

Editor's Corner Inside Front Cover

A Significant Effort—and A Significant Issue!
By Charles B. Wood 290

Seven Programs for Seven Countries
By Max Robert Otte 291

Nonformal Education for Rural Women Project Andra Pradesh, India 291

Tanzania's National Adult Education Plan 293

Thailand's Functional Literacy and Family Life Planning Program 294

Colombia's Acción Cultural Popular 295

CONCORDE in Honduras 296

The Philippines' Functional Education for Family Life Planning Project 298

Kenya's Village Polytechnics 300

Programs in the United States
By Anne Deaton 302

The Appalachian Adult Education Center 302

The Georgia Expanded Food and Nutrition Project 304

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Adult Education Center 305

Top of Alabama Regional Adult Secondary Education Project 306

The Los Angeles Regional Occupational Centers 307

Minnesota Literacy Council, Inc. 309

Parents and the Developing Child 311

Multinational Programs: A Commentary
By John M. Peters 312

Book Reviews 318

Accent on Social Philosophy 320

The Trading Post Inside Back Cover

THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S.A.

October 26-31, 1975
Salt Lake City, Utah

This year the annual conference will be conducted as a workshop investigating the theme—"OUR COMMITMENT TO A LEARNING SOCIETY."

BECOME INVOLVED!! SHOW YOUR COMMITMENT!! PLAN TO ATTEND!!

For further information, write:

conference . . .

AEA/USA

810 Eighteenth St., N. W.

Washington, D. C. 20006

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

NICHOLAS P. MITCHELL, Vice President for Administrative Services and Distinguished Professor of Adult and Continuing Education, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C. 29208.

Membership, Circulation, and Advertising Manager—BETSY ANGERT, Adult Education Association of the U. S. A., The Otis Building, 810 18th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20006.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

JAMES A. FARMER, Department of Continuing Professional Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill. 61801.

THEODORE P. GNAGEY, The South Orange-Maplewood Adult School, 17 Parker Ave., Maplewood, N. J.

RALPH C. DOBBS, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

JOHN B. HOLDEN, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

LEORA N. HORNING, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

ADULT LEADERSHIP is regularly indexed in EDUCATION INDEX, published by The H. W. Wilson Company, 950 University Avenue, New York 52, N. Y. Book reviews are indexed in BOOK REVIEW INDEX.

Office of publication: Washington, D. C.

Annual fee for membership: General, \$15.00 and \$25.00; Professional, \$30.00.

Subscription price to non-members: Domestic, \$13.00 a year; Canada and Mexico, \$13.50; Foreign, \$17.00.

Four weeks advance notice to the Circulation Manager, including an old address label, is necessary for change of address.

ADULT LEADERSHIP is published monthly except July and August, by the Adult Education Association of the United States of America, Charles B. Wood, Director. Second class postage paid at Columbia, S. C., and additional mailing office. Copyright 1975 by the Adult Education Association of the U. S. A.

Address all correspondence on editorial matters to the Editor, ADULT LEADERSHIP, University of South Carolina, Columbia; all on circulation and advertising matters to the Adult Education Association of the U. S. A., The Otis Building, 810 18th St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20006.



terials, which are scarce and expensive. The products made by the trainees are sold, and trainees are hired out on local contracts. Jobs such as the construction of houses, the building of pavillions in a local fair, the construction of furniture for primary schools, and the sewing of clothes for sale in the marketplace are all ways to provide income for the Village Polytechnics. By selling their products and services while training, the trainees gain confidence and favor in the community at large.

Those responsible for Village Polytechnics at the local level, the government, and NCKK, are particularly concerned with the subsequent employment of the trainees. This has led to the establishment of workgroups, which are meant to spur the trainees into partnerships to pool their efforts and help raise the necessary capital for tools and materials. Sometimes, however, self employment is not practical. Lack of capital for the workgroups and lack of professional experience means that some managers must place all their two-year graduates into local shops.

