

**IMPROVING SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS  
IN THE PERIPHERY**

**James H. Williams**

**Project ABEL**

**Harvard Institute for International Development**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **A. A PERSPECTIVE ON THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY IN PROVIDING EDUCATION**

- a. Three Models of Education and Community
- b. The Limitations of Government Provision
- c. The Community and the Periphery
- d. Organization of the Paper

### **B. WAYS TO IMPROVE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN THE PERIPHERY**

#### **1. ADAPT EDUCATIONAL DELIVERY TO LOCAL VALUES AND NEEDS**

- a. Identify Reasons for Low Enrollment
- b. Work Around Community Values
- c. Modify the Timing and Structure of Learning
- d. Adjust the Costs and Benefits of Education
- e. Adopt Appropriate Curricula
- f. Strengthen Cultural Identity

#### **2. FIND USEFUL WAYS TO INVOLVE THE COMMUNITY**

- a. Supporting the Instructional Program
- b. Supplementing School Resources
- c. Helping to Manage Schools
- d. Cultivating Community Support for Schools

#### **3. FIND WAYS THE SCHOOL CAN HELP THE COMMUNITY**

### **C. POLICY IMPLICATIONS: FERTILE CONDITIONS AND NECESSARY LINKAGES**

- a. Lessons for Improved School-Community Relations

## **LIST OF TABLES**

- Table 1. **School and Community Models in the Provision of Education**
- Table 2. **Local Demand and the Role of the Community**
- Table 3. **Adapting Educational Delivery to Local Values**
- Table 4. **Adapting Educational Delivery to Constraints Children Face**
- Table 5. **Adjusting the Costs and Benefits of Education**
- Table 6. **Developing Curriculum to Meet Peripheral Needs**
- Table 7. **Education to Reinforce Local Cultures**
- Table 8. **How Community Involvement Can Improve Education**
- Table 9. **Ways the Community Can Help Manage Schools**
- Table 10. **What Schools Can Do for Communities**

## **LIST OF BOXES**

**Box 1. Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)**

**Box 2. Curriculum in Colombia's Escuela Nueva**

**Box 3. Shuar Radio Education Project**

**Box 4. Parents' Associations in Vietnam**

**Box 5. School-Community Relations in Sri Lanka**

**Box 6. India's Project PROPEL**

## **A. A PERSPECTIVE ON THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNITY IN THE PROVISION OF EDUCATION**

The roles of the community and the state vis a vis education have changed, first, with the development of mass schooling, and second and more recently with the growing awareness of the limitations of government. Mass education, as currently organized, places relatively little value on the community, whether as a participant in the education of children, as a legitimate source of knowledge, or as a partner in the management of educational change. This may be changing. Conditions are ripe for a reconsideration of the contribution of the community, especially in the periphery, where the reach of the system usually falters.

**Three Models of Education and Community.** The community has not always played a passive role in children's education. Table 1 summarizes salient characteristics of three models of education, two historical and one currently emerging. Until the middle of the last century, responsibility for educating children rested with the community (LeVine and White, 1986). In a model we have called the traditional community-based education model, communities provided new generations of young people with the education necessary for transmitting local norms and economic skills. Education was deeply embedded in local social relations, and as such school and community were very closely linked. The government played a minor role. This model of education, while fostering social continuity and cohesion in the community, provided little basis for political integration at the national level and was of little use in meeting the specialized training needs of an industrial economy.

Table 1. Models of School and Community in the Provision of Education

	TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY-BASED EDUCATION	GOVERNMENT- PROVIDED EDUCATION	COLLABORATIVE GOVERNMENT- COMMUNITY EDUCATION
PURPOSE OF EDUCATION	Socialization into community; Survival of community	Socialization into national culture; Political, economic development of state	Socialization into national & local cultures; Serves local & national "improvement"
NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE TO BE ACQUIRED	Transmission of local economic skills & community norms	Transmission of state-approved knowledge	Negotiable; usually state- approved knowledge adapted to local needs
EMPHASIS	On community	On individual & state	On individual as member of both community & state
VISION OF COMMUNITY'S ROLE	All-encompassing	Passive recipient; potentially disruptive of government's project	Negotiable, ranging from community as focal point of development effort to community as important arm of government
ROLE OF GOVERNMENT	None to extent that government does not interfere	Assumes complete responsibility for provision of education	Negotiable, ranging from source of support for education defined by community to virtually complete control
IMPLICATIONS FOR PERIPHERY	Education depends on community commitment, capacity	Education depends on government commitment & capacity	Education as partnership; Education depends both on government and community; Highlights government's goals & will/ability to meet needs, values of diverse groups; Communities can or should assume role in provision & support; Communities should get say in what goes on

**Table 1. Models of School and Community in the Provision of Education  
(Continued)**

	<b>TRADITIONAL COMMUNITY-BASED EDUCATION</b>	<b>GOVERNMENT- PROVIDED EDUCATION</b>	<b>COLLABORATIVE GOVERNMENT- COMMUNITY EDUCATION</b>
<b>STRENGTHS</b>	Continuity & social cohesion	At its best, egalitarian, promotes national identity, development of individual & state, manpower expertise	Carefully planned, combines best of both earlier models
<b>PROBLEMS</b>	No basis for national integration; Education depends entirely on community capacity & initiative; Unable to meet manpower training needs of industrialized economy	Governments lack financial & management resources to reach all; May contribute to loss of traditional ways of living; May devalue local, peripheral cultures	May be another way to tax poor; May permit government to avoid responsibility to provide all with educational opportunity

This community-based model has largely been replaced with government-provided education. First in the industrializing nations of the West, then in colonies ruled by Western countries, and finally in the newly-independent nations themselves, governments have assumed responsibility for providing or regulating education. Initially, education was designed for the elite classes. Later it came to be viewed as appropriate and necessary for everyone and as such was the proper business of government. Through government provision, education is delivered through formal school systems, coordinated by bureaucracies placed above the community. To a great extent the content of education has been standardized within and across countries (Ramirez and Boli, 1982; Ramirez and Boli, 1987; Meyer, Ramirez, Rubinson, and Boli-Bennett, 1977). In attempting to equalize access and promote political integration and economic development, governments diminished the role of the community. The community, if considered at all, has been viewed as backward, or at least in need of transformation.

**The Limitations of Government Provision.** While government-provided education has led to the greatest expansion of education in history, its limitations are becoming increasingly apparent. Most obviously, financial constraints have made it difficult to provide the entire

population with metropolitan models of education. Governments often lack the money to provide every community with a fully-equipped school building and a full range of grades, teachers, and instructional materials.

Even when governments are able to provide all communities with schools, the schools often fail to provide all children with adequate education. In some places, children remain outside the schools, because of distance, demands at home, or cultural norms hostile to formal schooling (Anderson, 1988). In other areas, retention is the greater problem. Children enroll in school but drop out before reaching their educational potential. In still other areas, the greatest problem is the quality of learning. Whether through lack of inputs on the part of the school system or motivation on the part of learners, students fail to learn what they might.

Part of the problem is finance; another part is management. Most developing education systems are administered with greatly expanded versions of arrangements set in place by colonial governments. Colonial education systems were designed to achieve elite goals, with much smaller systems serving more homogenous and less dispersed populations. Many developing systems have expanded very rapidly, under conditions of relative austerity, but with little change in structure and little development of management capacity. As a result, many systems lack the personnel or capacity to provide all schools with adequate levels of administrative support.

Finally, even when a system is adequately managed, there are some aspects of the educational process that a government simply cannot attend to. Governments cannot, for example, provide a home environment that is supportive of students' homework. Yet a number of studies suggest the importance of such support. Parents and community members can reinforce the work of the school, if they believe in what the school is doing. What governments can do is work to establish conditions that will foster such parental and community support.

The role of the community is being re-evaluated. Various countries around the world, including some very poor ones, have initiated imaginative projects that provide a more important role for the community. While this "collaborative" model is still being defined, one common characteristic is clear. The collaborative model recognizes both government and community as important actors in education. Most communities, for example, lack the resources to provide children with an adequate education on their own. However, for education to be most effective, community needs and values must be reflected in policy choices. In its weaker form, the

collaborative model sees the community as playing an important supportive role in government provision of education. In difficult areas, such as remote, rural villages, community involvement may be the only way governments can realize their goals of universal access, improved quality, and better management.

**The Community and the Periphery.** Peripheral groups do not participate in the mainstream of social, political and economic life of the countries in which they live. They have relatively little economic or political power and thus tend to be under-served by education, health, and other public services. Although remote, rural populations are generally peripheral in this sense, poor urban dwellers may also lack access to power and services that characterize the periphery.

In the periphery changes in the roles of school and community are particularly important for several reasons. First, any problem in the center, whether of access, quality, or finance and management, is typically more severe in the periphery. Thus, barring extraordinary government commitment, financial set-backs in the center will be manifested as more dramatic cut-backs in peripheral schools (Jolly and Cornia, 1984). Second, communities in peripheral areas tend to play a more important role in children's lives than in the center. If, for example, local values are hostile to school attendance, the community's perspective will often prevail over the school's, and many children will remain outside the school. At the same time, the government's hand is usually weaker, so compulsory school attendance laws, for example, may be difficult or impossible to enforce. Third, given the general lack of services and government institutions in peripheral areas, schools are more visible. Thus, where there is demand for education, peripheral communities may take a more active interest in their schools than do communities in the center. By the same token, government interventions may have more effect.

Thus the issue of community demand or interest in education is particularly important in the periphery. Peripheral demand for education is typically characterized by one of two patterns. On the one hand, demand for education may be high and largely unmet. In such cases, evidence suggests that communities are willing to do a great deal to improve the quality of education with a minimum of government support. On the other hand, demand for education may be low due to cultural, ethnic or other differences with the center; lack of felt need for schooling; or other reasons. In such cases, an appropriate initial response by governments would be to adapt

schooling to better meet community values and needs. In either case, the community plays an important role in schooling, whether acknowledged, planned for, or not. Implications for the periphery are outlined in Table 2.

**Table 2. Local Demand and the Role of the Community**

	<b>HIGH LOCAL DEMAND</b>	<b>LOW LOCAL DEMAND</b>
<b>INITIAL ATTITUDE OF COMMUNITY TOWARD SCHOOL</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Indifferent/Resistant</b>
<b>ROLE OF COMMUNITY</b>	<b>Potential support to supplement &amp; reinforce government action; Can support schools in ways government cannot</b>	<b>Can block/undermine educational efforts</b>
<b>KEY VARIABLES DETERMINING COMMUNITY ROLE</b>	<b>Community lacks ways to provide support</b>	<b>Match between content/delivery of schooling &amp; local values, needs, economic constraints</b>
<b>GOAL OF GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION</b>	<b>Provide useful ways community can support schools</b>	<b>Adapt content/delivery of schooling to local context; Provide education useful to community;</b>

**Organization of the Paper.** A number of projects have attempted to link school and community more closely. Review of these projects shows that there are a number of low-cost options for improving education through better ties between school and community. This paper reports on these options. The idea is not to prescribe a set of approaches that should work in all contexts but to focus attention on a range of strategies and ways of thinking about problems in the periphery that can address different contexts. Given its resources and responsibility for education, we first focus on what the government can do to improve school-community relations.

