

CHAPTER 6

Co-ordination, Resources, Finance and Commonwealth Co-operation

The purpose of society is man... to serve man there must be a social organization... conducive to the greater production of things useful for the material and spiritual welfare of man. It may well be a function of society to organize and sustain efficient economic organizations and productive techniques, even when... unpleasant or restrictive... But... when the demands of 'efficiency' and 'production' override men's need for a full and good life, then society is no longer serving man, it is using him.

Julius K. Nyerere

Co-ordination and Co-operation (Local and National)

In its extensive consideration of these issues, the Delhi Conference turned first to the lead paper of Chris Duke. Noting that NFE must serve the 'poorest of the poor' and also that political dimensions and implications cannot be ignored, he went on to look at a number of 'key issues':

The first is whether and how one can distinguish these from government control. Related to this is a strategic question about centralization or central direction. Is it possible to manage an NFE strategy through a 'cascade' model whereby centrally generated policies, curricula, manuals, evaluation systems etc., are used and carried out locally; or does the centre-periphery approach (such as underlies the massive Iranian adult education and literacy campaign) by its nature contradict the spirit of NFE? Another aspect of this is that it may be necessary to exercise strong central control and direction in order to impose on officials those characteristics—'deformalization', 'debureaucratization'—deemed necessary for effective NFE. This has been suggested in a study of further education needs of aboriginal peoples in Northern Australia.²

A second key issue is the relation between governmental and non-governmental provision, and the role of the voluntary or NGO sector. In western Commonwealth countries the voluntary sector remains significant and quite influential in providing alternatives to formal schooling; such

private schooling, while it may be more innovative and experimental in some cases, is however not generally to be described as non-formal education, much less as NFE for development. The voluntary tradition is also significant in adult education. Here it is correct to describe the bulk of such work as NFE, though whether 'for development' is less clear. Co-operation between government and the voluntary sector will be increasingly important as hopes for development through education shift towards NFE. There is considerable unease in Australia, however, to take just one example, among voluntary providers of adult education as committees and commissions seeking to rationalize post-school education have led to new state machineries for co-ordination of provision. Co-ordination tends to lead to bureaucratization and indirect control. NFE may then lose precisely that non-formal character which is its distinctive virtue. In noting below the Indian approach as an example of national-level co-operation, we should reflect on what might be the best solutions to the need for co-operation and co-ordination without destructive control.

NFE within government systems is a third issue, one that poses a very difficult problem of co-ordination. Here, in contrast to the area of government/NGO co-operation, we might well feel that there is need for *more* authority and control. When we scan the range of functional ministries and departments—health, information, agriculture, productivity, industry, population planning, immigration, community and ethnic affairs, interior and so on—we find that NFE, like communication, appears as a service component in most. There may even be a large professional staff concerned exclusively with, for instance, health or population education, industrial training or agricultural extension. Often such personnel are engaged in functional literacy or community development—NFE activities without which their own particular objectives would be thwarted. Unfortunately, bureaucratic imperialism is so widespread that competition is commoner than co-operation. The result is duplication, waste of scarce resources, and confusion in the recipient community which experiences a succession of government officers trying to do similar things. Of course ministries and departments of education may be no less guilty than others, so control from that quarter might not provide the answer.

In turning now to local and national levels of co-operation and co-ordination we may simply note rather than explore the different substantive areas of education, whether school or post-school age, which are encompassed. It might be fruitful to reflect on the role of each of these in the basic cycle or core curriculum being defined in different countries, and by international bodies such as UNESCO, to prescribe what each child should attain before leaving the initial phase of education, whether formal or non-formal. They include literacy and functional literacy, education in productive skills, civics, citizenship or social education (which may include education for national integrity and security, general or liberal education), continuing or updating education of various kinds, and the conscientization or consciousness-raising expounded by Paulo Freire. It is immediately obvious that co-ordination across this range will be very difficult and often impossible.

While approaches to co-ordination at the national level are better known, local-level co-ordination and co-operation are equally important, perhaps

even more important in the sense that many different approaches can be tried within one country and those that are successful may be replicated elsewhere. Experimentation is harder for a total system than for part of it, and the risks associated with innovation are so great that little may ever be attempted.

At the simplest level co-operation can take the form of jointly publicizing available learning opportunities in both the public and voluntary sectors. Recent interest among adult educators in the need for information, guidance and counselling services for adults² includes such arrangements. In the Australian city of Melbourne, the Council of Adult Education produces an annual handbook of all identifiable courses. The Council is unique in Australia in being charged with stimulating and facilitating rather than merely making provision, although it is also a major provider of adult learning opportunities in its own right. In the same city the first and most successful of a number of learning exchanges provides another example of local co-operation and co-ordination entirely outside the government system; the learning exchange matches a rich diversity of teaching resources with learning needs with the assistance of a computer data bank. Similar arrangements are to be found in various cities throughout western countries of the Commonwealth. Another example of local co-operation in Australia is the Learning Information Network (LINK) an adult education information service started jointly by a university and a government department of education, which may come to acquire more active co-ordination and counselling functions in addition to the initial information service.³

These examples refer to adult non-formal education rather than alternatives for children. The research and development unit (BPPPK) of the Indonesian Ministry of Education is conducting a project in co-operation with the Department of Community Education (Penmas) to identify all the different kinds of community and governmental learning resources available to selected villages, as a basis for developing a community-based non-formal system of educational provision which draws on these resources (including the formal school and its personnel) to meet their learning needs. Two national workshops in Thailand in 1978 (one arranged by UNESCO, the other by a regional adult education NGO), examined local-level co-ordination of non-formal education, again taking into account the different community as well as governmental resources in the locality. The intention in Indonesia is that the local Community Education Officer should act as a co-ordinator and facilitator. In Thailand the first of these seminars laid strong emphasis on the need to cut across the lines of command from Bangkok through to the local level by means of some form of delegation to a local co-ordinating team. Otherwise directives from the centre within the priorities of national ministries and departments negate any attempt to co-ordinate in relation to local-level priorities and needs.