It is generally agreed that the demand for skilled artisans in rural areas is dependent upon the level of development of the areas concerned. One may speculate that unemployed Village Polytechnic graduates might eventually inundate the local markets in such areas as carpentry or masonry. However, the Village Polytechnic movement is extremely sensitive to this potential problem, and both NCKK and government leaders continually urge management committees to broaden and diversify their offerings to avoid the occurrence of such a situation.

Although the quantity of programs and the number of its graduates appears small in relation to the vast number of individuals who need both training and employment, a great deal of attention and some greater measure of national commitment have been generated by Village Polytechnics.

The ultimate outcome of the Village Polytechnics program will be dependent upon funding sources but more importantly upon whether there is genuine and concerted support in planning, administration, and implementation among the rural people whose economic well being is greatly affected by competent, trained manpower. During their brief lifetime, Village Polytechnics have demonstrated that the concept of providing low cost, pragmatic, and relevant training is both a viable and an important one in aiding the development of people as purposeful and productive members of Kenyan society.

PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

By Anne Deaton

In 1970 adult educators were told, "Yesterday's focus was on the individual, today the emphasis is on community needs."¹ In 1975, at the Multi-national Workshop on Adult Education, U.S. educators called for a *dual* emphasis.

Educators representing the U.S. projects affirmed the thesis that personal needs are in part "shaped, conditioned, and channeled by the social structures and forces of the human society in which each individual is born."² Yet, their various experiences suggest that this thesis alone comprises too broad a framework within which the adult educator can effectively begin to act. In their designs for alternative adult education programs, therefore, the U.S. projects expressed a dedication to meeting the needs of the "individual" who both shapes and is shaped by a milieu of social forces.

The strength of the U.S. contribution as a whole lies in the diverse strategies the projects employ to remedy the problems of educational deficiencies among disadvantaged adults. To some extent this diversity is explained by the range of institutional structures and sponsorship through which the various projects operate and by the alternative methodologies developed to accomplish their particular tasks. The following seven program descriptions represent summaries of the U.S. projects based on background papers authored by the presenters and the actual presentations made at the Workshop.

The Appalachian Adult Education Center³

The Appalachian Adult Education Center (AAEC), located on the campus of Morehead State University in Eastern Kentucky, represents

¹ Ernest E. McMahon, *Needs of People and Their Communities and the Adult Educator*. Adult Education Association of the USA, 1970, p. v.

² Harry L. Miller, *Participation of Adults in Education: A Force Field Analysis*. Boston: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1967, p. 3.

³ *Project Presenters*: George Eyster, Ann H. Drennan, Appalachian Adult Basic Education Center, Morehead State University, Morehead, Ky.

Anne Deaton is a graduate assistant in the Department of Continuing and Higher Education, University of Tennessee at Knoxville, and Field Researcher, AEA Multi-national Workshop Project.

a regional university's approach to the development, demonstration, and dissemination of innovative methods and materials in adult education. AAEC brings together the resources of federal, state, and local governments in its thirteen-state region in an effort to meet the varied educational needs of a unique population of undereducated Americans.

Acknowledging the Center's regional focus, however, does not detract from the far reaching impact of its findings. Indeed, the overall objective of the Center is to "effect significant improvement in the efficiency and quality of adult basic education throughout the nation." Hence, the Center emphasizes analysis of the developmental processes of effective adult education in many areas. Since 1967, AAEC has been engaged in more than one hundred projects in areas ranging from the development of rural community schools to the study of literacy programs in conjunction with vocational agricultural education.

AAEC, due to its regional status, is able to circumvent the constraints of political and geographic boundaries. The Center develops projects at the local level in response to problems identified by the region's state directors of adult education and libraries. At the local level AAEC assists the project staff in formulating possible solutions to these problems, in monitoring the project's progress, and in reporting project results and recommendations back to the state directors. This approach to regional problems minimizes the amount of time and money individual states must spend to reach solutions to community problems.

