in ABE learning center activities in your working area? How do you emphasis on it?
2. What are your roles and responsibilities indicated in your job description to enhance local community participation in the ABEP in your working area? Can you specify the role of the woreda education office and the ABE learning centers and the cluster supervisors in the woreda?
3. How do you evaluate your expertise/ capacity in enhancing local community participation and the capacity of the kebele officials, the ABE learning centers the supervisors, CMCs and KETBs? What were the inputs given to them? Do you believe that the government gives emphasis to local community participation?
4. Are there manuals/guidelines, strategies to facilitate local community participation in your woreda? How do you evaluate those materials in terms of adequacy, accessibility, clarity, applicability and relevance?
5. What were the contributions of the local communities to ABEP in the woreda? Could you explain it in terms of finance, labor, local materials, decision making? In which one these they participate easily and why is that? At which areas do they involve most and what about their diversification? Do they have a right to participate at every levels of participation?
6. How do the local community members participate in the ABEP? Do you have any organized ways of letting community members to participate and systems to evaluate the levels of community participation? What mechanisms and approaches employed?
7. According to your records and opinions, what do you say about the ways of local community participation in ABEP? How do you feel about the willingness of the local

community to participate in ABEP? Do the local communities accept willingly the request /directions with sense of ownership or not? If so why?

8. Do you think that facilitators and supervisors are willing to let local community to participate? Why?
9. What results were recorded due to local community participation in ABEP and how do they make a difference in the program?
10. According to your evaluation what problems did the local community face in involving in the ABEP in your woreda? Could you point out the core sources of those problems related to the ABE, community and woreda education office or any other body?
11. What were/are the major problems/challenges you face in facilitating/ coordinating community participation in ABEP in your working area? Could you explain it in relation to local community, procedure, governance, structure, capacity and so on?
12. What could be your suggestions to tackle those identified problems/challenges? Do you specify who does what for your suggestions?
13. Any other additional idea

## Appendix - 4

### ADISS ABABA UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

#### **Focus Group Discussion Guide to Center Management Committee and Parents/other Community Members.**

##### **General Information**

Group \_\_\_\_\_

Number of the group

Male \_\_\_\_\_

Female \_\_\_\_\_

##### **Discussion points**

1. How far do you believe in the benefit of local community participation in ABE learning center? Do you look in to the pros and cons of involving local community participation?
2. What are the roles and responsibilities of the committee/the board in enhancing community participation in ABE learning center? How were the performances?
3. Do you explain the means by which you are using to mobilize local communities in the process of implementing ABEP in your kebele?
4. Tools and procedures used to enhance community participation, presence of tools guidelines, strategies, and bylaws; the accessibility and familiarity of the tools to the committee/board- members as well as the beneficiaries. What do you feel about the procedures, applicability and relevance etc... of the procedures /guidelines?
5. What were the contributions of the local community? Types, degrees of participation and achievements so far. Are they willing to participate, is there sense of ownership? Do diversified people participate?

6. Support given to the committee and capacity of the supporters in regard to mobilizing the local community
  - a. Who support the community
  - b. How is the capacity of supporters (facilitators, kebele officials, supervisors,
  - c. How frequent the support is and in what ways
  - d. Inputs given workshops/orientation
  
7. Encountered problems and challenges
  - a. Problems of the committees.
  - b. Problems in relation to supporters (kebele officials, supervisors, facilitators, education office and government etc...)
  - c. Guidelines and procedures
  - d. In relation to local community
  - e. Capacity of coordinating and approach
  
8. Ways to tackle problems and challenges
  - a. The possible solutions for the problems and challenges
  - b. How can it be addressed
  - c. Who will be responsible for what



## Appendix - 6

### List of alternative basic education centres visited during data collection

No.	Name of the ABE centres	Kebele	Woreda	NGOs' Established	GO's Established
1	Bewa	Kemele (02)	Kobo	✓	
2	Gedadoye	Kobo Zuria (01)	Kobo	✓	
3	Woromigna	Weromigna(012)	Kobo		✓
4	Tigre Mender	Ayub	Kobo		✓
5	Kemele	Kemele (02)	Kobo	✓	
6	Rama/Ras Alula	Rama	Kobo	✓	
7	Atersha	Atersha	Kobo		✓
8	Ayu Medhanialem	Ayu Medhanialem (03)	Meket		✓
9	Berekeza	Berekeza (08)	Meket		✓
10	Sisye	Sisiyo ( 014)	Meket		✓
11	Maserut	Maserut (013)	Meket		✓
12	Hamusit	Hamusit ( 029)	Meket	✓	
13	Dabza	Dabza	Meket		✓
14	Woinamba	Talit	Wadla	✓	
15	Gebeta Mariam	Gazobelay ( 018)	Wadla	✓	
16	Serara	Chena Dikishe (o6)	Wadla		✓
17	Tsiyon	Beteyohans (012)	Wadla		✓

## Appendix – 7

### Name of woreda education experts who were interviewed

No.	Name	Position	Woreda
1	Ato Nigussie Demissie	Head of non- formal education desk	Kobo
2	Ato Tsegaye Masresha	Head of the woreda education office	Kobo
3	Ato Melesse Kassaw	Education program head	Kobo
4	Ato Muligeta Bihonegn	Education program head	Meket
5	Ato Tesfaye Tsige	Inspector	Meket
6	Ato Agegnehu	Head of formal education desk	Meket
7	Ato Wondoson Masresha	Examination and students' services expert	Wadla
8	Ato Wudasse Bezabih	Head of non- formal education desk	Wadla

## Declaration

I, the undersigned, declared that this thesis is my original work and all the materials used have been duly acknowledged.

Place: Addis Ababa University  
College of Education

Name: Samuel Tadesse Feleke

Signature: 

Date: 05/4/2007