In Australia the same phenomenon and need have been identified in relation to Aboriginal communities in remote areas of the Northern Territory and Western Australia. Regional co-ordinating committees in the latter seek to exercise authority delegated from the capital, Perth. In the Northern Territory a largely unsuccessful attempt was made to appoint Community Advisers from the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to act as local co-ordinators; their work was to include chairing co-ordinating committees of all officers of the

communities together with community leaders to plan an NFE response to community needs. The plan has had little success, partly because other officers retain their direct line to their own Head Office, whose dictates override those of the local situation. The same phenomenon has been exposed by the Centre for Continuing Education of the Australian National University in working with Australian subsidiaries of multi-nationals which are seeking to introduce schemes of industrial democracy in their workplaces. Such attempts are thwarted so long as the local functional section heads retain any direct line to their overseas functional heads, since their priorities will override the needs of the local situation. Remote control is singularly inappropriate in the struggle to secure effective co-operation and co-ordination in NFE.

When we turn to the national level there is a wealth of generally available information. However the problems are if anything yet more intransigent. Relations between governmental and non-governmental sectors can be problematic. There is also the strong adult education tradition in many countries to be balanced with the emergent and potentially wider and more significant thrust towards NFE. Ideally, the adult education tradition might be used to buttress NFE against the dangers of 'take over' and formalization by the formal system. A strong but outward-looking national adult education association may serve as the guardian of the distinctive virtue of both adult and system-wide non-formal education. India provides a good example of how this might be attained, despite difficulties between theory, structure and execution. A strong national association of thirty years standing has many organizational members, including state adult education associations. As part of the massive National Adult Education Programme India has upgraded its Directorate of Adult Education within the Ministry of Education and Welfare, and charged a Joint Secretary of that Ministry with the full-time responsibility for executing the Programme. It has also created a strong National Council representing different relevant interests inside and outside of government. And it is looking to the NGO sector, through the National Association, to play a key part in implementing the Programme. This suggests perhaps the minimal requirements for effective co-operation at the national level—a ministry unit with adequate resources and expertise as well as authority, an official or semi-official national council, and a strong national association with a regional, provincial or similar infrastructure.

Of course not all Commonwealth countries have the traditions and infrastructure of India in adult education. Singapore is just now seeing the creation of a national association based on the University of Singapore (Extramural Studies) and the People's Association, with co-operation from the newly merged Adult Education Board and the Industrial Training Board. Near-by Malaysia has no such association, nor indeed any one government department to provide a natural base for either adult or wider non-formal education; the responsibility for periodic monitoring of this area sits with the Implementation and Co-ordination Unit of the Prime Minister's Department. Hong Kong, on the other hand, has a young but very vigorous National Association based mainly in the voluntary and university sectors which, because of its very vigour, may be regarded by the Department of Education as something of an embarrassment, although cordial relations are maintained. In New Zealand, the structure was established by the National Council of Adult (Continuing)

Education, under the 1947 Adult Education Act but, partly perhaps for this reason, does not have a distinct national association. A recent history of New Zealand adult education suggests that the voluntary sector has suffered from this sequence of events.⁴ Canada, because of its two languages and traditions, has two Associations. The Australian Association of Adult Education is a strong and vigorous body, given the small dispersed population relative to the size of the country, but Australia has no Federal Government unit or department of adult education, and no national council. Like Canada it suffers from a lack of national co-ordination by being a federal system.

Apart from India, there are a number of Adult Education Associations in Third World Commonwealth countries. The People's Educational Association in Ghana appeared in the late 1940s while there are more recent developments in countries like Kenya or Botswana. One of the most successful is that of Guyana. Founded in 1956, the Association is now responsible for all courses formerly provided by the Ministry of Education. It receives an annual grant from Government and is able to employ a full-time adult education officer. It is also represented on each Regional Development Council.

Turning to co-ordination between government departments at national level, Chris Duke's paper notes that:

The problems of 'bureaucratic imperialism' and rivalry are so sadly and universally familiar that we need to do little more than acknowledge them. Nothing short of an act of political will and sustained decisive leadership will avert duplication and competition in NFE and community development, with cost to the quality and efficiency of educational services. Because NFE resources are so widely dispersed through government (and throughout society) the problem is far more acute than in the formal system; although not many countries suffer the difficulty of Thailand where education is divided between a powerful Ministry of the Interior which controls elementary education and a Ministry of Education responsible for other provision. A national council, if strong and strongly led, may go well along the way to solving this. The Central Literacy Committee in Burma provides an excellent example of a very high-level cross-sectoral Committee which plans, co-ordinates and mobilizes resources for the national literacy programme. Tanzania provides an outstanding example of integrated educational planning for development with the emphasis on adult education—again a consequence especially of strong commitment and leadership from the top, in this case from President Nyerere. In New Zealand while the voluntary sector, especially the Workers' Educational Association, paid a price for a National Council, one result in the long term has been to build adult education strongly into the Ministry itself, and even (perhaps confusingly) to redefine all post-school education, including higher education as continuing education.

We might be unwise to demand any one model for co-ordination or even co-operation at the national level in so dispersed and diverse a field as NFE. Among important features, however, should be included: access at a very high level and at an early stage to national development planning; some consultative and co-ordinating mechanism, also at a high level and with top-

level sanction, for co-ordination of effort between different government departments; understanding and appreciation of the unique role and contribution of NGOs and the voluntary sector. This includes both the traditional resources of Asian, African and South Pacific societies as well as agencies born in the main out of nineteenth century British tradition and emulated, more or less fruitfully and with more or less adaptation, in many countries during the colonial period. Government officers are among the most forward in many Commonwealth and other countries in recognizing the advantages of a strong non-governmental sector. This includes the tactical advantage to themselves of having a strong national association from which pressure may be exerted, even on themselves in their official capacity, in the interests of NFE. Such an opinion has been expressed by colleagues in government in Thailand and other countries in South-East Asia as well as by colleagues from different Commonwealth countries. In one African Commonwealth country the efforts of the national association in having established a quasi-official national council have reportedly resulted quite directly in a several-fold increase in the national budget allocation to adult education.

The emphasis on voluntary associations in Chris Duke's paper was taken up by the Conference itself, which urged Governments 'to encourage and support voluntary agencies in non-formal education'. However, it warned that 'structures are needed to harness the potential of voluntary effort'. In this context a Conference Recommendation notes that better use of voluntary agencies should be encouraged by: '(a) including their representative on national boards and commissions concerned with rural development and co-ordination of non-formal education, and on related bodies at other levels; (b) consulting them when non-formal education policies are being framed; (c) involving them in planning and implementing programmes that are in keeping with their interests and expertise; (d) extending technical support to their development programmes; (e) assisting them with evaluation; (f) involving and sponsoring their personnel in non-formal education training programmes both as trainers and trainees; and (g) offering grants-in-aid to non-governmental agencies capable of initiating and managing development-oriented non-formal education.'

Nevertheless, important though non-governmental agencies may be, it is governments themselves which must take the lead in promoting and co-ordinating effort in non-formal education.

As the Conference Report notes:

At the national level the co-ordinating machinery most likely to be successful is a structure that is an extension of the government's own administration. A national agency on which all relevant government and non-governmental agencies are represented can facilitate integration and quality control of non-formal education. In addition, such a board might be responsible for training and commissioning appropriate research and evaluation. National boards,

however, should not dominate programmes, and the planning, programming and evaluation of most projects should be decentralized. However, co-ordinating structures are needed. Thus at the village level there should be co-ordinating machinery where workers from different agencies are involved. In Tanzania, for example, the village council is the focal point for planning, programme implementation and evaluation...

The initiative for setting local development goals, for implementing local plans and for evaluation should be the responsibility of local government organizations or village management groups. In addition to their central concern, which is with the development and operation of the local educational programme, responsibilities at this level should include management of local non-formal education facilities, payment of staff and training field workers.

At provincial and state levels non-formal education responsibilities include framing state-level policy, curriculum development for training field workers, training supervisory staff, quality control through a system of inspection, evaluation of field programmes, the development of curricula and material for field education, and the organization of state-wide programmes.

At the central level, responsibilities should include framing the overall national policy for non-formal education, development of curricula and teaching materials for training supervisory and senior personnel, training senior staff, setting national standards through accreditation, evaluating state and national-level programmes, and commissioning whatever research is required...

Non-formal education is most effective when it is co-ordinated with other development services. At the local level especially, people may become confused when a plethora of agencies and departments with non-formal education components are simultaneously operating separate, unco-ordinated projects. To prevent this from happening, a co-ordinating structure is needed. This structure should aim at inducing co-operation among agencies and departments without dominating their activities at the local level.

The Conference spent some time considering the problem of location for a national co-ordinating structure. It was argued that:

In deciding the best location for the structure, a balance must be maintained between central direction on one side and local commitment and participation on the other.

To achieve this balance a number of problems have to be overcome. First, a co-ordinating body may not be both a good co-ordinating unit and a good implementing agent at the same time. There is a danger that the best energies and resources may be concentrated on co-ordinating non-formal education at the expense of practical implementation. Second, the nature of non-formal education itself demands creativity, flexibility, a need-centred approach. Yet tight co-ordinating structures have a habit of becoming rigid and therefore antithetical to the essential characteristics of non-formal education.

In some situations the location of a co-ordinating structure may not be a significant issue. For example, where all the agencies and departments concerned demonstrate a high degree of commitment, clear unity of purpose and real attention to needs, the location of the co-ordinating authority may be

self-evident. Similarly, if the approach of the government strongly stresses co-ordination among ministries and the growth of the system itself is based on principles of co-ordination and co-operation, ministries will readily place the responsibility for meeting their non-formal education needs in the hands of the appropriate implementing body. In other words, where there is already a spirit of co-operation among ministries and departments, they will be prepared to request the most appropriate ministry to co-ordinate the provision of non-formal education programmes to meet their needs.

Most Commonwealth countries seem to favour locating the responsibility for co-ordinating non-formal education close to the centre of political power. In some it is placed in the office of the president or the cabinet office so that the power and prestige of the office itself will facilitate co-ordination and co-operation. Malawi provides an example of this. In others there is a separate central co-ordinating office, with direct access to influential policy makers. In Swaziland the co-ordinating body is chaired by the Prime Minister. Its members are permanent secretaries of government departments, and its secretary is the Secretary to the Cabinet.

In Botswana the co-ordinating mechanism is located in the Department of Finance and Development Planning. The underlying rationale is that all ministries have an interest in finance and this interest may produce co-operation. One of the Conference recommendations is that co-ordination should be located in those ministries dealing with finance and for development. However, it should be noted that non-formal education is educational activity and therefore has a claim to be located within a government agency concerned primarily with education. By placing responsibility for co-ordination in a finance ministry, for instance, the educational function of non-formal education might become subordinated to other activities of the ministry. To return to the case of Botswana, The Ministry of Education through its Department of Non-Formal Education provides a central pedagogical resource and a production centre on which other ministries and agencies can draw.

Some Commonwealth countries have attempted to settle the problems of locating the co-ordinating authority for non-formal education by placing it outside the direct control of government. In Kenya, for instance, general co-ordination of non-formal education is undertaken by the Board of Adult Education which comprises representatives of government and voluntary organizations. The Board advises the government on policy changes which need to be made in an effort to improve adult education. Some government involvement is necessary to implement decisions and to call upon the various ministries for support. In Zambia, the National Adult Education Advisory Board draws its membership from voluntary agencies, government departments, parastatals, the political party, churches and trade unions. In the Zambia case there is also an Adult Education Association which is a voluntary body with branches at local and district levels.

Resources and Finance: an Overview

The information and ideas put forward in this book have so far avoided questions of resources and finance. There are at least three reasons why we have done this.

1. Just as non-formal education is a complex concept and has an even more complex and varied organization, so the origin of its resources is also complex; it is enormously difficult to assess the costs in these circumstances. Indeed, one conclusion to be drawn from the available literature is that both direct and indirect costs are not only difficult to assess, but bear little relationship to the effectiveness of programmes.
2. It is commonly stated that NFE is a cheaper form of education than formal schooling. Well, it can be if it is more effective. But the assumption that it is always cheaper is a dangerous one, partly because it is not always true and partly because it helps to perpetuate the myth that NFE is an inferior alternative.
3. Most importantly, and as Reg Green has pointed out,⁵ resources and finance by themselves will not create non-formal education capable of helping workers and peasants, aged and unemployed, women and minorities, to liberate their consciousness or improve their economic circumstances, their social condition or their political status. Organization and finance are means to the ends we have described. Much reorganization, especially by administrative science experts and management consultants, is an escape from facing problems that have little to do with organizational structures. More money is an equally uncertain panacea. *Per capita* expenditure on NFE does not seem very closely related to coverage, quality and output.

Financial Complexity

A UNESCO team engaged to evaluate the effects of the World Literacy Programme attempted to answer the question: 'What does it cost to make a person literate?' Even this simple question did not elicit a simple answer, as appears from the following extract from a table in their report.⁶

Table 6: The Cost of Making a Person Literate

Countries	Total Estimated Cost per Enrolled Participant	Total Estimated Cost per Final Participant	Estimated Cost per Final Participant (excluding research and evaluation)	Estimated Cost per Participant Passing Final Examination
	US.\$	US.\$	US.\$	US.\$
Sudan	7.00	272.00	110.00	269.00
Madagascar	112.00	126.00	48.00	...
Tanzania	7.00	10.00	9.00	32.00

Such varied answers are not surprising—and they need not lead us to assume glaring variations in efficiency. Dual use of resources (e.g. school buildings), voluntary labour and the use of the time of staff employed mainly for other purposes are but some of the variables which can lead to the production of wildly different answers to an apparently simple question. Moreover, even the extraction of figures from government estimates—themselves only part of the story—makes it necessary to look at the expenditure of a formidable number of governmental and non-governmental organizations. A recent estimate from Kenya⁷ produces the results shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Financing Adult Education in Kenya

Ministry	£	%
Office of the President	1,026,591	6.0
Directorate of Personnel Management	3,482,744	20.0
Ministry of Home Affairs	301,780	1.7
Ministry of Finance and Planning	117,755	0.6
Ministry of Agriculture	4,017,007	23.0
Ministry of Health	2,273,307	13.0
Ministry of Works	452,720	2.6
Ministry of Power and Communication	355,104	2.0
Ministry of Labour	702,749	4.0
Ministry of Housing & Social Services	412,730	2.0
Ministry of Co-operative Development	215,178	1.2
Ministry of Commerce and Industry	260,583	1.5
Ministry of Education	3,449,990	20.0
Office of the Attorney-General	96,203	0.5
Total	£17,164,441	
National budget	£451,545,675	
Adult Education as % of National Budget		3.8%

These figures, extracted from the printed estimates of government recurrent expenditure for the 1978/79 financial year, treat adult education broadly to include courses of training, literacy and non-formal education in general.

One of the most carefully calculated estimate of costs for any NFE programme comes from Botswana. The 'public consultation' on the government's policy proposals for the tribal grazing lands has already been mentioned; this consultation has been very thoroughly reported and evaluated.⁸ The whole process started in 1975 when the Cabinet instructed the Government's Rural Extension Coordinating Committee (RECC) to mount a national Consultation. The RECC established a small working committee—the Grazing Committee—that would be responsible for the day-to-day running of the

Consultation. The Grazing Committee was to be chaired by a Media Co-ordinator. Later a Consultation Officer was appointed to handle the processing and analysis of campaign feed-back data. The Grazing Committee's membership was made up of representatives from the College University's Division of Extra Mural Services (DEMS), the Botswana Extension College (BEC), whose Evaluation Officer led the Consultation's evaluation unit, the Ministry of Local Government and Lands, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Finance's Rural Development Unit. The Committee set up its own working groups to deal with Fieldwork and Training, Materials, Production and Evaluation/Consultation.

The Consultation had four phases. Briefly these were: (a) public discussion in *kgotla* meetings led by the Cabinet—August 1975; (b) briefings and seminars for Government and government-related officers—August 1975 to February 1976; (c) a massive radio learning group (RLG) campaign—(piloted in December 1976, and run in June and July 1976); and (d) analysis of response from the campaign (to be fed into the national land use planning exercise district by district).

The costs of all this activity have been very carefully computed. The *total* cost (both direct and indirect) is estimated at P 416 000 (U.S.\$ 483,000). Direct costs are costs which arose expressly because of the campaign and would not otherwise have occurred. Indirect costs include the costs of Botswana's resources which were diverted from other activities to the campaign. An RLG leader training course, for example, would have the direct cost of food, accommodation and transport for the leaders, and the indirect costs of extension workers' time spent organizing and running the course.

Table 8: The Campaign's Direct Costs by Amount and by Percentage of Direct Costs

Item	Pula	Percentage of Direct Costs
Campaign co-ordination	9,000	5.6%
Fieldwork and training	19,700	12.3%
Teaching materials	45,500	28.3%
Hardware (radio and tape recorders)	54,100*	33.7%
Consultation	17,300	10.8%
Evaluation	8,800	5.5%
Transport	5,000	3.1%
Postage (official free)	1,200	0.7%
Total direct costs	160,000	100.0%

*Purchase cost—no allowance for residual value

Table 9: The Campaign's Indirect Cost Items by Amount and by Percentage of Indirect Costs

Items	Pula	Percentage of Indirect Costs
Field support (extension workers' time, etc.)	137,700	53.9%
Senior staff support	41,600	16.3%
Overheads to senior staff	51,400	20.2%
Radio air-time	4,700	1.8%
Transport	20,400	7.8%
Total Indirect Costs	255,800	100.0%

Table 10: Total Campaign Costs by Amount and by Percentage of Total Costs

Direct Costs	Pula	Percentage of Total Costs
Campaign co-ordination	9,000	2.2%
Fieldwork and training	19,700	4.7%
Teaching materials	45,500	10.9%
Hardware (radio and tape recorders)	54,100	13.0%
Consultation	17,300	4.2%
Evaluation	8,800	2.1%
Transport	5,000	1.2%
Postage (official free)	1,200	0.3%
Total Direct costs	160,600	38.6%
Indirect costs		
Field support (extension workers' time, etc.)	137,700	33.1%
Senior staff support	41,600	10.0%
Overheads to senior staff	51,400	12.3%
Radio air-time	4,700	1.1%
Transport	20,400	4.9%
Total Indirect costs	255,800	61.4%
Total Campaign costs	416,400	100.0%

The Botswana example shows not only the complexity of computation but also the fact that NFE is not *necessarily* a cheap alternative—especially if the indirect costs (in this case 61.4% of the

total) are added in. However, it is important not to swing to the other extreme and assume that therefore nothing can be done! The example of the Ahmedabad Self-Employed Womens Association quoted in Chapter 5 shows that NFE can be resource generating as well as resource consuming.

Looking at NFE in terms of government budget allocations is probably *not* the best way of securing action. It is probably better to start with the mobilization of existing resources. After all, much NFE exists already: the task is to ensure that all available effort is used effectively. NFE, like any other social service, will certainly need some cash. However, more than for most other existing services, much can be done by using the people and the plant which already exist. Nevertheless without finance, motivation and ideals will be frustrated by lack of personnel, equipment, materials or physical facilities. Finance and organization may be likened to water supply and environmental sanitation: not very dramatic or, to the non-specialist, very interesting; and not guaranteeing very much when they are present but disastrously influential when they are absent. They are similar in two more respects. First, impure water leads to epidemics; second the environmental sanitation system suitable for London is neither appropriate nor practical for a Ghanaian village (and *vice versa*). Good organization cannot cause developmental NFE; bad organization can prevent it. In terms of funds and organization, the needs of NFE are quite different for Calgary and an Inuit village, for Windhoek and Tuvalu, for Liverpool and rural Bihar.

The Purposes of Resource Mobilization

It is perhaps useful at this stage to remind ourselves of the purposes for which resources must be mobilized:

1. First and foremost—as noted in Chapter 1—the non-formal idea derives from development planning. NFE is the series of educational components of national development plans. These are the essential building blocks from which knowledge understanding, skills and productive attitudes must derive. We are thus at the core of national policies and national decision making in seeking to mobilize resources for these activities. The non-formal system is or must become an integral part of the development system.
2. The definition of NFE as accepted by the Conference is the one propounded by Philip Coombs and included in his keynote address to the Seventh Commonwealth Education Conference: ‘Any organized learning activity outside the structure of the formal education system that is consciously aimed at meeting specific learning needs of particular sub-groups in the community—be they children, youth or adults. Non-formal education, thus defined, includes a vast

assortment of activities such as agricultural extension, skill training, health and family planning programmes, youth clubs and women's organizations with educational objectives, functional literacy programmes, and so forth.'⁹

3. The assortment of activities includes a variety of aims, all subordinate to the main goal of national development. They include consciousness raising; primary skills; and the capacity of previously excluded, oppressed, exploited or isolated groups (communities, classes) to organize themselves and act to advance their own welfare. The target groups as defined in Chapter 2 remain the focus of NFE.

4. NFE is thus perceived as related to basic human needs as seen by those participating in it, and to national needs as perceived by dominant national decision takers, and set out either in a formal national plan, a series of policy statements, or reversed preference through their actual decisions. (If these two sets of needs are in radical conflict—a not unknown situation—problems far beyond organization and finance or the scope of this book must ensue.)

5. Therefore NFE is necessarily within a specific socio-political and political economic context (quite possibly several contexts within one state or even one town). The dominant influences flow from these contexts as they inform the participant and decision-taker's perception of needs for and goals of NFE as they relate to organization and finance. They do not flow in the other direction. (This is not to deny a feedback—really ineffective organization and totally inadequate or incompetently used finance can quickly create a perception of NFE as ineffective.)

6. The divergence of problems of organization and finance flowing from different national contexts may not be as great as is sometimes supposed. Participants in serious, broad-coverage NFE programmes are predominantly persons who have been excluded, exploited and oppressed—whether wilfully or by neglect. NFE usually suffers both from inadequate co-ordination and from over-adequate imposition of co-ordinated 'standards'. Common problems include attempts to relate both to perceived participant needs and to established holders of personnel and purses, to discriminate positively and inclusively in favour of the under-privileged without reinforcing their exclusion and stigmatization. Such problems are not limited to poor or new, fragile or peripheral states but are equally critical (and equally unresolved) issues in rich industrial states. In this regard the Commonwealth is not divisible. Or, as Reg Green¹⁰ expresses it, some of the more critical modest goals are:

- (a) To be able to plan strategically (asking how many; where; in what topics; through what programmes; when, using what institutions, personnel and finance?).

- (b) To increase effective determination and choice of programmes by participants including accepting diversities of choices.¹¹
- (c) To co-ordinate implementation to avoid gaps and genuinely wasteful overlaps (e.g. the all too common failure to perceive that agricultural extension is a branch of education as much as of agriculture) and to ensure workable inter-relationships (e.g. building up rural library networks in the footsteps of literacy, ensuring that radio campaigns have expert media, education *and* subject personnel involved in their preparation).
- (d) To increase the ability of a wide range of national, local governmental, community, employer and voluntary bodies to innovate, be responsible for, and build self-reliance in respect of their programmes.¹²
- (e) To provide, as needed, support to all participating bodies (community or national, voluntary or state). Support includes expertise in programme and supporting-material design, and in evaluation procedures.
- (f) To encourage diversity, experiments and local control over NFE.¹³
- (g) To build up adequate personnel with appropriate qualifications to participate in NFE work.
- (h) To make maximum use of all motivated individuals with relevant contributions to provide and avoiding turning NFE 'teaching' into a large, full-time, 'professional' cadre duplicating the greatest weaknesses of the formal educator cadres.*
- (i) To ensure that adequate finance (governmental or other) for priority programmes (again governmental or other) is provided.
- (j) To limit the degree to which ease of financial administration and the relatively greater resources of the central government come to dominate NFE priorities, as opposed to participant goals and programme priorities determining institutional channels and financial procedures.¹⁴

Organization and Resource Planning

Organization in NFE, as we have seen in Chapter 5, is critical and possibly controversial. Certainly, popular participation in decision making seems a *sine qua non* of success.¹⁵ And organization is closely related to the way in which resources are mobilized, for resources are not limited to money. People, physical facilities (e.g. school buildings) transport and other equipment are all important. 'When thought of in these terms the resources needed to provide and sustain non-formal education require inputs by community groups, voluntary organizations, and a whole range of other contributors. To make resource mobilization effective, it is necessary to encourage participation by whole communities and to co-ordinate the use of resources. Such "hidden" elements (e.g. use of formal education physical facilities and personnel and community contributions) are often as large as those contained in formal budgets. It is important

*The countries, with large, mass-oriented, rapidly executed NFE programmes (e.g. Vietnam, Cuba, Mozambique, Tanzania) have not depended primarily on full-time, professional NFE teaching cadres.

that the non-formal education planning process for non-formal education at all levels should identify such "hidden" resources to allow their effective mobilization and co-ordination.'¹⁶

In his conference paper already referred to, Reg Green analysed organization in relation to resource mobilization by touching on six aspects—strategic, 'personpower', operational, programmatic, supporting services, and finance—in the following terms:

Strategic organization is basically a framework for co-ordinated NFE planning by all involved institutions... * [When effective,] an integrated structure should make possible the fitting together of four basic sets of inputs: potential and actual participant demands, national (or sub-national) development goals, existing NFE programmes, and new NFE proposals, to arrive at strategic identification of main activities and institutional responsibilities—in brief an NFE section of annual and multi-year development planning articulated broadly by programme, institution and location.

Personpower organization has two broad aspects—participants seeking primarily to learn, and resource personnel (who hopefully will learn but have quite specific inputs to provide). The first aspect involves indentifying who (groups, individuals and communities) need and seek what types of NFE, where and when. The second requires identifying availabilities and gaps in persons with skills and capabilities in subject matter (e.g. disease control for cocoa, child and mother care, French for Swahili speakers, political participation), supporting services (e.g. book design, radio programme development, printing) and communications (e.g. discussion group leading, literacy teaching, skill development, agricultural or health extension). The availabilities must perforce influence what initial NFE programme building is, and the remaining gaps lead to personpower development for both full and part time, care and supporting service personnel. Research and evaluation organization needs as one of its main goals to translate findings into personpower organization both as to participant performance and perception and also as to specific resource personnel performances and problems.

Operational organization depends on what bodies are responsible for implementing NFE. A Ministry, a branch of an international voluntary agency, UNESCO, a diocese, a village council, a women's group in a deprived urban neighbourhood will not organize NFE in the same way. There is little to be said in general beyond the points made earlier on what organization of NFE should seek to achieve (allow) and the stress on maximum access to decision taking, implementation and review for participants and field resource personnel. Perhaps, however, the need for diversity depending on the operating body is one of the organizational points most in need of repetition because it is so readily forgotten, especially in the context of otherwise desirable co-ordinated strategic planning.

Programmatic organization crosscuts strategic and operational organization. Some programmes, for example a national campaign for environmental

*Some of the problems of achieving that organization are discussed in Chapter 5.

sanitation or a local campaign to build health via pure water, nutrition (including food growing and storage), waste disposal, parasite eradication, general health education) require detailed planning and parallel, interlocking implementation by several implementing bodies and possibly in several geographic locations. In such cases one institution should be primarily responsible (e.g. perhaps the Public Health Division of the Ministry of Health in the one case and a village council in the second) for administration, co-ordination and supervision, with clearly defined responsibilities and forums for consultation for all institutions involved. In general these organizational frameworks should be limited to the programme in question and terminate automatically on its conclusion. Co-ordinating organizations only too readily multiply until their participants have no other functions and, equally critical, operating personnel no longer have any real relation to the co-ordination organization.

Supporting organization relates to ensuring that specialized services are available to and used by operating bodies. For example, agricultural extension can benefit by printed, graphic, radio and audio-visual materials. However, agricultural personnel are unlikely to be media experts (or *vice versa*) and need both to have the supporting services made available and to be given some education in their potential uses and limits. Printing and duplicating (e.g. wall newspapers), audio-visual materials (including tapes made by participants and circulated to other groups and to 'experts') and libraries are among the more evident and general examples of specialized services for which organizational channels to and from NFE bodies are needed. However, other cases will arise (e.g. nutrition education in NFE frequently suffers because no parallel agriculture input to facilitate actually growing the new dietary items is provided).

Resource organization is needed with each of the preceding organizational aspects. It involves first identifying what real resources are needed (e.g. meeting places, resource personnel, books, slide projectors, shovels, wood for carpentry) and what is already available. Then it goes on to mobilization (acquisition) of the balance of the real resources and finally to drawing up financial requirements from which institutional financial and physical budgets can be derived, bargained for, implemented, controlled and evaluated.

Resource planning for NFE should thus begin with real resources, not with money. In the first place one cannot implement a programme with money unless personnel, meeting places and material are available, and in the second one cannot produce a credible financial requirement until one has articulated real resource requirements and how these are to be met.

In one sense of course, even beginning with physical resource requirements is a mistake. The starting point is desired outputs—whatever NFE participants seek to acquire. The next step is to identify programmes and only then proceed to work out what resources they will need. In NFE as in other areas there is a real danger of drawing up budgets which justify inputs (money, personnel, buildings) for their own sake or for the sake of programmes, and not in terms of outputs or proxies for output. Again, one purpose of research and evaluation should be to build up usable and determinable proxies for output less crude than enrolment, less speculative than opinion surveys, and more precise than general levels of output or health.

If NFE is perceived as a central means of meeting participants' basic human needs and national development targets, the resource requirements will be substantial. In a country of 10 million the projected enrolment might be of the order of 2½ million to 3 million. This (given adequate coverage of isolated areas and of topics with high importance to participants or communities, but not mass enrolment) would require 75,000 – 100,000 'classes'. At three hours average per 'class' per week 225,000 – 300,000 meeting place hours would be required. Computing at the rate of one book, four pamphlets, six pencils and two writing pads per participant, further plausible overall requirements can be projected for articulation and refinement.

The magnitude of these projections has three implications. Imagination is needed to see how they can be met in human and physical terms—adding 25,000 full-time teachers is likely to be quite unfeasible no matter how much finance is provided. Similarly, maximum use of existing facilities (including salaries) is needed to make the NFE financial budget politically credible. Finally, some radical additions to facilities will be needed in fields well beyond educational contact points or Ministries of Education. For example:

- (a) Personnel (and financial) requirements can be radically reduced by using primary school teachers, public and private sector middle and high qualification personnel, and anyone with competence in a field for part-time teaching in subjects in which participants have an interest.
- (b) For part-time programmes (usually in the evening or non-working day) there should be little need for new buildings since primary schools, clinics, community centers, mosques and churches normally have space not used at the relevant periods. This can mean a very major saving indeed on capital costs (as well as limiting real construction resource pressures).
- (c) Printing 3 million books and 12 million pamphlets per 10 million population for direct NFE programmes (and presumably perhaps half as many more for supporting libraries and work-related programmes) is likely to require major expansion not only of education writing and editing capacity, but also of printing and publishing, unless the state is both rich and marked by high levels of readership.

As a result, the NFE real resource and financial budgets are likely to be quite different in breakdown from those typifying formal educational systems. Salaries of teachers and places to meet will normally be markedly lower as proportions of expenditure. Supporting materials (from seeds for agricultural courses to newsprint or videotape for community communications workshops) and equipment (similarly from ploughs through typewriters to tape recorders) will normally need to take a higher share either than in formal education budgets or in most present NFE budgets. Finally, related expenditure (e.g. the writing, editing, printing and publishing chain) will need to go well beyond NFE proper and well beyond what is normally covered in most sectoral formal education budgets.

Five key areas require special mention:

1. *Personnel* requirements fall into four categories: full-time, part-time, related and supporting. Ideally the vast majority will be in the middle two categories with NFE an additional role entered into for modest remuneration

with other significant motivations (including status and public image as well as more selfless ones). Full-time programmes, including teaching all NFE personnel and organization, will require full-time staff. Related personnel are those in fields such as agricultural extension, public (or preventive or paramedical) health, community development, recreation and youth. All of these should certainly be perceived as involved in NFE at the same time as being engaged in existing substantive programmes unlikely to be integrated into education as such, however broadly defined. Supporting personnel include those in media, printing and publishing, specialized facility or equipment production and maintenance. All personnel for NFE require specialized education—especially those with formal education teaching qualifications.

2. *Places* should pose problems only for year-round full-time programmes like folk colleges and service units (e.g. libraries, NFE personnel training centres and supporting services such as media centres and printing houses). For the bulk of programmes it is programatically feasible and financially essential to use workplaces, schools (including secondary, technical and tertiary to secure access to laboratories and workshops), general community and religious meeting places, clinics and other government buildings, outside their normal working hours. For genuinely needed buildings there is a need to avoid shabbiness (NFE will not prosper if seen as a poor relation of 'real' education) but an even greater need to limit structures to programme needs. The latter is a requirement education in general fails to meet rather notably. Non-formal education's better performance to date is probably related less to money than to sounder thinking.

3. *Media* are critical NFE resources both within the programmes and for creating an environment in which NFE is desired and where participants can build on their NFE experience by reading, listening, seeing for self-education and recreation, leisure, pleasure and skill enhancement. Among the main media are: newspapers (including community, wall or mimeod variants); audio visual facilities (including closed circuit sets and simple cameras which allow 'class' or community tape making); books and pamphlets (hopefully with graphic illustration, to help learning directly and to break up the arid expanse of page after page of uniform type, and channels such as community and workplace libraries to make them generally available) and finally radio (especially when linked to supplementary materials and local discussion groups). All these tend to be in scarce supply, not very oriented to NFE and often remarkably imitative of the least satisfactory aspects of industrial economy media in a majority of developing Commonwealth countries.

4. *Materials* needed vary from programme to programme, for example slates and pencils for literacy, pipes, pegs and lines for simple surveying and village layout, and spades, cement and hoes for environmental sanitation (including pit latrine building). Unfortunately the articulated requirements are often not worked out with care (e.g. applied agricultural practice programmes with reading material, but no tools, seeds, plants, fertilizer) and are usually either underbudgeted initially or are the first to fall victim to budget cuts. These are penny wise, pound foolish savings of effort or money. NFE must be applied, not theoretical. Without adequate materials it inevitably cannot be truly applied.

5. *Research and evaluation* is intermediate between an aspect of organization and a real resource. To be truly effective, evaluation needs to be integrated into programmes so that results in terms of output (not only cost) become known automatically, and in time to revise procedures or programmes which are not working as intended. The natural desire not to exhibit one's failings (a desire unfortunately buttressed nationally by most resource transfer bodies and international expert agencies which often exhibit the aversion in a near pathological form when their own programmes are involved) can be countered by the equally natural desires to remedy them promptly and to build on one's successes—both impossible without built-in evaluation. It is silly, especially in educational terms, to plan in detail what is to happen, then fail first to collect data to see what is happening and second to commission detailed detective exercises to see what did happen. Research, like evaluation, should not be the monopoly of programme operators but again is most effective if integrated into ongoing operations and at least partially action-oriented. While these points are particularly true of new and experimental programmes requiring revision or expansion, generalization or elimination, they also hold for ongoing bread and butter (or rice and sauce) NFE. What is examined can usually then be done better, and what is appropriate in 1978 should not be so in 1988 if development really is being achieved.

Money and other Resources

Unfortunately, identifying the actual resource requirements of a programme and converting them into money terms does not end the problem of financing, even after care is taken to limit calls on resources. In the first place there is never enough money or real resources for all programmes which could be justified were there no financial constraint. Further, the fitting together of real resources and finance is very often not a simple exercise. Third, resource mobilization (real or financial) is not a zero sum game—some routes reduce and some increase either resources or the cost of the programme.

The first problem is not unique to NFE. Ultimately it is a combination of problems. First, the relevant decision takers have to be convinced that NFE is of adequate priority to justify the allocation of resources. Included among these decision takers will be treasuries who will be asked for 2½ per cent of their recurrent budgets, primary school teachers who will be asked to devote eight hours a week to NFE programmes, and radio stations who will be asked to allocate 20 per cent of broadcasting time and adequate personnel to education programming. They will be expected to justify the allocation in absolute terms and in comparison with what will have to be cut out (constables or offices, leisure or part-time work, music or political speech coverage) to allow NFE the resources sought.

The second problem is determining what cuts can be made with minimum damage to goals when the maximum obtainable resource allocation falls short of that sought. To convince relevant decision takers, NFE planners must:

- (a) Demonstrate that NFE is critical to the person or body with the resources i.e. that it will meet specific development goals and that teaching will provide income and raise the status of the primary school teacher within the community.

- (b) Present a convincing case that care has been taken to avoid unnecessary resource demands and to include all costs (over-expenditure of money is unpopular with treasuries, attempted 'over-expenditure' of personnel leads to gaps in programmes).
- (c) Build a record of past achievement on which to base claims as to future performance—again in terms relevant to the decision taker approached.
- (d) Serve participants' goals in a way which leads to a 'constituency' willing and able to express its support to officials, agencies, members of parliament and political parties.

No NFE strategy is likely to involve only one agency. Nor are all participating bodies likely to list their programmes as NFE, for example agricultural extension and health/nutrition education by paraprofessional and professional staff associated with clinical or environmental programmes are very unlikely to appear as non-formal education or even as 'education' in formal budgets. Equally not all institutions and agencies will share a common budget (federal, state and local government, community organizations, voluntary agencies).