In Kentucky, for example, AAEC was asked to develop a program of individualized instruction through learning centers. AAEC, with multiple agency support, demonstrated the effectiveness of a learning center through three basic procedures employed in all AAEC projects:

- (1) *community assessment*—a review of demographic information, community needs, and resources.
- (2) *establishing objectives*—in conjunction with project staffs and community policy makers.
- (3) *management by objectives*—outlining specific goals, activities, responsibilities, knowledge needs, and evaluation procedures.

This one learning center's success encouraged the development of learning centers throughout Kentucky. Also, subsequent AAEC studies of the

benefits of home instruction by paraprofessionals resulted in Kentucky's adoption of that delivery system for a particular portion of the target population. The Kentucky projects were grounded in four major concepts which guide all work at the Center:

- (1) that educational programs must be designed in terms of the characteristics and needs of the client;
- (2) that education for adults must stress the development of basic skills and their application to the business of everyday living;
- (3) that adults are most effectively served through cooperative planning and sharing of the education and welfare resources of the community; and
- (4) that demonstration projects should
 - (a) be capable of replication;
 - (b) continue after the demonstration period; and
 - (c) disseminate their findings.

As already indicated in the first of these concepts, AAEC has found it useful for purposes of need assessment to categorize the 57 million adults in the U.S. with less than a high school education into four groups of people. *Group I* refers to economically secure adults with less than a high school education. They accept the value of education and can be easily recruited through the media to learn in class settings. *Group II* refers to a less economically stable class of people who also place a high value on education. Heavy work schedules and family responsibilities often frustrate their desires to participate in educational activities. People in *Group III*, while maintaining a respect for education, are quite difficult to recruit. Their time and energies are reserved for eking out a living. Unlike the first two groups, they do not respond to media recruitment. AAEC studies show this group necessitates one-to-one recruitment (either door-to-door or agency referrals). The people of *Group IV* are fatalistic about their life chances and are highest in priority on an index of need. AAEC studies indicate that people in this group, once recruited, show significant gains in learning through home instruction.

An analysis of these four groups suggests that distinct educational delivery systems are required to match the particular characteristics of the persons in each group. The findings from studies of these four groups relate to an extensive list of demonstration projects dealing with new programs, materials, facilities, teaching techniques

and educational technology. Because of AAEC's comprehensive dissemination efforts through print, nonprint, personal contact, and technical assistance, its major findings have influenced the development of programs in states across the Appalachian region and the nation.

AAEC is presently demonstrating the value of indigenous paraprofessionals taking ABE instruction into the homes of adults who are members of Group IV. A related study is also underway to evaluate the effectiveness of a televised adult secondary series, alone and in combination with other support systems like home study instruction. Additional demonstration projects are investigating the ways in which ABE and public libraries can best coordinate services to all disadvantaged adults.

In all these endeavors AAEC serves as a model for other regions with unique populations of disadvantaged adults. AAEC is both a catalyst for improving the lives of the people within its region and a stimulus for adult educators throughout the nation to adopt those educational innovations which demonstration has proved viable.

The Georgia Expanded Food and Nutrition Project ⁴

The Georgia Expanded Food and Nutrition Project (EFNEP) represents one state's role in a nation-wide effort to help low-income families improve the nutritional quality of their diets. EFNEP merits the attention of adult educators for two reasons in particular: (1) EFNEP exemplifies a successful home-based instruction program, and (2) EFNEP demonstrates that paraprofessionals can be the vital link between state and local service agencies and the disadvantaged adults they are trying to reach.

EFNEP operates through the Cooperative Extension Service which was granted this responsibility by Congress. Congress selected Cooperative Extension because of its unique organizational structure which combines the resources of the United States Department of Agriculture, state land-grant institutions, and local governments.

In Georgia, since 1969, EFNEP has functioned through county extension offices manned by college-trained county extension agents. The extension nutrition agent in this group trains and supervises the paraprofessional nutrition aides who

⁴ *Project Presenters:* Dr. Nan B. Preas, Mrs. Ann Peisher, Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Georgia, Athens.

take nutrition education directly into the homes of the clients.