If education is for all then the first task of educators is to get children in school and keep them there. We assume that all children want to learn, though they may not want to attend school as structured. Thus Section B describes strategies to increase educational participation in areas of low demand by tailoring educational programs to better meet community needs and values. Strategies described in this section depend, in large part, on government action, often opening up the regulations governing schools to more flexible programmatic options. Sections

C and D look at school-community relations in communities where there is both access to and demand for education. The focus in these sections is on ways of increasing the quality of what children learn through greater and better community participation in schools (Section C) and through school involvement in the community (Section D). Strategies discussed in these sections focus primarily on school and community-level action. We propose the idea of school-community exchange, in which schools and communities collaborate in development projects of mutual benefit. Though the literature provides few examples of programs in which educational policy makers consider direct school contributions to the community an important issue, our review suggests that school action on behalf of the community improves both the demand for education and community participation. The last section summarizes previous discussions with a series of recommendations for reaching the periphery through improved school-community ties.

## **B. WAYS TO IMPROVE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN THE PERIPHERY**

### **1. ADAPT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS TO LOCAL VALUES AND NEEDS**

Community attitudes toward education are an important determinant of the effectiveness of schooling, especially in the periphery. Our survey of the literature suggests that community attitudes toward the school range from outright hostility to apathy to enthusiastic support and that these attitudes can either retard or block government efforts to expand schooling or can serve as an important base of support. Government strategies should vary accordingly, depending on the extent of community demand. In contexts where schooling is valued, the basic problem facing government is to devise helpful and realistic ways for the community to provide support. In contexts where schooling encounters indifference or resistance, the government must adopt a different approach, one of engaging community interest in schooling. This latter strategy implies: 1) a search for the reasons for lack of interest in education, and 2) a willingness to adapt the content and delivery of educational programs to fit the needs and values of diverse communities.

This section looks at ways to enroll and retain children who, despite the existence of a nearby school, do not participate. Thus, we do not consider, here, the provision of schools where there are none. A review of the literature shows that, in many cases, low levels of demand for education are not immutable but can be changed through appropriate government action.

**Identify Reasons for Low Enrollment.** In many cases educational participation is low because the government has lacked the resources to provide education to the more-difficult-to-reach periphery. In other areas, however, children remain out of school despite the government's provision of nearby schools. The first step in addressing problems of low educational participation is to determine the specific reasons for lack of local demand.

Research has identified a number of possible reasons (Anderson, 1988; Kelly, 1987; Wan, 1975; National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1970). Communities may resist schooling when delivered in ways that are incompatible with local values such as in Pakistan and Bangladesh, where religious norms proscribe public interactions between girls and boys (King and Bellew, 1991). Parents may also hesitate to enroll their children in school when school schedules prevent children from attending to household tasks, or when travel time to school is excessive. Rigid age and attendance requirements may prevent children from acquiring an education they would want if it were timed more flexibly. Parents are unlikely to educate their children when direct costs, such as school fees and uniforms, are perceived as being too high, or when the benefits of education are low (Nkinyangi, 1982; World Bank, 1987). Moreover, the relative values of such costs and benefits may differ at the periphery from those of the center.

The content and quality of schooling are other issues. Parents may feel that the school teaches their children little that is useful in village life. They may be critical of teachers who are poorly trained, frequently absent, or prone to use physical punishment. As discussed in the chapter on language policy, further alienation may occur if schooling is provided in a non-native language, which is often the case in the periphery. Finally, there may be a generalized resistance to education where schools are viewed as attempts by the government to weaken or destroy a community's cultural or ethnic identity.

Again, consequences of these problems may be more severe in the periphery than in the mainstream (UNESCO, 1984c), and some sub-groups, such as girls, may be more adversely affected than others (Anderson, 1988; Kelly, 1987).

The following discussion highlights strategies that have been used to address each of these problems. Key points are summarized in Tables 3-6.

**Work Around Community Values.** Schooling often represents a challenge to the traditional norms and allegiances of the community. Of course, one of the primary purposes of schooling is the inculcation of "modern" values and national allegiance. In many cases, however, the organization and delivery of schooling challenge community values in ways that are neither intended nor necessary to realizing the stated goals of education.

Not surprisingly in many parts of the world such value conflicts center around gender roles. If, for example, a co-educational school is established in a community whose culture proscribes public interactions between female and male students, parents are faced with a choice between their values and those of the school. If the parents' values win out, girls lose the opportunity to get an education. Even if girls are enrolled, their participation is likely to be short-lived. In cases such as these, steps taken to adapt the delivery of educational programs to bring it into greater harmony with local values are likely to pay off in terms of increased participation and achievement.

**Table 3. Adapting Delivery of Education to Local Values**

<b>REASON FOR LOW PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADDRESS PROBLEM</b>
<b>Method of Delivery Conflicts with Local Values Related to Gender Roles</b>	<b>Correct specific problems (Build walls, latrines, etc.)</b>  <b>Establish single-sex schools</b>
<b>Generalized mismatch between values of schooling and local values</b>	<b>Link schools with important local institutions such as religious bodies; upgrade quality of such programs</b>
<b>Lack of Appropriate Role Models as Teachers; Lack of Sufficient Numbers of Teachers for Peripheral Schools</b>	<b>Recruit &amp; deploy more female and/or local teachers: recruit &amp; train locally, modify entrance requirements, subsidize teacher-training, provide room and board, set up flexible posting policies</b>  <b>Recruit &amp; train educated community members as teachers</b>

Some problems are rather easy to remedy; when parents and community members have specific and identifiable objections to the way education is provided, it may be possible to increase participation simply by fixing the problem. This appears to have been the case in Pakistan, where building boundary walls around schools eased parents' concerns over their

daughters' safety (World Bank, 1987a, 1987b), and in Bangladesh, where the provision of enclosed latrines overcame an important community objection to schooling for girls (World Bank, 1985).

Single-sex schools may provide an important way for governments to provide a "safe" learning environment for girls. A study of girls' mathematics achievement in single- and co-educational schools in Nigeria found that girls learned more and exhibited more positive attitudes toward mathematics in single-sex schools than in coeducational settings (Lee and Lockheed, 1990).

Sometimes, however, low community demand for education is associated with a more generalized mismatch between local values and those implicitly espoused by modern schooling. One potential solution is to link educational programs with important local institutions such as religious bodies. Pakistan, Kenya, Bangladesh, the Gambia and other countries have accredited Koranic schools by training teachers to add general primary school content to the school's religious curriculum. Such schools enjoy the respect of local people and form a continuity with traditional community-based education, but often suffer from poor quality (Warwick, Reimers, and McGinn, 1989; World Bank, 1987b; Eisemon and Wasi, 1987; UNESCO, 1984a; King and Bellew, 1991). In such cases, it may be necessary to take steps to improve the quality of Koranic schools, as has been done in the Gambia, by working with religious organizations to broaden the curriculum and provide better trained teachers (King and Bellew, 1991; World Bank, 1990a).

Greater recruitment and deployment of women teachers is often suggested as a way of increasing girls' enrollments (Anderson, 1988; Kelly, 1987; National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1970). Women teachers serve as important role models and can make girls feel comfortable in the possibly "foreign" atmosphere of the school. For similar reasons, deployment of teachers from peripheral communities may increase enrollment and retention. Recruitment and training of local teachers may solve some of the problems faced by teachers from outside such as isolation and difficulty fitting in (Dove, 1982). However, deploying greater numbers of peripheral and women teachers is difficult, for many of the same reasons that their

enrollment is low in the first place<sup>1</sup>.

A combination of strategies seems to be most effective in increasing the number of women teachers (and by extension, teachers from peripheral groups): recruiting and training in local areas (rather than urban centers); reducing requirements for entrance into teacher-training programs where appropriate; subsidizing teacher education; providing room and board to those in teacher training; and designing flexible posting arrangements so that teachers can obtain postings near their homes (King and Bellew, 1991). Nepal successfully implemented a program combining these characteristics, contributing to a three-fold increase in the proportion of women teachers in primary schools over an eight year period (UNDP, 1982).

Another option is recruiting relatively well-educated members of local communities and training them. Nonformal programs in Bangladesh and Maharashtra India that have recruited and trained educated community residents have been very successful (Lovell and Fatema, 1989; Mallon, 1989; UNESCO, 1984a). Part of the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee's (BRAC) success in attracting girls to its schools appears to have been the fact that two-thirds of its teaching staff are women (see Box 1).

#### **BOX 1. BANGLADESH RURAL ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE (BRAC)**

---

The Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) set up schools to reach the unreachable in a context where being poor, rural, and/or female in Bangladesh meant getting a low-quality education if any at all. BRAC's schools arrange instruction around the needs of students and families. Schools operate before or after the main workday, thus providing children who must work with an opportunity to learn. BRAC's schools are free from many of the regulations characterizing the formal school system. Students may enter at non-standard ages and progress at their own rate. Examinations are infrequent and tied to the material that has been taught. Local communities are required to provide school facilities according to BRAC guidelines. Teachers are recruited from local communities and provided with training and a small stipend. Special efforts are made to hire women as teachers. The curriculum is geared toward local concerns but coordinated with the formal school curriculum so that students can continue their studies if they so wish.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more complete treatment of this theme, refer to the companion paper on recruiting teachers for the periphery.

The success of projects such as BRAC's suggest that when education is provided in ways that make it truly accessible, children will attend school. BRAC's schools, established in rural areas where educational participation has traditionally been very low, have a dropout rate of one percent. Eighty-three percent of BRAC's students continue their studies in regular schools, whereas previously few would have gotten any schooling at all.

**Modify the Timing and Structure of Learning.** The delivery of education may also conflict with a family's economic needs, again in ways neither intended nor relevant to the content of education (Kelly, 1987; National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1970; UNESCO, 1984c; Wan, 1975). Family well-being may depend on children's help in caring for siblings (Coletta and Sutton, 1989), preparing food, gathering fuel and water, or working on the farm. Parents may choose not to enroll their children in school when school schedules prevent the youngsters from attending to such tasks.

The school year is generally scheduled in ways that make it difficult for children to play an economic role in their homes (Kelly, 1987). Most school curricula require: that children enter school at a certain age; that they spend most of their day at school; that they attend school most days the school is open; and that they progress from one grade to the next without interruption. Failing to abide by these requirements means failure at school and failure to get an education. It is a difficult system to combine with work, an easy system to fail at, and a system permitting few second chances. Each of these requirements results in the loss of potential students, and none have anything to do with the content of what is learned. Children who do not enter school at the appointed age become self-conscious about studying with younger students and are more likely to drop out (National Council of Educational Research and Training in India, 1970). Children who miss part of the school year often have to repeat the entire year; many drop out instead. The result is often a vicious cycle of failure.

A UNESCO study of the dropout problem in Asia, for example, found that two-thirds of Thailand's dropouts had previously repeated a grade. The report went on to propose that automatic promotion be established as a matter of policy as has been done in Malaysia and Korea and that exams be abolished in early grades (UNESCO, 1984c). Other research supports the

educational value of automatic promotion (Haddad, 1979) and the detrimental effect of too many exams too early.

Several education programs have addressed these problems by structuring their programs around the demands facing target students (refer to Table 4). Child care arrangements have permitted many girls who would not otherwise been able, to attend school in China, Colombia, and India (Lockheed and Verspoor, 1990; Coletta and Sutton, 1989; Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development, 1984). For example, new regulations permitting girls to bring their siblings to school have been piloted in Ghansu, China. Site-based child care has permitted women workers to care for their children, thus freeing their daughters to attend school. In Colombia, the Hogares de Bienestar Infantill program provides community-based child care in poor areas, again permitting girls who would otherwise have had to take care of younger siblings to attend school. The Vakaswadi project in India identified the need to care for younger children as an important constraint on girls' attendance at school. By providing nurseries at school, enrollments increased and dropout rates fell.

**Table 4. Adapting Delivery of Education to Constraints Children Face**

REASON FOR LOW PARTICIPATION	MEASURES TO ADDRESS PROBLEM
School attendance prevents children from caring for siblings	Permit siblings to attend class
School attendance prevents children from attending to household tasks: preparation of food, planting and harvesting, etc.	Set up day-care centers near school or at work sites
Curriculum requires that students: enter at a particular age, attend school virtually every day, continue without interruption, complete an entire year or fail	Schedule school for morning or afternoon only
Children pass the prescribed age of entry.	Schedule school year around growing seasons
Failure is easy	Develop non-graded, unit-based curricula; Allow children to enter, progress at own pace
	Develop second-chance programs, Provide ways for children to join formal schools later
	Automatic promotion; Elimination of exams in early grades

Several programs have the structural flexibility to meet the scheduling needs of target children. BRAC and Escuela Nueva permit students to enter at different ages (Republic of Colombia, 1990; Lovell and Fatema, 1989). The Maharashtra project targets pupils aged 9-14 who have passed the prescribed age for entry into the formal system (Naik, 1982). Escuela Nueva assumes that children will have to work much of the day and will be unable to attend school every day. Learning is structured with sequential, semi-programmed teaching materials that children can put down and pick up again when they are ready. Repetition has been structured out of the program through "flexible promotion" (Republic of Colombia, 1990). The Maharashtra program structures learning along principles of ungraded mastery learning. BRAC lets each community decide whether classes will be held in the morning or evening, so as to conflict least with children's household tasks. By targeting the delivery of educational programs to the needs of those bypassed by the rigid schedules of formal schooling, these programs have stimulated local interest in education and made it easier for students to succeed in learning.

The Vakaswadi project in India modified not only the scheduling of school but the location as well, literally taking the school to the meadows where children tended cattle. Children took turns watching the herds and studying (Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development, 1984).

Other projects that have attempted to restructure learning illustrate that unanticipated outcomes and resistance to new ideas often accompany success in the implementation of new ideas. The IMPACT project in the Philippines replaced teachers with "instructional supervisors" who oversaw the learning of an average of 100 students. Community members were involved as teacher aides, and upper-grade pupils tutored younger students in multigrade classes. Instruction was provided through self-instructional units for grades 4-6. The pilot program was successful in terms of student outcomes and cost effectiveness. IMPACT students scored as well as conventional students on standardized curriculum-based tests; a greater percentage went on to regular high schools; fewer were unemployed; and costs ran 50% less than for conventional schools. However, the program ran into administrative difficulties and stiff resistance from the vested interests of teachers during the process of expansion to the national scale. Lack of commitment to the project at the national level led to difficulties in arranging the funding

necessary for dissemination. When given an option of programs, parents opted for conventional schools (Nielsen and Cummings; Stromquist, 1981).

Several countries attempted to adapt the IMPACT program to their own contexts. Again, while some objectives were achieved, other problems were encountered. The PAMONG project attempted to replicate IMPACT in Indonesia but ran into resistance from the educational bureaucracy. The program was successful in reaching dropouts and meeting the needs of isolated schools where multigrade teaching was already the rule. The bureaucracy, however, was unwilling to make the changes necessary to realize potential cost savings from the project: Ministry officials refused to modify their formula for calculating the number of teachers needed in a particular school and to permit PAMONG-developed materials to be used instead of Ministry-approved textbooks. The testing schedule was not changed to match the PAMONG instructional schedule. In addition, music and physical education, while included in standardized tests, were not taught in the PAMONG materials (Nielsen and Cummings; Stromquist, 1981).

IMPACT was brought to Malaysia in the form of Project InSPIRE and was used to provide remedial instruction in peninsular Malaysia and to reach outlying communities in Sabah. In the Malaysian context teachers are reported as having welcomed the self-instructional materials, while Ministry officials objected. The project managed to survive by affiliating itself with a local university and obtaining press coverage (Nielsen and Cummings). Bangladesh also attempted to replicate IMPACT with even less success (World Bank, 1985; Cummings and Nielsen). Enrollments did not increase, nor did dropout rates decrease. Parents apparently lacked confidence in a strategy where older children taught younger children. In addition, the self-instructional units required greater supervision and teacher attention than initially expected.

Liberia introduced programmed instructional materials to provide greater access to education in a context of too few teachers and instructional materials (Boothroyd and Chapman, 1986; Nielsen and Cummings; Windham, 1983; IEES, 1986). The IEL project (Improved Efficiency of Learning) was successful in terms of some objectives -- access, achievement, and cost effectiveness. Enrollments increased by 71% with no increase in the number of teachers. Dropout rates were lower than in comparison schools, and students scored significantly higher on English and mathematics tests. Costs compared favorably with those of conventional classroom instruction. The effects of the program on learning differentials by gender, however,

were discouraging. Girls in IEL classes scored significantly lower than boys did in either IEL or comparison groups and lower than girls in conventional schools. Evaluators suggested that the reasons for these discrepancies were the greater demands of the self-instructional materials in terms of independent study, which conflicted with the demands on girls' time at home. They cautioned that in communities where educational levels are low, instructional materials must be carefully adapted to the level of instructional support children are likely to find at school.

The programs outlined above operate at the early stages of education, their basic objective being to provide out-of-school and at-risk children with basic educational opportunities. An important consideration in the design of such programs is whether children enrolled in such alternative educational programs will be able to enter conventional schools should they decide to seek further education. Bangladesh seems to have been particularly sensitive to this problem. BRAC explicitly established linkages with the formal primary system so that graduates of the BRAC program could continue their studies. Bangladesh established some 200 "feeder schools" organized by village workers and explicitly designed to provide out-of-school children with the basic skills necessary for enrollment in government primary schools (Rasmussen, 1985). Similarly, graduates of Bangladesh's Underprivileged Children's Program (UCEP) are entitled to enter public vocational schools (UNESCO, 1984b).

That BRAC, Escuela Nueva, and the Maharashtra programs were more broadly successful than the IMPACT programs may be understood as a function of community and governmental support. Problems with these programs arose as a result of either a mismatch between program design and community needs and values, or resistance from the educational bureaucracy. BRAC, Escuela Nueva, and the Maharashtra programs involved the community in planning, implementing, staffing and managing their educational programs. As significant, perhaps, the government did not interfere. By way of contrast, lack of community involvement was cited as a primary reason for problems with the IMPACT model in Malaysia and the Philippines. Parental objections to older students teaching younger students helped undermine successful replication of the IMPACT model in Bangladesh. Resistance from the educational bureaucracy and from teachers undermined the effectiveness of IMPACT in Indonesia, the Philippines and Malaysia.

**Adjust the Costs and Benefits of Education.** Parents also make enrollment decisions on the basis of more direct economic concerns: How much does school cost? What economic benefits can children be expected to get from school? Do expected future benefits outweigh the current opportunity costs?

In some cases, parents may want to enroll their children in school but are prevented from doing so by the direct and indirect costs of education: school fees, clothes or uniforms, textbooks and other materials. The school may be located too far from home for the child to commute, especially at the secondary level, and parents may be unable or unwilling to board children near the school. In other cases, the benefits of education may unclear. Education may not, in the parents' estimation, be of much use in helping their children obtain future work. The school's curriculum may seem (or be) unrelated to community needs; it may not teach anything (seen to be) of practical value. The curriculum may be geared toward preparing students for continuing in the next level of education, an option that may not appear desirable or possible. Finally, the benefits of education may accrue differently to different groups. What is the use of seeking an education if one is effectively barred from participation in future schooling or work outside the area? If women, for example, have few opportunities in the work force, why, parents might ask, should they be educated for such jobs? These questions may be particularly important for the periphery, which is likely to be poor and outside the mainstream economy, less able to afford costs and less likely to see benefits.

As with other aspects of parent and community demand for education, government policies can influence parental choices (refer to Table 5). Despite the fact that primary education is "free" in most countries, there are hidden costs that may prevent poor children from attending school (National Council of Educational Research and Training, 1970). Many countries require uniforms, charge fees of various kinds, or require payment for textbooks. In cases where costs such as these have been identified as barriers to school attendance, governments have tried several approaches to reducing the costs to families. In terms of uniforms, governments have experimented with providing uniforms free of charge in Bangladesh and eliminating the regulations requiring uniforms in rural areas of Sind, Pakistan (King & Bellew, 1991). Sri Lanka's free textbook program has formed part of the government's comprehensive strategy to

enroll all children in school, regardless of socioeconomic status (Enquist, 1982). Such programs can be expensive, however, as can programs to eliminate fees entirely. They may also encounter unforeseen problems.

**Table 5. Adjusting the Costs and Benefits of Education**

<b>REASON FOR LOW PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADDRESS PROBLEM</b>
Direct costs are too high	Reduce fees, cost of uniforms, materials, etc. across the board  Establish sliding scale, to vary by community or student, for fees, uniforms, materials, etc.  Eliminate fees and/or uniform requirements; Provide materials free  Establish student loan programs
Differential costs/benefits for sub-groups	Target scholarships to sub-groups
School too far from community to commute	Establish boarding facilities; Charge according to ability to pay, etc.
Opportunity costs too high	Incorporate income-generating activities into curriculum; Combine work with academics
Few future economic benefits seen to attending school;	Incorporate job training into curriculum with strong placement and counseling support;  Establish affirmative action programs in workplace
Little potential for further education	Publicize opportunities, provide support for further education & work;

The Kenyan government announced in 1974 that it would eliminate primary school tuition. A subsequent study found that the plan did not provide a way to replace the lost revenues to schools. To meet their expenses, schools had imposed other fees. The net result was that the poor ended up with even less access to schooling than before, thus pointing to the need to consider the broader ramifications of specific policies however apparently benign (Nkinyangi, 1982).

Theoretically, it is possible to adopt a sliding scale approach to tuition and fees, whereby students would pay what they could according to some objective scale. We were unable to find any examples of this approach, however, perhaps due to the administrative and political difficulties governments would face in implementing such a scheme. On the recommendation of the World Bank, Malawi did implement a scheme where students were charged user fees at the secondary level. The funds thus obtained were to be used to finance primary education and a scholarship program for poor secondary students (Thobani, 1983). It is unclear, however, whether the funds were actually used to make improvements in the primary system or whether the intended recipients actually received secondary scholarships.

However, despite expense and administrative difficulties, targeted scholarship programs have been successful in increasing girls' participation rates in Bangladesh and Guatemala and increasing the longevity of girls' attendance in Nepal (King & Bellew, 1991). Presumably programs such as these might work with other disadvantaged populations. The Bangladesh program almost doubled the proportion of girls attending school in project areas; dropout fell from 15% to 4%. The program has had a multiplier effect. Girls are encouraging their sisters to attend school, are learning financial independence and postponing marriage plans. Local schools have also improved with the guarantee of incoming funds from scholarship students. The Guatemala program links scholarships to requirements that the girls maintain a 75% attendance record and not get pregnant. The program was successful in keeping girls in school; more than 90% of scholarship recipients are reported as completing the school year.

While student loans have been suggested as a way to assist low-income families in educating their children while limiting costs on the part of the government, few governments have attempted to implement loans for primary or secondary education.