A strategic budget—physical and financial—for all NFE is desirable because it gives an overview of relationships among different segments and an overview also of the different financial and real resource capacities and requirements of the various component units. Since it is by definition a sketch, it is unlikely to be useful to treat it as a formal operational budget draft or even to carry it out in the detail needed for such a budget.

The key (and in almost all cases dominant) source of finance should be the central budget (or the state budget if NFE is at state level in a federal system). This is a matter of necessity as a serious NFE strategy requires resources beyond the capacity of other institutions. If other institutions (local government or community, voluntary agency or employer) are better placed to mobilize personnel and/or facilities then they should receive financial transfers to allow them to do so. Certain economies of scale are usually greater in raising funds for core programmes than in programme operation, mobilizing personnel or securing funds for associated or experimental programmes.

Mobilization is critical because using brute financial force is expensive in money terms (e.g. building new 'classrooms' instead of using community, voluntary body or primary school space). It also reduces the range of participation possible (e.g. a full-time professional teacher cadre verses part-time volunteers paid honoraria or supplementary wages combined with a limited full-time staff) by increasing real resource costs, probably damaging the quality of the NFE and endangering diversity and responsiveness to participants' perceptions of their own needs. That side of the financial problem is really an organizational one—keeping the tensions between co-ordination and participation, efficiency and diversity, professionalism and enthusiasm creative.

On the other hand, mobilization of external funds—by agencies or governments needs rather more systematic attention than it has usually received, in the light of national NFE priorities. First it has usually been too donor-initiated, and the way it did or did not relate to overall national and

community efforts has been inadequately articulated. Co-ordination is critical even in respect to voluntary bodies—random solicitation abroad by all and sundry is not likely to be efficient either in maximizing receipts or in relating to participant needs. Second, many governments have not given enough priority to seeking funds for NFE (at least judging by the startling response some have encountered with offers exceeding their ‘bargaining’ draft requests). Third, the ways in which foreign resources (funds, personnel or physical resources) can best be used to fill gaps deserves serious, not random attention. This is especially true because in most countries much equipment (e.g. audio visual, typewriters, printing presses) and some materials (e.g. paper, books) must be imported, and for imports finance in the form of foreign exchange has distinct advantages.

Commonwealth Co-operation

Non-formal education by its very nature and in terms of its major virtues (relevance, flexibility) is not a prime subject for the international organization of programmes. Nor is replication of one country’s programme in another country likely to be effective. Needs are usually specific and, to some extent, time and culture bound. Even where new techniques have been developed (e.g. mass radio learning campaigns) and used effectively elsewhere (e.g. from Tanzania to Botswana) the purposes and ultimate achievements of the programmes are likely to be different. Even in respect of finance, national sources are often more likely to be appropriate to the flexibility and local relevance which is looked for; these features do not fit readily into most aid patterns.

What then is left for Commonwealth co-operation?

The Delhi Conference made a number of important recommendations in this area, noting that there are many ways in which such co-operation on a pan-Commonwealth, regional or bilateral basis can help in improving existing NFE programmes and developing new ones. Some of them, in particular regional seminars and seminars on special topics, training facilities, the creation of a panel of consultants, the idea of an information service for NFE, the proposed research association, and a number of projects relating to publications, are to be given special consideration by Commonwealth Education Ministers at the Eighth Commonwealth Education Conference in 1980.

As we said in Chapter 1, The non-formal idea has indeed ‘come of age’. But coming of age will be to little purpose unless followed by maturation and development, and for that there will have to be much thought and care and hard work. In that, if not in the detailed implementation of programmes, the Commonwealth idea can surely help the non-formal idea. Above all we need to keep our plans and our resolutions firmly fixed on the needs of the poor. To perfect those plans and to translate them into effective action we have to start with

their understanding and their co-operation. Only then will the non-formal system merge with education as a whole—and with the national and international development we all seek to promote.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 6

- 1 Duke, C. & Sommerlad, E. *Design for Diversity: further education for tribal aborigines in the north*. Canberra, Education Research Unit, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University 1976 (Occasional Report 5, no.8).
- 2 University of Southern California. *Ways and Means for Strengthening Information and Counselling Services for Adult Learners: report of international symposium*. Los Angeles, University of Southern California, 1978.
- 3 Davies, D. & Delaney, R. 'Link: an information service for adult learners' in Australian Journal of Adult Education, vol.17, no.3 November 1977, pp.1–8.
- 4 Williams, Barry M. *Structures and Attitudes in New Zealand Adult Education, 1945–75*. Wellington, N.Z., New Zealand Council for Educational Research, 1978.
- 5 Green, R.H. Paper on 'Organization and finance'.
- 6 UNESCO. *The Experimental World Literacy Programme: a critical assessment*. Paris, Unesco and the United Nations Development Programme. 1976.
- 7 Kenya Journal of Adult Education, vol.6, no.3, February 1979.
- 8 Botswana. Ministry of Local Government and Lands. *Lafatshe la Rona: our land: the report on Botswana Government's public consultation on its policy proposals in tribal grazing land*. Gaborone, Government Printers, 1977.
- 9 Coombs, Philip H. 'A fresh look at the world education crisis' in *Report of the Commonwealth Education Conference*. Accra, 1977. London, Commonwealth Secretariat, 1977, pp.58–67.
- 10 Green, R.H. op. cit.
- 11 For example, see diversity of views over whom villages should select for folk college courses cited in Y.O. Kassam's conference paper *The Folk Development Colleges Programme in Tanzania*, reproduced in Chapter 3.
- 12 Mbilinyi, Marjorie. 'Basic education: tool of liberation or exploitation?' in *Prospects*, vol.7, no.4, 1977, pp.489–503.
- 13 For example in the folk development college cases, strengthened personnel and finance also meant re-centralization with rather uneven district and village involvement in programme control—Y.O. Kassam. op.cit.

- 14 Again Mbilinyi and Kassam. *op.cit.*, illustrate the substantive links which come with access to finance especially when the financial source is concerned with effective use of the funds.
- 15 Green, Reginald Herbold. *Adult Education in National Development Planning: notes towards an integrated approach*. Bonn, Deutscher Volkshochschul-Verband, Toronto, International Council for Adult Education, 1977.
- 16 Conference Report.