In 1973-74, two hundred paraprofessionals in Georgia's EFNEP, under the supervision of twenty-eight agents, taught 43,106 homemakers. Such numbers in themselves testify to the extent of EFNEP's outreach to low-income families. EFNEP's staff feels that their success is largely due to (1) the use of paraprofessionals as nutrition aides, and (2) the use of assessment techniques which effectively determine the client's dietary needs.

The heavy reliance on paraprofessionals is due to their ability to communicate with low-income clients. EFNEP stresses that paraprofessionals initially are unlikely to possess even a basic understanding of nutrition and education concepts. Nevertheless, each paraprofessional engages in an intensive orientation program followed by weekly inservice training sessions to ensure basic teaching competence in nutrition and related areas. Upon employment, the paraprofessional receives two weeks of training in EFNEP's basic nutrition curriculum and in program mechanics. Emphasis in both orientation and in-service training is placed on developing a keen awareness of the interrelated needs, characteristics and values of the target audience.

EFNEP's second major strength, effective need assessment, is a product of the following sources of information in judging a homemaker's particular needs:

- (1) Food recall based on 24-hour record of the homemaker's dietary intake provides an indication of the homemaker's current eating patterns.
- (2) Specialists' recommendations.
- (3) Paraprofessionals' observations recorded in detailed logs.
- (4) Homemaker's expressed needs.

Unique among these sources is the food recall record which also assesses the behavioral change in the diet of each homemaker. Recalls are recorded when a homemaker first joins EFNEP and thereafter at six month intervals. The food recall records of 1972-73 indicate that EFNEP has significantly increased the dietary intake of participating families.

Careful examination by the nutrition agent and paraprofessional of information gained through need assessment procedures determines the area in which the homemaker will begin study. In addition to a basic "curriculum" covering instruction in food and nutrition areas,

other areas related to food nutrition such as consumer education, gardening and sanitary practices are also introduced.

The learning characteristics and particular needs of EFNEP's target population have similarly influenced the way in which this basic curriculum is presented. Three techniques of instruction have proven themselves valuable to both the learner and the paraprofessional:

- (1) *Mint-lesson*—A one page guide for the paraprofessional which lists the lesson's major points and suggests activities to actively involve the homemaker during and between home visits.
- (2) *Illustrated concept*—A graphic expression of the lesson.
- (3) *Illustrated handout*—A single-page illustrated sheet left with the homemaker which reiterates the main point of the day's lesson.

Several basic concept packets have been developed to assist the paraprofessional in matching the appropriate educational materials to the particular needs of each homemaker. The first packet deals with the basic four food groups and is used with beginning homemakers; the second illustrates the proper handling of food and is appropriate for second year homemakers; the third packet, serving more advanced homemakers, teaches the relationships of food to nutrients and nutrient function.

EFNEP's educational methodology reviewed above facilitates the paraprofessional's teaching and the homemaker's learning in an unhurried but progressive manner. Indeed, the key word in EFNEP now is progression. While remaining true to its original objective, EFNEP is training paraprofessionals to assist the homemaker in the transition from individual instruction to group experience outside the home and in other Extension programs. This expanded objective is designed to further the coordination of activities between EFNEP and other agencies with complementary interests in disadvantaged families while broadening EFNEP's total impact in target communities throughout Georgia.

**Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
Adult Education Center⁵**

The Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Adult Education Center shares a unique relationship with the

⁵ *Project Presenters:* Rosemary Mayer, SSCM, Dr. Martin Luther King Education Center, Kankakee, Ill. and Dr. David Ferris, Director, Adult and Continuing Education, Kankakee Community College, Kankakee.

community in which it is located and with its major sponsor, Kankakee Community College. The King Center is a learning center which offers basic education and GED proficiency programs for adults. Basically, it is the King Center's purpose to foster dignity and security in each student.