Provision of boarding facilities, sometimes targeted to specific populations, has been used to increase participation in school. For example, various Indian states established free ashram boarding schools for "scheduled" tribal children. Ashram schools emphasize practical skills and encourage children's self-reliance, with students growing their own food and "managing their own affairs" (UNESCO, 1984a). Bhutan, in order to allay parental fears about the safety of their girls and to encourage girls to continue their schooling, provided boarding facilities for upper primary grades (King & Bellew, 1991). Boarding schools are expensive, however, and it is sometimes

difficult to ensure that targeted populations will reap the benefits. Kenya, in an effort to encourage enrollment by students from peripheral tribes, set aside places in its boarding schools for such students. However, the school's requirement that students provide their own bedding and cutlery apparently prevented the intended beneficiaries from taking advantage of the places reserved for them. Instead, students from more advantaged regions were found to occupy the reserved beds (Nkinyangi, 1982), an important lesson in how costs reasonable to one population may be prohibitive to others.

Reducing the direct costs of education to students and families necessarily implies increased costs to the government and difficult choices among competing priorities. Obviously, the cheapest strategy is to do away with requirements for unnecessary items such as uniforms. The difficulties of targeting specific groups have been noted, along with the potential benefits.

Another strategy is to decrease the current opportunity costs of school enrollment or increase the future benefits of education. As discussed earlier, schools can compensate for the current opportunity costs of schooling by adapting delivery to the household tasks facing children in particular contexts. There is evidence that children whose families depend on them to earn income will study when classes are scheduled before or after work or when they can combine work with school.

In some contexts, nonformal schooling can be combined with income-generating activities, as in two projects in India. An experimental program in Madhya Pradesh, India paid children to produce mats and chalk for the Department of Education, and linked students' employment with a basic educational program. Program costs were 40% of conventional programs, and the Department of Education earned a 15% profit on its investment. Children who had dropped out or never enrolled in school were able to acquire a basic education; some children continued their education in the formal school system (Singh, 1982). A similar program in Maharashtra, India set up woodworking shops and negotiated contracts with private firms. As part of their studies, children learned crafts while producing objects for sale. As a result, primary enrollments are reported to have increased while dropout rates have decreased (UNESCO, 1984a). Students at the Philippines' *barrio* high schools paid their own tuition through income-generating activities coordinated by the schools (Orata, 1977).

In some contexts, extreme deprivation may prevent any education at all unless programs are accompanied by attention to income and other essential needs. A comprehensive program of vocational training centers targeted women in post-war Bangladesh, integrating education with training in productive skills, day-care, food, and medical care (King & Bellew, 1991).

Even when direct and opportunity costs are not a barrier to education, however, parents may decide not to enroll their children because they see little future use for education. Part of this may be a failure to ensure that parents understand the benefits of education. Three programs discussed earlier -- BRAC, Escuela Nueva and Maharashtra schools -- were successful in areas where demand for education had once been low. All three paid special attention to communicating their objectives to parents and enlisting community support in planning and implementation. Evaluations of these programs noted parents' appreciation of the practical benefit of the skills taught by the programs (Lovell and Fatema, 1989; Republic of Colombia, 1990; Naik, 1982). At the same time, however, all three programs emphasized practical skills that could be put to immediate use in daily life. Thus in planning education for low demand areas, school officials need to make certain that the benefits of their educational programs are real, given the context of the community, and understood by parents.

A number of vocational training programs have attempted to link school and future work more closely. Some succeed; many do not (World Bank, 1991). Parents sometimes resist vocational education programs, not wanting their children to be educated for manual labor. Typical was the attempted implementation of a vocational education curriculum in the Sudan. Parents resisted the program and refused to cooperate, fearing that the program would hurt their children's chances on examinations and train their children for a life of manual work (Ngalamu, 1986). Again, the mismatch between community needs and school design set the stage for failure.

Successful programs seem to fall into one of two types: They either prepare students for jobs in growth areas of the economy or supplement training with strong placement and guidance. More generalized vocational training programs are generally less successful (King & Bellew, 1991). Morocco successfully implemented a technical education program targeting women (Lycette, 1986; USAID, 1983). A strong counseling component supplemented by energetic efforts on the part of program staff to place women in apprenticeships enabled many women to

get and keep jobs. Given the economic isolation of many peripheral areas, it seems that vocational education programs for peripheral schools need to pay special attention to the needs of local economies.

**Adopt Appropriate Curricula.** The benefits of education are obviously heightened by the use of appropriate curricula. However, adapting the content and structure of curriculum to meet the demand in peripheral communities requires creative design (refer to Table 6). First, the needs of children in the periphery may differ from those of children in the center. Communities with little experience with education may have a special need to see the utility of what students learn (UNESCO, 1984a; Lovell and Fatema, 1989; Republic of Colombia, 1990). There is little sense in providing students unlikely to pursue further education with a curriculum that primarily aims to prepare students for more schooling. At the same time a totally separate curriculum is likely to reinforce the isolation of peripheral children. Certainly the provision of instructional materials in the children's language (and teachers who speak this language) is a key factor in the utility and demand for education, but if the country's dominant language is a different one, students may need instruction in both languages<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the paper on language policy in this series.

**Table 6. Developing Curriculum to Meet Peripheral Needs**

<b>REASONS FOR LOW PARTICIPATION/INTEREST</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM</b>
Curriculum is of little apparent use in children's present and projected future lives	Include material that is visibly useful in village life
Specially adapted curricula may not permit children to continue on to higher levels of education	Include sufficient material from the regular curriculum so that children can continue their education if they want to
Instruction is provided in a language the children do not know	Provide at least initial instruction in the child's home language
Instruction is not provided in a country's dominant language	Provide instruction at higher levels in the dominant language
The curriculum is structured so that only teachers can use it. Thus, learning depends entirely on the presence and capacity of teacher	Develop self-instructional materials that can be used by students with minimum professional supervision
The curriculum is lock-step and geared towards mass instruction; children must keep up with the pace of the class or fail	Develop modular systems of instruction which students can use at their own pace

Peripheral schools may need curricula that are more flexible than the standard curriculum, adaptable to multigrade classrooms<sup>3</sup>, self- and peer-instruction, teachers with varying capacities, and children's individual time schedules and learning speeds. Because of their likely isolation from the cultural resources of the center, peripheral children need a more self-contained curriculum that do children in the center. As discussed earlier, one of the problems with Nigeria's IEL project and the IMPACT project in Bangladesh was that the materials required more time and supervision than children had access to.

Escuela Nueva's curriculum has met these multiple demands remarkably well, by carefully adapting the timing and content of the instructional program to fit the constraints of Colombia's rural schools (refer to Box 2).

<sup>3</sup> Refer to the multigrade classroom paper in this series.

## **BOX 2. CURRICULUM IN COLOMBIA'S ESCUELA NUEVA**

---

Recognizing the impracticality of providing each primary school with a multigrade teaching staff, Colombia's Escuela Nueva program designed its curriculum for multigrade teaching. Because of children's varying time demands, instructional materials are designed to be studied alone, in groups, or with the teacher. With flexible promotion, children proceed at their own pace; no one must repeat a year. The curriculum emphasizes general principles but places them in the context of daily life. Students are encouraged to find local examples, and teachers are encouraged to elaborate on the material provided. The content of the curriculum permits students to join conventional schools at any time. Each school is equipped with a library consisting of 100 books, thus ensuring that all children will have access to a minimum number of reference materials.

Evaluation of the program shows very positive results. Children enrolled in Escuela Nueva schools scored higher on tests of self-esteem and equally well on tests of creativity as compared with students in conventional rural schools. Interestingly, girls scored as well as boys on tests of self-esteem. In terms of achievement, Escuela Nueva students out-performed students in conventional schools on tests of Spanish, mathematics, and socio-civic behavior. Eighty-nine percent of teachers surveyed believed that Escuela Nueva schools were better than conventional rural schools, which, it must be remembered employed a teacher for each grade (Republic of Colombia, 1990).

Program developers realized that the training teachers are given in applying the curriculum is as important as the curriculum itself. Thus, teacher training is an essential component of Escuela Nueva. New teachers participate in a series of week-long workshops, each focusing on a particular aspect of the program and supplemented by regular visits from supervisors who focus on ways to improve instruction. The emphasis is on practical rather than theoretical training; teachers learn to implement the program. Teachers also learn of the leadership role they are expected to play in the community and ways of fostering school-community collaboration. The program shows that teacher training need not be long term or expensive to be effective. Assuming an average class of 40 students, annual teacher-training costs are estimated at \$2.05 per student. Escuela Nueva's curriculum, while difficult to design, is easy to teach. By way of contrast, standard national curricula, teacher training, and supervision are easy to administer -- using the same materials and methods everywhere -- but difficult for the teacher to adapt to the particular circumstances of the periphery (Republic of Colombia, 1990; Lovell and Fatema, 1989).

---

Even when a curriculum is specially designed for particular needs, it may fail in the classroom if not accompanied by changes in teaching practices. An ethnographic study of a "practical curriculum" implemented in Botswana found very few differences from standard teaching practices (Prophet, 1990).

Teachers' efforts to relate national curricula to local needs are supported by explicitly aimed teacher training and by measures fostering collaboration among teachers such as school clusters and instruction-oriented, as opposed to administrative, supervision by principals and district officials (Cummings, Gunawardena, and Williams, 1992). School personnel may need to be taught skills for working with communities and given positive attitudes toward local communities, as was found in Sri Lanka and the Philippines (Ekanayake, 1980; Carino and Valisno, 1992).

**Strengthen Cultural Identity.** A final way to stimulate local demand is to use the school to strengthen local culture. When a creative teacher, school or community organization is able to link education with a de-valued or threatened local culture, community interest in education is solidified (refer to Table 7). A dedicated teacher can do a great deal to arouse community interest, for example, by creatively drawing on the community as a source of knowledge. A teacher in a rural high school in southern Appalachia (USA) was able to engage his students' interest in learning about their cultural heritage. Initially skeptical, students soon began researching and documenting local handicrafts, customs, and legends; interviewing community members; and eventually publishing a series of books (Foxfire, 1991). Community pride and interest in the school blossomed.

**Table 7. Education to Reinforce Local Cultures**

<b>REASON FOR LOW PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>MEASURES TO ADDRESS PROBLEM</b>
Schooling ignores or devalues, local culture	Permit/encourage development of curriculum to increase awareness, pride in local culture
Schooling implicitly forces a choice between local and mainstream cultures, economies	Permit/encourage teaching of value of both cultures, skills for bi-cultural survival

In a very different context, the aboriginal Shuar people of Ecuador were able to revive much of their culture through a collaboration between school and community organizations (Refer to Box 3).

### **BOX 3. SHUAR RADIO EDUCATION PROJECT**

---

Like many aboriginal peoples, the Shuar Indians of Ecuador faced a cultural and economic crisis. Purchases of traditional Shuar land by low-land colonists had eroded much of the tribe's sense of community. However, with the assistance of Salesian missionaries, Shuar leaders were able to secure group title to their land. Based on this success, community leaders established a bilingual Spanish-Shuar radio program that enabled children to live with their families and study. Previously, children wanting an education had to leave home for boarding schools, where schooling was carried out in Spanish and children were culturally isolated. Faced with these alternatives, most children stayed out of school. With the new radio program, however, educational participation grew dramatically. Most children stayed in their villages after growing up, and a new pride in local culture emerged. The tribe has since developed several businesses, which will enable the community to survive in the country's larger cash economy (Cultural Survival; Merino, 1984).

---

While the governments played no direct role in either of these cases, they did permit the development of special curricula. In some contexts, governments might encourage such work.

Review of these cases suggests that most people believe in education and will enroll their children in school if school is truly accessible. In many cases where children are not in school, there are powerful constraints preventing them from being there. Educational programs able to identify and adapt their delivery around these constraints have gotten enthusiastic responses from children and parents. Children from the periphery are as capable as mainstream children if education is adapted to their needs. The standard model of education, however, does not work well for many peripheral communities: many children remain out of school, are forced to repeat or drop out. In many cases the school's delivery problems are unrelated to the content or goals of education. In such cases consideration of the needs, values and constraints facing the community may be the only way to reach peripheral children.

#### **2. FIND USEFUL WAYS TO INVOLVE THE COMMUNITY**

In contrast to the contexts discussed earlier, where communities for one reason or another lacked interest in education, there is in many places great demand for education. Being peripheral has often meant getting less of what others have and of what such communities want. In such contexts, community support can make a great difference in the psychic and material resources schools have to work with. There is little that governments have to do to stimulate

such support but channel it in useful ways. For purposes of the discussion, we have grouped community support for schools into three general areas: support of the instructional program, supplements to school resources, and support in managing schools (refer to Table 8).

**Table 8. How Involvement of the Community Can Improve Education**

---

**PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM**

**Cultivate an environment supportive of school program**

**Improve enrollment, retention, attendance**

**Monitor study at home; Ensure all students have adequate study space**

**Identify & help students with problems; Help students with family emergencies**

**Boost morale of school staff**

**Provide assistant or regular teachers**

**Provide instruction in specific areas of expertise (where teachers lack expertise); Pass on community knowledge**

**Provide apprenticeships/work opportunities**

**SUPPLEMENT SCHOOL RESOURCES**

**Donate land for school; donate labor/materials to build/help build school building**

**Repair/maintain facilities**

**Donate equipment, Learning aids (eg, books, teaching materials)**

**Raise money for school**

---

**Supporting the Instructional Program.** One of the most important and least discussed contributions of the community is the most nebulous -- support of the school's instructional program. Community support is difficult to talk about but easy to recognize. Where there is support, children attend school regularly and are interested in their studies. Where parents support education, schools are able to achieve a great deal, even under very difficult circumstances.

Vietnam's Parents' Associations (PAs) illustrate the positive potential for community involvement in schools, in a context of popular support for education but very little money (refer to Box 4). Recognizing the government's financial constraints, yet poor themselves, PAs have

contributed time and energy to supporting the school's instructional programs in a variety of ways. As a result, teacher morale and student performance have improved.

#### **BOX 4. PARENTS' ASSOCIATIONS IN VIETNAM**

---

Vietnam's Parents' Associations were formally authorized by legislation in connection with a series of system-wide reforms begun in 1981. The PAs operate at the school level to improve relations between schools and parents and to help schools improve the quality of education.

PAs do a number of things to achieve these objectives. They play an important role in reducing dropout, for example, by providing children from poor families or families in crisis with clothes and school equipment. PAs work to improve pupils' studies by ensuring that every house has a quiet "study corner," with table, chair, bookshelf and light reserved for children to study. Many schools run double shifts; children when not attending school are assigned independent study. PAs monitor and assist students in completing their assignments, offer extra classes to help slower students and consult teachers and parents when problems are identified. PAs arrange special classes and contests to encourage gifted pupils. PAs organize activities such as school excursions, sports competitions and arts festivals.

PAs also play an important role in keeping up teacher morale to compensate for low salaries. PAs visit teachers on Vietnam's Teachers' Day with gifts of appreciation. PAs organize teachers' housing, sometimes constructing residences, or arranging land or discounted building materials. PAs organize extra classes for teachers to supplement their incomes, provide special holidays for outstanding teachers and arrange reduced rates at resorts (Thin, 1992).

---

Communities can also play more direct roles in support of the school's instructional program by providing instruction in specific skills that teachers cannot teach, by providing connections to the world of work, by giving teachers constructive feedback to help improve pedagogical skills, and, directly, by providing teaching staff. Thus, in addition to the activities described above, Vietnam's PA members teach students their trades, advise students on career options, and provide on-the-job training. In some locations, Vietnam's PA members attend classes, help teachers prepare teaching aids and offer suggestions on how to improve their teaching.

The Philippines' PLSS (Parent-Learning Support System) goes a step further, explicitly drawing parents into the formal classroom to improve the quality of primary education in disadvantaged areas (Carino and Valisno, 1992). PLSS is based on three beliefs: 1) the education of children is a joint responsibility of schools and parents; 2) poor children are as capable of

learning as wealthier children; 3) with guidance, parents can and should play a significant role in planning, managing and assessing their children's education. PLSS includes a variety of school-based strategies designed to improve the learning of poor children. Parents are involved in identifying problems and in planning and implementing solutions. Begun in a disadvantaged squatter settlement in Manila and a poor rural area of Leyte, student achievement in PLSS project areas has increased and dropout has been reduced.

Some programs have involved parents and other community members directly in teaching, either as teaching aides or as teachers. Pakistan recruited and trained local community residents who had little formal education to serve as assistant teachers (Verspoor and Leno, 1986). Nonformal educational programs in India and Bangladesh have recruited and trained community members to staff their programs, paying them a small sum (UNESCO, 1984a; UNESCO, 1984b). A typical example is the Maharashtra program discussed earlier, where teachers with some secondary education are recruited from villages and provided with one week of practical training in development and use of locally-relevant teaching materials and classroom management techniques. Bangladesh recruits and pays local residents with some education (usually women) to teach in its nonformal programs.

**Supplementing School Resources.** Pressures to improve the quality of schools and increase enrollment, coupled with stable or decreasing government budgets, have led governments to look to communities to supplement resources available to schools <sup>4</sup>. Communities have supplemented school resources in a variety of ways, many involving donations of labor or in-kind contributions.

Governments have asked communities to donate the land and labor to construct school buildings and to maintain school facilities in a number of countries, including Angola, Guyana, Nepal, Malawi, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Vietnam, and Yemen. Bray and Lillis describe a number of problems related to design, quality control and costs that governments must resolve in working with communities to build schools. Nonetheless, the larger point remains that

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Bray and Lillis, 1988 for an extensive treatment of the issues highlighted in this section.

communities in many different contexts have been willing to provide considerable assistance in building schools.

Communities can play a considerable role in this. Over half of the school buildings in current use in Vietnam, for example, were built through the Parents Associations (Thin, 1992). In Eastern Nigeria community cooperation in donating land and labor for school construction enabled the government to build 287 new secondary and technical schools at a minimum cost to the government. As a result, enrollment increased 165% between 1975 and 1982. Girls seem particularly to have benefitted from this program; female secondary enrollment in the project state of Anambra was the highest in Nigeria (Okoye, 1986).

In the Philippines, communities opened 2000 *barrio* high schools, 1000 preschool classes, 75 community colleges, and a number of multigrade schools in poor and remote areas, at no cost to the government (Orata, 1977). In many cases students paid for operational expenses as well by making and selling products for market. The limited evidence available indicates that graduates performed as well as graduates of conventional high schools on national examinations.

In some cases, such as in Bhutan, governments have linked provision of government resources, in this case teachers, to community provision of school facilities (King & Bellew, 1991; World Bank, 1988).

Despite a greater influx of resources from the community, however, over-reliance on community resources can result in serious problems with equity or quality. Reliance on community resources tends to exacerbate inequalities across schools and regions. A negative outcome of the Nigerian project was increased regional inequalities in favor of areas with greater willingness and resources. Lillis and Ayot detail the multiple effects of *harambee* schools in Kenya (Lillis and Ayot, 1988). While the establishment of *harambee* schools has permitted large numbers of children, especially girls, to attend primary and secondary school, *harambee* schools often suffer from very low quality. Community provision of *harambee* schools has reduced pressure on the government to improve opportunities and quality for all potential students, and has increased rather than decreased regional inequality in education. Similarly, richer communities in Sri Lanka have captured the greater benefit from the loosening of government restrictions on private contributions to schools (Cummings, Gunawardena, and Williams, 1992).

At the same time, however, the Sri Lankan study found that most communities, especially those in poor, isolated areas, were eager to help their local schools. Communities provided monetary or in-kind support, averaging 6% of the value of school budgets. The poorest communities, however, provided the greatest amounts of money, equivalent of 8% of annual school budgets. The form of community support varied according to the resources of particular communities. Wealthier communities tended to contribute money or expensive equipment, while poorer communities donated labor (see Box 5).

#### **BOX 5. SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS IN SRI LANKA**

---

As part of a series of reforms beginning in the late 1970s, the Sri Lankan government set out to improve school-community relations. Legislation authorizing the establishment of local School Development Societies (SDS) was enacted to provide a formal structure for community input and resources into the schools. While previously only parents' and teachers' opinions were solicited, now the entire community was asked to assist in helping develop local schools. At the same time the legislation encouraged schools to play a strong community role.

A survey of schools carried out several years after implementation of the reform found that 69% of all communities provided schools with some form of support and that 58% of the schools provided support to their communities. Schools helped build roads (29%) and places of worship (29%), assisted with religious, cultural and recreational events (23%) and provided personnel and facilities to teach school dropouts (10%). Communities helped organize school functions (56%), provided monetary support (56%) and helped build and maintain school facilities (42%). As one community member stated:

"Here the people are poor, and the funds are poor too. But people show their good will in other ways, by labor, by their high respect for the principal and teachers and their feeling of intimacy towards the school" (Cummings, Gunawardena, and Williams, 1992: 30).

---

Community support of schools in Sri Lanka was found to depend on five factors: The first requirement was the existence of a clearly defined community to which the school could relate. Community contributions were highest to two types of schools: elite urban schools with well-organized alumni organizations and schools in poor, isolated villages. Schools that drew students from less clearly defined geographic and social areas showed much lower levels of community support. Community ownership of the school was an important factor in determining community support.

Strong leadership on the part of the principal, along with community respect for the principal, was a second important predictor of community support, particularly in peripheral communities. The more educated and the higher the career status a principal had, the greater the levels of community support. In poor communities, the principal's level of education and career status were even more highly correlated with community support than community socioeconomic status.

Principals' administrative practices also affected community support. In peripheral areas, schools whose principals included community members, public officials and teachers in decision-making and who helped students and their families (e.g., by contacting parents if students failed to attend school) received the highest levels of community support.

A fourth factor was the extent to which the government was making visible efforts to improve the school. School clustering, provision of greater administrative support at the sub-regional level and greater implementation of improvement projects at the school level were associated with high levels of community support. Again, the effects of government action were clearest in peripheral communities.

The final factor was the degree of support the school gave the community. This support varied in form: In some communities, schools helped build roads or religious buildings. In others, schools helped organize community cultural or recreational events. Some schools provided dropouts with opportunities for further education. It is interesting that peripheral communities, while the poorest in terms of financial resources, provided the greatest percentage and absolute levels of support to their communities. Most schools received greater value than they gave by an average factor of 1.8<sup>5</sup>.

The two most important predictors of community support for schools in peripheral areas were the characteristics and leadership of principals and perceived government interest in local schools. Equally significant is the finding that these two factors played a much more important role in peripheral areas than in mainstream communities.

---

<sup>5</sup> This figure is based on the value of contributions -- monetary, labor, and in-kind -- principals estimated that communities made to schools divided by the value of contributions of schools to communities (Cummings, Gunawardena, and Williams, 1992).

The case of Sri Lanka illustrates that many of the determinants of community support of schools are under the control of the government. Also, while it may be argued that Sri Lanka is atypical in both its demand for education and its traditions of community support, it must be recognized that Sri Lanka is one of the poorest countries in the world. For Sri Lanka's poorest communities to provide such high levels of support indicates the potential of school-community collaboration in the periphery.

**Helping to Manage Schools.** Many governments face management as well as financial crises, especially in relation to the periphery. As educational participation has risen and the number of schools increased, most systems have been unable to provide all schools with adequate administrative support. The periphery has typically suffered the most. Thus, a third general area in which communities can help schools is that of management. Raised in professionalized and bureaucratic models of school provision, government officials in the past have often overlooked the management support that schools can draw from communities. With the movement toward decentralization, however, governments have looked for ways to include people at the local level in running schools.

There are several reasons for involving the community in running schools: Perhaps the most important reason is that involving parents and community members in the school's efforts is likely to improve the chances of school success. Whether the project involves getting students to do their homework or repairing a school building, community involvement is likely to foster community ownership and cooperation and forestall resistance. Fostering community participation in managing schools emphasizes the joint responsibility of parents and school for children's learning. One ingredient of BRAC's success, for example, is that each community decides when school is to be held.

There are other reasons as well. The extent of material support a community provides a school is likely to depend in large part on whether the community feels ownership of the school. Formally involving community members in running the school is one way to foster such ownership. Schools, particularly in the periphery, are likely to be understaffed. Community members can take over some of the work of teachers and principals. Finally, community members may have expertise that school personnel lack.

There are a range of options for involving the community in managing schools (summarized in Table 9). Most systems have some version of parent-teacher associations. While many systems are unwilling to allow parents to be directly involved in teaching, projects in several countries have encouraged direct community involvement in instruction.

**Table 9. Ways the Community Can Help Manage Schools**

---

<b>HELP MANAGE SCHOOLS</b>
<b>Ensure greater likelihood for successful implementation of school plans</b>
<b>To foster responsibility of parents for children's learning</b>
<b>To provide greater material support</b>
<b>Provide manpower to reduce burden on school staff</b>
<b>Supply expertise</b>
<b>Assist in fund-raising, provide moral support, general advice</b>
<b>Provide new ideas, serve trouble-shooting functions</b>
<b>Serve on advisory/management committees</b>
<b>Assume joint responsibility (with school) for planning, managing, evaluating local school programs</b>
<b>Come to assume, over time, major responsibility for local education, formal and informal, with government support and technical assistance</b>
<b>Take over most of the management functions of the school, with minimal government assistance</b>

---

The most common model of community involvement in school management is that of the standard PTA, in which parents and the community play an important supportive role vis a vis fundraising and moral support but a peripheral role in terms of decision-making and instruction. Malaysia provides a typical example: "the role of the PTAs is understood to be one primarily of material support ... They are not, in principle, entitled to interfere in matters relating to pedagogical methods or program content" (Dato' Asiah Abu Samah, 1992: 52).

It is possible to broaden the role of parent-teacher associations as illustrated earlier by the case of Vietnam. Thus, in addition to providing material support, parent-teacher associations can serve as a formal way of soliciting parents' input on the school's operation. PTAs can serve as a forum where problems can be discussed and solutions sought before problems become serious.

PTAs can also be sources of innovation and new ideas. In terms of policy decisions and instruction, however, this version of the PTA remains limited. Indonesia's BP3 parent-teacher associations appear to operate on this model (Moegiadi, Jiyono, Mudjiman, and Soemardi, 1992). The BP3s are expected to arrange support for schools, improve relations between school and parents, select local curricula content, offer general advice, and "ensure the school's success by not interfering with technical teaching matters" (p. 39).

A more inclusive model establishes organizations in which community leaders serve an advisory or consultative capacity, as in Sri Lanka's Student Development Societies or the advisory boards of private schools throughout the world. The authority of such bodies can vary but their role is one of arbiter and broad policy making, not involvement in the day-to-day operations of the school. Such advisory groups typically draw their membership from high status community members. In this model the school and its staff bear the primary responsibility for providing education, based on the advice or policies of the advisory board.

A still more inclusive model involves ordinary parents in the school's operation in terms of both school policy and day-to-day operations. This model emphasizes the partnership between school and parents and entrusts the planning and delivery of local education to both groups. The Philippines' PLSS program discussed in the previous section operates on these assumptions: "The entry of parents into formal teaching-learning situations greatly enhances the emerging belief that ... parents -- as partners of teachers and school administrators -- are also responsible for the provision of education" (Carino and Valisno, 1992: 34). Indonesia has also begun to develop a model of education along these lines in its COPLANNER program. Though not yet operational, the project seeks to establish Community Forums for Educational Development (CFED) in each community (Simanungkalit, Moyle, and Bernard, 1992). CFEDs will become part of the formal educational bureaucracy and will bring together village leaders, principals, teachers, supervisors, parents and other community members to plan and meet the educational needs of the area, both formal and nonformal.

A further model views the school as a community-managed enterprise, but one that requires inputs and technical support from the government. India has developed such a program in its PROPEL project (Naik, 1992). The project includes a variety of local interventions designed to stimulate local communities to take charge of their own educational destinies. Each

village has a Village Education Committee which plans and oversees local projects and loosely coordinates its efforts with the project as a whole.

A final model turns over the burden of responsibility for the operation of schools to local communities with virtually no support from the government, as in Peru's radical experiments in decentralization (Malpica, 1980; Salazar, 1972; Ruiz-Duran, 1980). This model is less useful for two reasons: First, most governments are unwilling to let go of their authority and responsibility for education, particularly at the primary level. Second, the evidence suggests that many communities are unable to provide or manage schooling unaided.

What is most effective is devising ways of cultivating a cooperative relationship between government, school and community so that each group can contribute what it does best.

**Cultivating Community Support for Schools.** It is interesting that the literature has focused most of its attention on material support from communities. While the financial angle is of obvious appeal to governments, greater attention to drawing instruction and management support from communities can help schools become more effective. Thus, we have attempted to highlight the diversity of support communities can offer.

Community support for schools cannot be mandated. However, given an interest in education and the right conditions, many communities are eager to help. Community support is likely to make an important, maybe critical, difference in the quality of peripheral schools. Communities are already involved in the school's work whether or not their involvement is explicit, and anything that encourages parental support is likely to improve the school's instructional program. Governments would do well to encourage positive involvement. Despite the diversity of communities covered by the projects reviewed, several common conditions of community support are clear. Schools with the following characteristics typically received generous support from their communities:

Openness on the part of the school: "Readiness of the school to welcome changes and to receive and utilize inputs from its local community" (Carino and Valisno, 1992:36)

Personal commitment of school staff, especially the principal: The commitment and leadership of the principal is a crucial factor in determining the degree of community support.

Regular, structured communication among local actors in the educational process: For long term improvement of the school, community members, parents, principals and teachers need a regular forum to promote discussion and follow-through on school improvement plans.

Visible government efforts to improve schools: Communities are more likely to support schools when they see the government taking an interest in the school and when they see the school getting better.

School involvement in the community: School action on behalf of the community demonstrates the commitment of the school.

### 3. FIND WAYS THE SCHOOL CAN HELP THE COMMUNITY

Evidence suggests that both local demand for education and community support of schools are increased when the school helps the community, when there is an exchange, even if it is largely symbolic. Through government provision schools have sometimes put an unnecessary distance between themselves and the community. While some distance may be essential in avoiding the politics and rivalries of community life, our review suggests that schools do better when they assume leadership roles in their communities. This section focuses on what the local school can do for the local community (refer to Table 10). Again, we suspect that the effects of school action are more pronounced in the periphery, given the greater visibility of the school and the relative lack of other government services.

Table 10. What Schools Can Do for Communities

COMMUNITY PROBLEM	WHAT SCHOOL CAN DO
Many school dropouts, illiterates	Offer instruction Provide alternative ways for dropouts to obtain educational certificates
Few learning resources	Provide dropouts with ways back into the formal school system Share educational resources
Community problem addressable with information	Provide access to information
Low level of community development	Provide ideas, information, leadership, and labor to address specific community problems

There are a number of roles the school can play in the community. At the most basic level school staff can participate in community activities and projects. In Sri Lanka, for example, school children helped build roads, organize community religious festivals, cultural activities and educational programs (Cummings, Gunawardena, and Williams, 1992). At a slightly greater level of involvement schools can share resources with the community -- school buildings, books, tables and chairs.

Perhaps most importantly, schools can offer instruction -- adult literacy classes, classes to prepare children for examinations, classes for school dropouts, and the like. While teachers may be less than willing to devote a lot of time to such activities, even one afternoon a week could have an important impact. Schools have access to information the community may lack. Special community workshops on child care, health, nutrition and agriculture are relatively easy to arrange, and again can have an important impact. Schools can teach the community about its cultural heritage or document facts of local life. Escuela Nueva teachers, for example, are asked to carry out basic community surveys for other government agencies. In other areas as well, schools can help community members in their interactions with the government.

More involved still, schools can initiate community projects, repair of local buildings, development of appropriate technology, and such. At its most involved, the school can serve as the center for community development efforts such as in the Bunumbu and PROPEL Projects discussed below.

The important point is that schools rarely move beyond the most basic levels of participation in community life, and a little school support for the community can go a long way toward building good ties. There are many things the school can do if it makes the effort.

Two projects in particular provide good illustrations of what the school can offer the community. The Bunumbu project in Sierra Leone sought to combine the training of primary school teachers with community development. The project was coordinated by the Bunumbu Teachers' Training College, and twenty villages were selected as pilot school villages. Community members built schools, and teacher trainees organized a variety of community development projects while teaching at the village schools. Teacher trainees worked with villagers through all phases of the projects. In addition to educating children, teacher trainees worked with communities to establish village cooperatives, youth clubs and handicraft shops.

The project served as catalyst for a number of other local development projects. Villages were able to develop the internal leadership necessary to design and implement future self-improvement projects (Lebby and Lutz, 1982).

India's PROPEL project's current objective is the universalization of primary education. Ultimately, it hopes to turn the management of education over to local communities. In order to achieve its current objective PROPEL has undertaken a variety of projects on behalf of the community, including pre-schools, women's support groups, training of teachers to help children manage the transition to primary school, adult literacy classes and the establishment of People's Education Houses to serve as libraries and local cultural centers. In carrying out these projects, PROPEL has generated local demand for education and an increased capacity on the part of poor villagers to plan and manage their own affairs (Naik, 1982). (Refer to Box 6)

#### **BOX 6. INDIA'S PROJECT PROPEL**

---

High levels of participation in Project PROPEL dispelled the general assumption held by educators and government officials in India that rural communities saw little value in primary education, especially for girls. Girls are reported as having "flocked to the centers." Parents were happy that their daughters were learning to read and write, that schools were free and that classes were held after the working day. When instructors were unable to attend class, students sometimes took over instruction. PROPEL schools invited community participation and scrutiny and were able to mobilize considerably more community resources than local formal schools. Some students from the formal schools have demanded that they be permitted to attend PROPEL classes in addition to their regular classes. A new sense of collaboration has been fostered among local government officials and the community (Shaeffer, 1992b: 156).

---

Because most discussions of school-community relations concentrate solely on what communities can do for schools, there is little information available on school involvement in communities. However, the relationships are synergistic. What schools give, they get back in kind. Specific projects will depend on school capacities and community needs. This kind of relationship is described in the following quotation about "high-achieving schools" in Thailand:

The third major dynamic ... was the strong relationship higher achieving schools had created with their surrounding communities, including the temple. Parents were more involved in school decisions, the curriculum of the school and, probably as a result of such involvement, contributed more to the school, both financially and in in-kind services. School was a part of the community, not a separate government institution ... Parents felt comfortable visiting the school whenever they wished. They came to expect the school

to educate their children and were willing to support the school in this endeavor ... The temple would contribute financially to the school. Finally, both the principal and the teaching staff participated in local community activities, including religious ceremonies (Shaeffer, 1992b: 61).

### **C. POLICY IMPLICATIONS: FERTILE CONDITIONS AND NECESSARY LINKAGES**

We set out to identify options for improving education in the periphery through changes in the relationship between school and community. According to the current mode of educational organization the government bears virtually complete responsibility for the provision of education while the community has been relegated a minor role. This model has not worked well for the periphery. Governments have lacked the resources to provide peripheral populations with adequate educational programs. Even with sufficient resources, however, educational models for the center have not always worked in peripheral areas. The education and development literature has suggested that such populations are not uninterested in education. Our review has convinced us that when the delivery and content of education are matched to the values, needs and constraints of peripheral populations, children and their parents do get involved in formal schooling.

The community has always played an important though often hidden role in education. When the community supports the school, the school does well. When the community opposes or is indifferent to education, the school's task is more difficult. When community resistance or apathy is coupled with a relatively weak school presence, as in many peripheral areas, the school is unlikely to make much progress. However, when community and school values converge, peripheral communities can offer rich sources of moral, instructional, and material support. According to this view, the task facing government educators is to foster a positive role for the community in the provision of education.

We have suggested a collaborative model of educational provision in which: 1) government considers the constraints, needs and values of the community and adapts the delivery of education accordingly, 2) the community is actively involved in supporting the school, and 3) the school plays an active leadership and instructional role in the community. While such an approach may improve education in the center, it may be essential for reaching the periphery.

Such collaboration can be promoted in a number of ways. If any overall lesson emerges from this review, however, it is that attention to specific contexts is essential in attempting to reach the periphery. Thus, we have identified broad strategies with specific operational components which policy makers can adapt to their particular circumstances.

Improvements in school-community relations offer an under-utilized policy space for improving education. Utilizing this space requires imagination, changes in attitudes, sustained and careful attention to implementation, but relatively little money.

### Lessons for Improved School-Community Relations.

1. Promote Innovation: The most creative school-community projects developed first as experiments or as non-governmental initiatives designed to address needs not being met by the regular operation of the school system. While some projects were later expanded or incorporated into the government system, the impetus typically came from outside. Though government has a poor record of initiating innovation, it has an important role to play in supporting it. There are several ways governments can support innovation. They can: publicize the need for innovation, loosening regulations that prevent new experimentation; provide small grants to support new projects; and facilitate the expansion of small-scale projects. Governments can also stress in their training programs the need for innovation at all levels of the education system and provide financial, career or status incentives to successful innovators.

2. Work toward Collaborative rather than Competitive or Coercive Relationships Among Educational Actors: Virtually all of the changes suggested in this report require cooperation among parents and community members, school staff and educational authorities. Such cooperation is hindered by competition for resources or status or by relationships predicated on enforcement. Collaboration is enhanced by regular, structured communication among actors in the educational process and clear delineation of responsibilities and "turf." Openness of the school to ideas from the outside has been cited as one of the single most important determinants of community participation. Teachers are unlikely to attempt new teaching practices if supervisors chastise them for not "going by the book." Negative teacher attitudes toward rural people are cited as a major reason for lack of participation and high dropout (National Council of Educational Research and Training in India, 1970).

3. Treat the Community as Responsible for Education and as a Capable Partner in Providing It: Implicit in most existing educational arrangements is the notion that education is solely the business of government professionals. Here we have argued that community attitudes toward the school determine much of the effectiveness of schooling, and that community interest in education, properly channeled, can endow schools with support that government professionals cannot. Involvement of the community in planning and delivering education can go a long way toward giving the community ownership of the school and a stake in its success. Projects have demonstrated that even the poorest parents will assume responsibility for educating their children if permitted and guided.

4. Find Ways to Involve the School in Meeting Community Needs: Schools have the potential to offer communities much more than they typically do now. By expanding educational programs beyond the usual school populations, by sharing resources and by assuming a leadership role in the community, schools can make a real difference in community life, especially in the periphery.

5. Start Where People Are; Adapt the Delivery of Education in the Periphery to Local Values, Needs, Economic Constraints, and Cultures: Much of the lack of participation in education derives from a poor and pedagogically unnecessary match between the form in which education is delivered and the needs and values of peripheral populations. Where educational programs are carefully designed in consideration of local perspectives, children attend school happily. Such design requires careful attention to the constraints facing children and their families, targeting of special sub-populations and a willingness on the part of government officials to modify their conceptions of what a school must be like.

6. Make It Easy for Children to Succeed: Repetition and dropout frequently result from children's encounters with systems that require lock-step participation and make education into a series of hoops through which children must jump. If the objective is universal enrollment and learning, governments need to: emphasize positive early encounters with education, minimize the chances of failure, offer second and third chances to learn and provide multiple ways into the system.

7. Develop Appropriate Curricula: The content of standard curricula developed for urban, mainstream, further-education-seeking students is often not appropriate to the needs of rural,

peripheral children who may end their education early. Similarly, a curriculum predicated on the assumption that one teacher will be teaching one grade often does not fit the reality of peripheral classrooms, where multigrade teaching is often the rule, and where students may come and go according to household demands. The most successful programs have developed instructional programs that are student-centered, of obvious utility, and require only resources that students have access to. Successful curricula lend themselves to self- or peer-instruction and are flexibly structured so that children can stop studying at any point and resume later without penalty. The best instructional materials are adaptable to the varying capacities of teachers yet permit creative adaptation (as opposed to application) by the teacher to local and classroom contexts. At the same time, alternative curricula need to provide students who wish to continue their schooling with an adequate academic background. That all of these requirements can be met is illustrated by the Escuela Nueva program.

8. Train People for Collaboration: The types of collaboration envisioned here do not come naturally to people working in the current system. Every successful school-community program has included a substantial and on-going training component. System administrators need training for new roles as collaborators in innovation as opposed to enforcers of regulations. Principals need to know how to reach out to and involve the community in the school. Teachers need training in adapting instruction to particular needs. Communities need to be trained in their responsibilities and capacities as partners in education.

9. Regularly Supervise and Support Peripheral School Staff: Principals and teachers are particularly isolated in the periphery. Innovation is enhanced, principal and teacher behavior improves, student achievement increases, and repetition decreases when sub-district offices are established near schools and when schools receive regular supervisory visits. Supervision is particularly effective when it helps teachers improve instruction in a collegial fashion. In many contexts school clusters have been useful in promoting innovation and reducing the isolation of small peripheral schools (refer to Bray 1987 for a more complete treatment of school clusters).

10. Promote Personal Contact in the Community: Personal relationships are extremely important in most peripheral communities. All successful school-community innovations had at least one committed person at the local level to make contact with community members and parents, to follow through on various tasks involved in project implementation and to solve problems. A project often succeeds or fails because of the personality of the project broker.

11. Implement Carefully: While most of the projects described here are relatively inexpensive, they require careful attention to implementation, especially during introduction and expansion. All projects require committed local staff to shepherd the project. Projects being implemented across larger areas need sustained leadership from the top and cooperation from actors at all levels of all government agencies involved (Cummings, Gunawardena, and Williams, 1992<sup>6</sup>). Successful projects learn from their mistakes (Republic of Colombia, 1990), make adjustments for unanticipated outcomes in-process, and anticipate resistance from those with stakes in current arrangements.

In this review, we have attempted to describe strategies for promoting successful school-community interactions. Projects are successful to the extent that they choose a mix of strategies appropriate to the needs and capabilities of government, school, and community. Both government and community are essential to providing more and better education to the periphery. The art is managing appropriate roles for each.

---

<sup>6</sup> For theory and examples of successful and unsuccessful implementation of projects, see, for example, Warwick, 1982; Rondinelli, 1990; Korten, 1984.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, Mary B., 1988. "Improving Access to Schooling in the Third World: An Overview," *BRIDGES Research Report Series, No. 1*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Institute for International Development.
- Bellew, Rosemary and Elizabeth King, 1991. "Promoting Girls' and Women's Education: Lessons from the Past," *Policy Research, and External Affairs Working Papers (WPS715)*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Boothroyd, R.A., and D.W. Chapman, 1987. "Gender Differences and Achievement in Liberian Primary School Children," *International Journal of Educational Development* 7: 99-105.
- Bray, Mark and Kevin Lillis, 1988. *Community Financing of Education: Issues and Policy Implications in Less Developed Countries*. Oxford, U.K.: Pergamon Press.
- Bray, Mark, 1987. *School Clusters in the Third World: Making Them Work*. Paris: UNESCO-UNICEF Cooperative Programme.
- Carino, Isidro and Mona Valisno, 1992. "Parent-Learning Support System (PLSS): A School and Home-Community Collaboration for Raising Pupil Achievement," in Sheldon Shaeffer, ed., *School and Community Collaboration for Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning, pp 34-7.
- Coletta, Nat and Margaret Sutton, 1989. "Achieving and Sustaining Universal Primary Education: International Experience Relevant to India," *WPS 166*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Cultural Survival, various years. Shuar Radio Education Project. various mimeos.
- Cummings, William, 1986. *Low-Cost Primary Education: Implementing an Innovation in Six Nations*. Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.
- Cummings, William, G.B. Gunawardena, and James Williams, 1992. *The Implementation of Management Reforms: The Case of Sri Lanka, BRIDGES Research Report Series No.11*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Institute for International Development.
- Dove, Linda, 1986. *Teachers and Teacher Education in Developing Countries*. London: Croon Helm.
- Dove, Linda, 1982. "The Deployment and Training of Teachers for Remote Rural Schools in Less-Developed Countries," *International Review of Education*. 28: 1-27.

Enquist, O., 1982. *Education and Training in Sri Lanka: A Sector Analysis*. School of Education, No. 77, Malmo: Sweden.

Ekanayake, S.B., 1980. "Training Teachers for Changing Roles in Sri Lanka," *Prospects* 10.

Eisemon, Thomas and Ali Wasi, 1987. "Koranic Schooling and its Transformation in Coastal Kenya," *International Journal of Educational Development* 6: 257-70.

Haddad, Wadi, 1979. "Educational and Economic Effects of Promotion and Repetition Practices," *World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 319*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Halpern, Robert, 1986. "Effects of Early Childhood Intervention on Primary School Progress in Latin America," *Comparative Education Review* 30: 193-215.

IEES (Improving the Efficiency of Educational Systems), 1986. "The Feasibility of Integrating Programmed Learning with Conventional Instruction in Liberian Primary Education." Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University.

Jolly, Richard and Giovanni A. Cornia, 1984. *The Impact of the World Recession on Children*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Kelly, Gail, 1987. "Setting State Policy on Women's Education in the Third World: Perspectives from Comparative Research," *Comparative Education Review* 23: 95-102.

Korten, David and Rudi Klauss, 1984. *People-Centered Development: Contributions Toward Theory and Planning Frameworks*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Latif, Abu Hamid, 1991. "A Case Study on Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee's Facilitation Assistance Programme on Education," mimeo.

Lebby, Sam and Jack Lutz, 1982. "Education and Productive Work: The Bunumbu Approach," *Prospects* 12: 485-93.

Lee, Valerie and Marlaine Lockheed, 1990. "The Effects of Single-Sex Schooling on Achievement and Attitudes in Nigeria," *Comparative Education Review* 34: 209-231.

LeVine, Robert and Merry White, 1986. *Human Conditions: The Cultural Basis for Educational Development*. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lillis, Kevin and Henry Ayot, 1988. "Community Financing of Education in Kenya," in Mark Bray and Kevin Lillis, eds, *Community Financing of Education: Issues and Policy Implications in Less Developed Countries*. Oxford, U.K.: Pergamon Press.

Lillis, Kevin, and M.E. Sinclair, ed., 1985. *School and Community in Less Developed Areas*. London: Croom Helm.

Lockheed, Marlaine and Adriaan Verspoor, et al., 1990. *Improving Primary Education in Developing Countries*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Lovell, Catherine and Kaniz Fatema, 1989. *The BRAC: Non-Formal Primary Education Programme in Bangladesh*. New York: UNICEF.

Lycette, Margaret, 1986. "The Industrial and Commercial Job Training for Women Project in Morocco." Washington, D.C.: United States Agency for International Development.

Mallon, Nacha, 1989. "The Community Classroom," *World Education Reports* 28: 15-18.

Malpica, C., 1980. "Education and the Community in the Peruvian Educational Reform," *International Review of Education*. 26: 357-367.

Merino, Jose, 1984. *Mirando al Manan: Una Educacion Shuar*. Sucua, Ecuador: Mundo Shuar.

Meyer, John, Francisco Ramirez, Richard Rubinson, and John Boli-Bennett, 1977. "The World Educational Revolution, 1950-1970," *Sociology of Education* 50: 242-58.

Moegiadi, Jiyono, Mudjiman, and Soemardi, 1992. "Experiences in School and Community Collaboration," in Sheldon Shaeffer, ed., *School and Community Collaboration for Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Ngalamu, J., 1986. "Integrated Rural Education Centers (IRECs) as Basis of Vocationalization at Primary School Level: The Southern Sudanese Experience." London: Institute of Education, London University.

Naik, Chitra, 1982. "An Action-Research Program on Universal Primary Education - The Plan and the Process," in Gail Kelly and C Elliot, eds., *Women's Education in the Third World: Comparative Perspectives*. Albany, New York: State University of New York.

Naik, Chitra, 1992. "Promoting Primary and Elementary Education (PROPEL)," in Sheldon Shaeffer, ed., *School and Community Collaboration for Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) in India, 1970. "Attacking Educational Wastage at the Primary Level in India." *Education in Asia: Reviews, Reports, and Notes*. Bangkok: UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia.

Nielsen, Dean and William Cummings, "The Impact of 'IMPACT': A Study of the Dissemination of an Innovation in Six Countries." mimeo, Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Nkinyangi, John, 1982. "Access to Primary Education in Kenya: The Contradictions of Public Policy," *Comparative Education Review* 26: 199-217.

Okoye, Mary, 1986. "Community Secondary Schools: A Case Study of a Nigerian Innovation in Self-Help," *International Journal of Educational Development* 6: 263-74.

Orata, Pedro, 1977. "Barrio High Schools and Community Colleges in the Philippines," *Prospects* 7: 401-12.

Pollitt, Earnest, 1990. *Malnutrition and Infection in the Classroom*. Paris: UNESCO.

Prophet, Robert, 1990. "Curriculum-In-Action: The 'Practical Dimension in Botswana Classrooms," *International Journal of Educational Development* 10: 17-26.

Rasmussen, P.E., 1985. "The Mass Educational Program of the IRDP/DANIDA Project, Noakhali, Bangladesh: A Success Story So Far," *International Journal of Educational Development* 5: 27-39.

Republic of Colombia, 1990. "The New School Programme: More and Better Education for Children in Rural Areas." Bogota: Ministry of Education.

Robinson, Wade, Nadia Makery, and Andrea Rugh, 1987. "Fourth Annual Report of the Study of USAID Contributions to the Egyptian Basic Education Program." Washington, D.C.: Creative Associates.

Ramirez, Francisco, and John Boli, 1987. "The Political Construction of Mass Schooling: European Origins and Worldwide Institutionalization," *Sociology of Education* 60: 2-17.

Ramirez, Francisco and Richard Rubinson, 1982. "Global Patterns of Educational Institutionalization," in Philip Altbach, Robert Arnove, and Gail Kelly, ed., *Comparative Education*. New York: MacMillan.

Ruiz-Duran, G., 1980. "Experience of Educational Microplanning in Peru Through Nuclearisation" in D. Malpica and S. Rassekh, eds., *Educational Administration and Multilevel Plan Implementation: Experiences From Developing Countries*. Paris: UNESCO, IIEP.

Salazar, A. 1972. "On Educational Reform in Peru," *Prospects*, 2: 383-391.

Shaeffer, Sheldon, ed., 1992a. *School and Community Collaboration for Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Shaeffer, Sheldon, ed., 1992b. *Collaborating for Educational Change: The Role of Teachers, Parents and the Community in School Improvement*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Simanungkalit, Dr., Colin Moyle, and Doran Bernard, 1992. "Community Participation in the Planning and Implementation of Educational Resources (COPLANNER)," in Sheldon Shaeffer, ed., *School and Community Collaboration for Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Singh, R.P., 1982. "An Indian Experiment in Earning While Learning," *Prospects* 12: 495-8.

Sri Lanka, Ministry of Education, National Institute of Education, 1986. *Case Studies of School-Community Relations*. Colombo: Ministry of Education, mimeos.

Stromquist, Nelly, 1981. "A Review of Educational Innovations to Reduce Costs," in Sivasailam Thiagarajan and Aida Pasigna, eds., *Financing Educational Development*. Ottawa, Canada: International Development Research Center.

Thiagarajan, Sivasailam and Aida Pasigna, 1988. *Literature Review on the Soft Technologies of Learning, BRIDGES Research Report Series, No. 2*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Institute for International Development.

Thinh, Bui Gia, 1992. "Qualitative Improvement in Basic Education through the Collaboration and Co-operation of Parents' Associations," in Sheldon Shaeffer, ed., *School and Community Collaboration for Educational Change: Report of an IIEP Seminar*. Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning.

Thobani, Mateen, 1983. *Charging User Fees for Social Services: The Case of Education in Malawi*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Tilak, Jandhyala, 1989. "Female Schooling in East Asia: A Review of Growth, Problems and Possible Determinants," *PHREE Background Paper Series, No. PHREE/89/13*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

UNDP, 1982. "Nepal: Teacher Training (Equal Access of Women to Education)." Project Findings and Recommendations. New York: UNDP.

UNESCO, Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development, 1984a. "Towards Universalization of Primary Education in Asia and the Pacific, India Country Study." Bangkok.

UNESCO, Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development, 1984b. "Towards Universalization of Primary Education in Asia and the Pacific, Bangladesh Country Study." Bangkok.

UNESCO, Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development, 1984c. "The Dropout Problem in Primary Education: Towards Universalization of Primary Education in Asia and the Pacific-Some Case Studies: China, India, Peninsula Malaysia, Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Sri Lanka and Thailand." Bangkok: UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia and the Pacific.

USAID, 1983. "Industrial and Commercial Job Training for Women in Morocco, Final Report." Washington, D.C..

Verspoor, Adriaan, and Janet Leno, 1986. "Improving Teaching: A Key to Successful Educational Change, Lessons from World Bank Experience." Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

Wan, U Thien, 1975. "A Study of Educational Wastage in Burma." Education in Asia: Reviews, Reports, and Notes. No. 7." Bangkok: UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asia.

Warwick, Donald, 1982. *Bitter Pills: Population Policies and Their Implementation in Eight Developing Countries*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Warwick, Donald, Fernando Reimers, and Noel McGinn, 1989. "The Implementation of Reforms in the Primary Schools of Pakistan." Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Institute for International Development.

Weick, Karl, 1982. "Administering Education in Loosely-Coupled Systems," *Phi Delta Kappan* 63: 673-676.

Weiner, Myron, 1991. *The Child and the State in India*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Wiggington, Eliot, 1991. *Foxfire: 25 Years*. New York: Anchor Books.

Windham, D.M., 1983. "Cost Analysis of the Improved Efficiency of Learning Project." Monrovia, Liberia: Ministry of Education.

World Bank, 1982. "Colombia Staff Appraisal Report. Subsector Project for Rural Basic Education." Washington, D.C..

\_\_\_\_\_ 1985. "Staff Appraisal Report Bangladesh Secondary Primary Education Project." Washington, D.C..

\_\_\_\_\_ 1987a. "Project Completion Report Fourth Education Project (Credit 892-Pak)." Washington, D.C..

21

\_\_\_\_\_ 1987b. "Staff Appraisal Report: Islamic Republic of Pakistan Third Primary Education Project." Washington, D.C.. cited in Bellew and King, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1988. "Staff Appraisal Report, Bhutan Primary Education Project." Washington, D.C..

\_\_\_\_\_ 1990a. "Staff Appraisal Report The Gambia Education Sector Project." Washington, D.C..

\_\_\_\_\_ 1990b. "Staff Appraisal Report of the Sind Primary Education Project." Washington, D.C..

\_\_\_\_\_ 1991. *Vocational and Technical Education and Training*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

# *Advancing Basic Education and Literacy*

*A project of the U.S. Agency for International Development*



This ABEL2 Clearinghouse Information Package contains a selection of resource material in a key area of basic education. Other packages that are available include:

**Inter-Sectoral Impact of Education**  
**Mobilizing Community Support for Education**  
**Educating Girls and Women**  
**Educational Quality**  
**Early Childhood Education**  
**Grade Repetition/Automatic Promotion**  
**Policy Reform**  
**Improving the Quality of Teaching**  
**NGOs and Basic Education**

The ABEL2 Clearinghouse Information Packages are meant to provide a variety of perspectives on important issues and should be of use to those involved in planning and implementing basic education programs. The packages are intended to be "living" collections which will be augmented and changed over time as new material becomes available. The list of topics will be expanded in future.

We hope that you find the information packages useful. Please let us have your comments and suggestions for updating and expanding the material.

To request additional information packages, please contact the ABEL2 Clearinghouse at the following address letting us know the titles of the packages you require:

**ABEL2 Clearinghouse**  
**Academy for Educational Development**  
**1875 Connecticut Avenue NW**  
**Washington DC 20009 USA**

**Telephone: 202 884 8292**  
**Fax: 202 884 8408**  
**E-Mail: ABEL@AED.ORG**

**Consortium:** Academy for Educational Development; Creative Associates International, Inc.; Education Development Center, Inc.; Florida State University; Harvard Institute for International Development; Research Triangle Institute **Collaborators:** Abt Associates Inc.; Centro de Investigación y Desarrollo de la Educación (CIDE), Chile; Clark Atlanta University; Educational Research Network in Eastern and Southern Africa (ERNESA), Kenya; Educational Research Network for West and Central Africa (ERNWACA), Mali; Fundación Volvemos a la Gente, Colombia; Institute for International Research; Juárez and Associates, Inc.; National Center on Adult Literacy, University of Pennsylvania; Regional Center for Educational Innovation and Technology (INNOTECH), Philippines; Research, Educational and Development Initiatives Ltd. (REDI), Sierra Leone; Save the Children; World Education

**Academy for Educational Development**  
**1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Washington, DC, 20009-1202, USA**

56