The King Center, founded in 1968, is modeled after an innovative adult education center in Chicago's Woodlawn area. A Catholic priest and nun sought to duplicate the Woodlawn approach in a three-story house located in a predominately black Kankakee neighborhood. The house and location were chosen as the best learning facility to overcome obstacles to participation such as: (1) lack of transportation; (2) differences in social and academic status with people in other sections of the city; (3) the need for learning environment that did not recall failure and frustration; (4) the stimulus of a "success orientation" in the student's own neighborhood, and (5) the lack of child care facilities.

The encouragement and support extended by Kankakee Community College (KCC) was crucial to the establishment of the King Center. Impressed with the idea and philosophy of a neighborhood learning center, KCC agreed to include the King Center as one of the college's projects. Administering the King Center under KCC's Continuing Education Program enabled the King Center to operate with considerable creativity and autonomy. At the same time it received the direction and assistance needed to overcome the many hurdles facing a new program.

KCC's nurturing role is a significant departure from and reinterpretation of the way in which institutions of higher learning can support community development efforts without controlling them. The King Center affords a channel through which the resources of a community college can flow to the target area. These resources include not only money and the expertise of educational staffs, but also KCC's ability to facilitate the involvement of state and federal programs, knowledgeable advisory groups, community organizations, and the public media.

In addition to KCC's input, another factor which has greatly contributed to the King Center's success is the day care center housed in a building adjacent to the King Center. With the support of Public Aid funds for families unable to pay for their children's participation, the day care center has grown from a two-hour program

these and other 309(b) dissemination efforts.

The Effectiveness of 309(b) Dissemination

A question included in our national survey of 805 local ABE directors read as follows: "Listed below are some major 309(b) projects funded in the past. Please indicate how familiar you are with each project." Seven of the largest and most publicized projects were listed and briefly described.¹ Respondents were asked to check one of four response options: (1) never heard of it; (2) heard of it but have no details; (3) quite familiar, but have not used project ideas or products; (4) quite familiar. I have used project ideas or products.

As might be expected, the results indicated that project dissemination efforts were most successful within their respective geographical regions. Thus, in the Southwest 60 percent of local directors had at least heard of SWCEL and in the same region some 73 percent had heard of Texas Guidance and Counseling. Reported adoption rates in this region were 12.4 percent for SWCEL and 19.2 percent for Texas Guidance. In Western states, about 53 percent of local directors had heard of Communi-Link and some 13 percent reported using a project idea or product.

Although the 309(b) projects listed in our questionnaire seemed to have met with some regional dissemination success, none, except possibly the Appalachian ABE Center, succeeded particularly well in disseminating nationally, as Table 5 shows.

¹In addition to the four projects studied in depth, the list included the Appalachian ABE Center (Kentucky), the Adult Armchair Project (Pa.), and the Southern Regional Educational Board ABE Project (Ga.).

Table 5

**Local ABE Directors' Familiarity with and Use of 309(b)
Project Ideas and Products
(In Percent, N=805)**

<u>Project</u>	<u>Never Heard of</u>	<u>Heard of but Have No Details</u>	<u>Quite Familiar but Have Not Used Products</u>	<u>Quite Familiar and Have Used Products</u>
Texas Guidance & Counseling	52.7	29.7	8.9	8.7
Project RFD	60.1	25.2	11.7	3.0
Communi-Link	63.7	19.5	10.7	6.1
SWCEL ABE Project	66.5	22.3	7.1	4.1
Adult Armchair	67.2	20.0	7.4	5.5
Appalachian ABE Center	31.4	40.8	15.3	12.5
SREB ABE Project	66.3	19.1	6.1	8.5

In terms of the scope of dissemination, Table 5 shows that six of the seven widely publicized 309(b) projects failed to reach at least half of the local ABE directors. In terms of depth, the data indicate that most ABE directors who had heard of the projects did not possess detailed information about them, and that no project achieved more than a 12.5 percent utilization rate.

Detailed knowledge, as contrasted with general awareness information, seems to be a significant factor in securing utilization of project outcomes. When the percentage of utilization reported by directors who claimed that they were "quite familiar" with the projects is computed, the following results: