

# **AN ASSESSMENT OF COMPETENCIES OF THE ADULT EDUCATION FACILITATORS THROUGH VALID PACK: A CASE STUDY OF INDIA**

**<sup>1</sup>P. Adinarayana REDDY, <sup>2</sup>D. Uma DEVI**

*<sup>1</sup>Sri Venkateswara University, INDIA*

*<sup>2</sup>Sri Krishnadevaraya University, INDIA*

---

**Abstract.** India being the most populous countries, has taken initiatives to qualify the human resources by implementing various educational programmes from time to time. Adult education is in operation at different levels for different sections of the population. The Saakshar Bharat is an Adult Education Programme which is an extension of National Literacy Mission intended to impart functional literacy to 70 million illiterates in the age group of 15 years and beyond. In addition, it is to cover 1.5 million adults under basic education programme and an equal number under vocational (skill development) programme. The functionaries involved are of heterogeneous in their qualifications and competencies. The functionaries involved in Saakshar Bharat are administrators (Director, Deputy Directors, Assistant Directors, Project Officers etc.), facilitators (Supervisors, Mandal Coordinators), Adult Literacy Teachers (Literacy Educators, Village Coordinators). There are no clear-cut prescriptions for the qualifications/ competencies for the functionaries work-

ing at grass root level viz., facilitators and adult teachers. Very few attempts have been made to develop the tools for assessment of the competencies of adult education facilitators and to measure them. The present paper provides an insight into the assessment of the adult education facilitators competencies by using valid pack, an instrument developed in the European context. It also study the competencies of the facilitators based on self ratings, external observer's ratings and consolidated ratings i.e., and studied the relationship between competencies and personal characteristics of the Adult Education Facilitators.

*Keywords:* adult education, facilitators, adult literacy teachers, illiterates

---

### **Introduction**

India is the second populous countries in the world with 121 billion populations and occupies 127th position in terms of Human Development Index. It is the progressive nation with significant human resources in the areas of science and technology and contributing for the world economy. However, majority of its population is low educated (i.e., one third of the total population and around half of the women) and half of the enrolled children in the schools are dropping within the five years of formal education. Further, majority of its population are based in rural areas and depends on primary sector for its livelihood which is yielding inadequate returns due to low skills. In order to accelerate the pace of the development and to bring inclusive development through promoting literacy and know-how, the Government has launched several educational programmes. One of the current programmes implemented for the promotion of human resources among the illiterates and low educated is Sakshar Bharath.

### **Sakshar Bharath**

The Sakshar Bharath is a national programme aimed at imparting functional literacy and numeracy to non-literate and non-numeral adults, enable the neo-literate adults to continue their learning beyond basic literacy and acquire equivalency to the formal education system, impart non and neo-literates relevant skill up-gradation programmes to increase their earning and improve living conditions and to promote learning society by providing ample opportunities to neo-literate adults for their continuing education. The programme is aimed to impart functional literacy to 7 million adults in the age group of 15 years and beyond by giving top-notch priority to the women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, minorities and other disadvantaged groups and adolescents in rural areas of low literacy status.

In order to implement the programme, it has evolved an administrative set-up from national level to grass root level wherein, three categories of functionaries viz., administrators (Directors, Deputy Directors, Assistant Directors, Project Officers etc.), facilitators (Supervisors, Mandal Coordinators), Adult Literacy Teachers (Literacy Educators, Village Coordinators) are involved. At the national level, National Literacy Mission Authority is monitoring the programme. At the state level, State Literacy Mission Authority, at district, the Zilla Lok Shiksha Samithi, at Mandal level, Mandal Lok Shiksha Samithi and at the Grass root level, Panchayal Lok Shiksha Samithi is responsible for the implementation of the programme.

### **Mandal Coordinators**

The progress and performance of any developmental programme largely depends on the effective functioning of its functionaries working at various levels. The Mandal Coordinator who is working at the sub-divisional level of the district, i.e., mandal is a liaison between the field functionaries and the district administration. The qualifications and other competencies pre-

scribed for the post of Mandal Coordinator are graduation along with computer knowledge, experience in adult education as volunteer / prerak, possession of leadership qualities and knowledge about community and its needs. A nine day training programme in three spells is conceived to create awareness about the programme, promote competencies required for organizing the programme and flinching aplomb towards the programme.

The Mandal Coordinator is responsible for conducting literacy survey at the mandal level, to identify the illiterates, educated who are willing to cooperate with the programme, organizes training programs for the village coordinators, literacy educators, collects and distributes the teaching-learning material at the field level, monitors the programme, coordinates with the other developmental programmes and disseminates the information on various developmental programmes for the benefit of the community, organizes extension lectures for the benefit of the community through experts, promotes vocational skills through short-term and long-term training programmes and evaluates the performance of the learners on regular basis and submits the same to the higher ups. The functions performed by them go a long way in determining the performance of the programme. Hence, the Mandal Coordinator is a facilitator for promotion of adult literacy at the community level. The competencies possessed by them in turn affects the quality of the programme. Keeping in view of the above, an assiduous attempt has been made to review the studies conducted to identify the competencies of the adult education functionaries and its impact on their performance.

### **Review of literature**

Axford (1969), Cobely (1976), Tripathi (1977), Malakondaiah (1980), Reddy & Kumaraswamy (1984) and Reddy (1992) have identified the characteristics of an effective adult education instructor and attributes of the successful adult educator by National Association for Public School Adult education

(1986). Cass (1971), Yesanna (1986), Reddy & Devi (2005) have identified the personal factors relating to the performance of the preraks. Knox (1971) reviewed twenty studies on adult education teachers, came to the conclusion that a hiatus is always found between average and outstanding teaching. The studies were aimed to identify the qualities, characteristics and attributes of the adult education functionaries and factors associated with their effectiveness.

### **Need of the study**

The roles and functions of the Mandal Coordinators clearly demonstrate that they are the kinpin of the programme and the performance and quality of the programme largely depend on their competencies. As the programme is nascent, no attempt has been made so far to assess the competencies of the functionaries involved especially the Mandal Coordinators. Further, research in the area of competencies of adult education functionaries in India, is scanty and sporadic. In view of inadequate research in the area and the investigator's exposure to the European adult education communities, the Validpack which has been developed to measure the competencies of the adult education teachers was found to be a relevant and suitable tool to adapt to the Adult Education Functionaries in Indian context. Keeping in view of the important role played by the Mandal Coordinators as Adult Education Facilitators (AEF) and importance of promoting competencies for improving the performance of the programme, there is a need to assess their competencies to identify the strengths and weaknesses for replication and rectification respectively. In view of the above, the present study is conceived to study the relevance of valid pack to identify the level of competencies possessed by the Facilitators and to study the influence of personal characteristics on their competency levels.

### **Objectives of the study**

(1) To study the suitability of the Valid Pack for measuring the competencies of Adult Education Facilitators in India; (2) To assess the competencies of the AEF by using Valid Pack; (3) To study the competencies of the AEF based on the self ratings, external observer ratings and consolidated ratings; (4) To study the relationship between personal characteristics and competencies of the AEF.

### **Methodology**

#### *Locale and sample of the study*

The study was conducted in Chittoor district of Rayalaseema Region of Andhra Pradesh, India. The Chittoor district comprises 66 mandals (sub-divisions) and three Revenue Divisions viz., Tirupati, Madanapalle and Chittoor. The district has 3,745,875 population. Among them there are 1,889,690 (50.44%) men and 1,856,125 (49.56%) women. Of the total population 2,176,990 and 1,083,301 of them are literates and illiterates respectively. Among the literates, 1,273,940 are male and 93,050 are female. In order to promote literacy among the illiterates in the age group of 15 and beyond, the Sakshar Bharath Phase I programme was launched and enrolled 80,000 illiterates and made 68,758 literates. At present the Sakshar Bharath Phase II is in operation with an enrollment of 82,720 illiterates. In addition, it has also conducted equivalency examination for 245,000 neo-literates and awarded equivalency certificate of 3 years of schooling to 159,726 by the National Institute of Open Schooling (NIOS).

For implementation of the Sakshar Bharath at district level, Zilla Lok Shiksha Samithis (ZLSS) was constituted, which is headed by the Chairman of Zilla Parishad. The District Collector acts as coordinator and the office of the Deputy Director, Adult Education will serve as the secretariat of the ZLSS. The Deputy Director implements the Sakshar Bharath throughout the

district with the assistance of the Project Officers, Assistant Project Officers and Supervisors. At the middle level, Mandal Coordinators will act as the cushion between field level functionaries such as village coordinators and Literacy Educators and administration at the district level. He transmits the directives from state to grass root level, submit the progress of the programme to the higher ups. Out of 66 mandal coordinators functioning in the district, 60 mandal coordinators were involved in the study and constituted as the sample. Further all the supervisors (6) form the sub-sample of the study and acted as external observers for rating the performance of the Mandal Coordinators i.e., Adult Education Facilitators (AEF).

#### *Research tool*

The status of research on competencies of Adult Education Functionaries is found to be not an attractive area in India for the researchers in view of the short tenure, quick turnover of the functionaries and lack of regularity of the positions. However, sporadic attempts have been made earlier to study the competencies of the Adult Education Functionaries. The review of literature clearly demonstrates that there is no suitable research devise for measuring the competencies of the Mandal Coordinators working in the Sakshar Bharath or in any other programmes relating to the adult education. The Valid Pack is a unique and innovative package of validation instruments that create a framework for the documentation and evaluation of trainers and evaluation of competencies, and intended to assess the competencies of adult educators, build a base for certification and culls out the areas of training. It creates a profile of the competencies of the Adult Education Facilitators and provides a scope for drawing a mind map for graphic representation of the thoughts, ideas and reflections on the competencies.

Keeping in view of the importance of the area and the relevance of the Valid Pack for assessment of the competencies of the Adult Education Facili-

tators by using all sources of data viz., self ratings, external observation on the performance of the facilitators and personal interaction and consolidation of the competencies scores is found to be the best available option for measuring the competencies. In other words, this is the only tool which takes into account of all the areas where the facilitators are involved and interacted. Keeping this in view and investigators proximity with the Valid Pack, its utility and workability to the Indian Context, it has been chosen as research tool.

The Valid Pack consisting of three parts viz., self evaluation, external observation, interaction with the sample and consolidation of the ratings. The items in the instrument were translated and contextualized according to the Indian Scenario. The translated version of the instrument was given to five experts in the field of Adult Education for their comments and to point out its relevance to the original context. The suggestions of the experts were carried out and piloted on a small sample to study its workability. Based on the feedback, the final format of the tool was designed.

#### *Data collection*

As indicated earlier, all the Mandal Coordinators working in the district were treated as sample of the study and an attempt has been made to assess their competencies by using the adopted version of Valid Pack instrument. Before conducting the study, the investigators have obtained the permission of the Deputy Director for collection of the data from the Mandal Coordinators. The investigators visited all the Mandal Coordinators and explained to them about the study, its objectives and the tool to be filled by them. Further, as per the original instrument, the external evaluator should observe the performance of the facilitator about 2-3 hours. In the case of the Mandal Coordinator, he is not only involved in training the other functionaries, but also performing the other tasks for effective implementation of the programme. In view of this, the investigator has chosen the immediate superi-



or of the Mandal Coordinator i.e., the Adult Education Supervisor as external evaluator to rate the competencies of the Mandal Coordinator as he is monitoring the performance of the Mandal Coordinator on day-to-day basis on all the aspects such as roles and functions prescribed to Mandal Coordinator. Before initiating the data collection, the supervisors were trained for a day about various steps involved in evaluation of competencies and procedure to be observed. After satisfactory feed back from the supervisors, they were asked to rate the competencies possessed by the Mandal Coordinators. In the second stage, the mandal coordinators were asked to evaluate their performance through self ratings.

In the third session of the study, the supervisors and the Mandal Coordinators were arranged to sit face-to-face to discuss about the ratings assigned to them by the Supervisor and based on the interaction and feedback, the consolidated ratings were provided. In this process, there is ample scope for the Supervisors who acted as external observers to evaluate the performance and to assign the suitable ratings on competency levels in the consolidation stage. It has taken more than two hours per sitting and all the six supervisors who were trained to rate the 60 Mandal Coordinators have taken about ten days to complete the ratings. The data thus collected were pooled together and analyzed keeping in view the objectives of the study.

#### *Analysis of the data*

Keeping in view of the objectives of the study, the collected data was analyzed based on different sources of ratings viz., self ratings, external observation ratings and ratings provided after personal interaction viz., consolidated ratings. The Mandal coordinators were classified based on the criterion mean competency rate,  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$  SD into three groups as low competent, moderate and more competent. Further, the data was also analyzed to see the relationship if any between the competencies and personal characteristics of the AEF

on different personal domains. The statistical techniques like mean, Standard Deviation, t-test and F-test were utilized.

### *Findings of the study*

The study was conducted to identify the relevance of Valid Pack for the assessment of the competencies of the Adult Education Facilitators in the Indian Context. Whether the Valid Pack classifies the facilitator into different groups based on their competencies and to ascertain the relationship between the personal characteristics and competencies. Keeping in view of the above, the findings are presented in four sections. Section – I describes the profile of the AEFs working in Sakshar Bharath Section – II examines the suitability of the Valid Pack to the Indian Context as viewed by the experts. Section – III describe the utility of the tool to classify the AEFs into different groups based on their competencies. Section – IV examines the relationship between competencies and the personal characteristics as per the source of the competency scores i.e., self evaluation, external observation ratings and consolidated scores on competencies.

### **Valid pack: an instrument to measure the competencies of the AEFs**

The Adult Education programmes are being implemented to enhance the human potentialities leading to the Human Capital Formation and to invest in the economy. In order to make use of the available human resources effectively, the educational programmes were devised from time to time based on the needs of the time and space. This has resulted in utilization of all competent human resources in the economy. In this process, the competent and suitable manpower were drawn and trained as trainers for promoting human resources among the functionaries of adult education. The success of the programme depends on the competencies of the AEFs involved in adult education which in turn depends on the possession of required competencies among the

trainers. In the present context, an attempt has been made to assess the competencies of the AEFs by using the Validpack which was developed by the Romanian Institute of Adult Education for validation of socio-pedagogical adult education competencies popularly known as VINEPACK.

*Suitability of the Valid pack for the Indian context*

In the light of the above, the tool viz., Valid pack instrument was circulated to five experts in the field of adult education and five field functionaries to go through the tool, to study its suitability to the adult education functionaries of Sakshar Bharath. Further, based on their suggestions, a one day workshop has been conducted to discuss on the suitability of the tool. The workshop unanimously recommended that the Valid Pack may be used as it is. Based on the above, the tool has been translated into local language i.e., Telugu and administered to the sample of 20 Mandal Coordinators and 10 field functionaries working at district level. The responses obtained clearly demonstrated that the tool can elicit the desired information from the sample. Keeping in view of the above, it was felt that the tool can be adopted and used in Indian context to assess the competencies of the adult education functionaries working at various levels.

Nodoubt, the tool has been devised for the Europe, keeping in view of their needs and limited functions, however, in Indian context, the functionaries are too many and working at various levels with different backgrounds and levels of education. Hence, it was suggested to administer at the middle level functionaries who are involved both in academic and administrative spheres of the programme. The administrative system at the district level of Sakshar Bharath clearly indicates that the Mandal Coordinator is the only functionary involved both in the administrative and academic spheres of the programme.

*Profile of the sample Mandal coordinators*

The Mandal Coordinators selected are from heterogeneous groups. Majority of them are men. In terms of community, the sample was classified into three groups based on their community viz., Forward Castes (OC), Backward Castes and Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes represented 38.33 % followed by Backward Castes (33.33 %). The Other Castes are represented 28.33 %. The educational qualifications of the Mandal Coordinators shows that one third of them are graduates, one fourth of them possessed Post Graduate degree, thirty percent of them possessed Post Graduation with BEd degree and 11.67 % of them are qualified teachers i.e., graduation with B.Ed. This clearly indicates that more than half of the Mandal Coordinators possessed Post Graduation degree and 41.67 % & with BEd degree.

The marital status point of view, 61.67 % of them are married and 38.33 % of them are unmarried. Further, more than half of them belong to low income group and 30 percent of them are from more income group followed by middle income group (16.67 %). The family occupation of the Mandal Coordinators shows that nearly two thirds of them are from agricultural families followed by labour and employment. The experience of the Mandal Coordinators in adult education shows that 88 % of them have more than one year experience in adult education either as volunteer or prerak. Only 11.67 % of them have less than one year experience in adult education. It indicates that the administration has preferred only those who have some experience in adult education as Mandal Coordinators. On the whole, the trend shows that majority of the Mandal Coordinators are men, SC/ST, Post Graduates, married, low income group, agricultural families with adequate experience in adult education.

*Self-perception of the competencies of the Mandal coordinators*

The first part of the Valid Pack instrument intended for the assessment of competencies based on the self ratings was administered to the sample Mandal Coordinators. The obtained results were presented according to the components of the competencies viz., knowledge, training management, assessment and valorization of learning, motivation and counselling and professional and personal development. Further, the data was analyzed to bring out the relationship between the personal variables and the competencies possessed in different areas. The details of the analysis are presented below.

*(a) Knowledge vs. personal characteristics*

Based on the background characteristics, the Mandal Coordinators were classified into different groups based on their personal characteristics and calculated the mean competency scores in the area of knowledge and t/F test was applied to find out the differences if any among different groups.

The competency scores in the area of knowledge obtained by the Mandal Coordinators belonging to different groups show that there is no significant difference among them indicating that all the groups possess more or less similar competencies. However, the Mandal Coordinators belonging to Scheduled Castes possessed more competencies followed by backward castes and other castes. Among different educational groups, the Post Graduates with B.Ed have more knowledge followed by post graduates and other groups. The married group and more income group possessed more knowledge. In the case of previous experience and experience in current position, those who have more previous experience and experience in current position have more knowledge.

On the whole, the Mandal Coordinators belonging to scheduled castes, post graduates along with BEd degree, married, low income group, previous experience in adult education and more years of experience in the current position possessed more competencies in the area of knowledge.

*(b) Training management vs. personal characteristics*

The competencies in the area of training management shows that there is no significant difference among different groups in their mean competency scores indicating that the personal characteristics do not have a role in determining their competency. However, the trend indicates that the backward castes, post graduates, unmarried, more income group, having previous experience in adult education and more experience in the current position are more competent than the other groups.

*(c) Assessment and valorization of learning vs. personal characteristics*

The competency in the area of assessment and valorization of learning indicates that all the groups more or less have obtained similar mean competency score indicating that there is no significant difference among different groups. Further, the calculated *F/t* test results also supported the above. However, the trend of the mean competency scores shows that the backward castes, graduates, unmarried, more income group, with experience in adult education and more experience in the current position have possessed more competencies in the area of assessment and valorization of learning.

*(d) Motivation and counselling vs. personal characteristics*

The competency scores in the area of motivation and counselling indicated that there is a significant difference between different caste groups of Mandal Coordinators. However, such differences are not found among different groups of Mandal Coordinators belonging to education, marital status, income, previous experience and experience in the current position. Further, the trend shows that backward castes, graduates with B.Ed degree, unmarried, more income groups with previous experience in adult education and more

experience in the present position possessed more competencies in the area of motivation and counselling.

(e) Personal and professional development vs. personal characteristics

The education-wise classification of the Mandal Coordinators shows that graduates possess more competencies followed by the other groups viz., graduates with BEd, Post Graduates with BEd and post graduates. The unmarried and more income group possessed more competencies. In the case of previous experience and current position, the competencies were increased along with the years of experience.

**Table 1.** Mean competency scores, SD and *t/F* values obtained by the Mandal coordinators in the area of knowledge

| S<br>N<br>o<br>. | Va<br>ri<br>abl<br>e  | Gro<br>up  | N  | Knowledge        |        |         | Training<br>manage<br>ment |        |         | Assessment<br>and Valori<br>zation |        |         | Motivation<br>& Counsel<br>ing |        |         | Personal &<br>Professional<br>Develop<br>ment |        |         | Total Com<br>petencies |        |         |
|------------------|-----------------------|------------|----|------------------|--------|---------|----------------------------|--------|---------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|--------------------------------|--------|---------|---|--------|---------|------------------------|--------|---------|
|                  |                       |            |    | M<br>e<br>a<br>n | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n           | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n                   | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n               | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n                              | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n       | S<br>D | t/<br>F |
| 1                | Ca<br>ste             | OC         | 17 | 13.59            | 2.00   | 0.43@   | 39.47                      | 8.31   | 1.67@   | 62.71                              | 2.42   |         | 75.31                          | 1.81   | 3.38*   | 39.44   | 1.23   | 0.48@   | 71.24                  | 1.18   |         |
|                  |                       | BC         | 20 | 14.10            | 3.01   |         | 41.65                      | 7.86   |         | 68.56                              | 1.65   | 0.55@   | 85.59                          | 1.89   |         | 38.03   | 0.83   | 0.48@   | 75.05                  | 1.03   |         |
|                  |                       | SC         | 23 | 14.30            | 2.20   |         | 37.09                      | 8.39   |         | 63.32                              | 1.22   |         | 73.64                          | 1.04   |         | 36.71   | 0.55   |         | 68.65                  | 1.32   |         |
| 2                | Ed<br>uc<br>ati<br>on | De<br>gree | 20 | 13.50            | 2.87   | 1.34@   | 38.00                      | 8.32   | 0.93@   | 68.09                              | 2.15   | 0.15@   | 78.70                          | 1.70   | 0.27@   | 40.55   | 1.15   | 1.63@   | 70.15                  | 1.21   |         |
|                  |                       | PG         | 15 | 13.89            | 1.83   |         | 41.97                      | 8.92   |         | 64.45                              | 1.44   |         | 75.89                          | 1.39   |         | 36.63   | 0.60   |         | 73.30                  | 1.19   |         |

|   |   |                              |        |                       |             |                        |                  |             |                        |             |             |                   |             |                        |                  |             |                   |                  |                  |                        |
|---|---|------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|
|   |   |                              |        | 3                     |             |                        | 3                |             |                        |             |             |                   |             |                        |                  |             |                   | 0                | 8                |                        |
|   |   | De-<br>gree<br>&<br>B.E<br>d | 7      | 1<br>3<br>4<br>3      | 1<br>9<br>9 |                        | 3<br>6<br>2<br>9 | 6<br>5<br>8 |                        | 6<br>1<br>3 |             | 8<br>2<br>7       | 0<br>9<br>5 |                        | 4<br>0<br>0      | 1<br>0<br>0 |                   | 6<br>8<br>5<br>7 | 1<br>0<br>4<br>1 |                        |
|   |   | PG<br>&<br>B.E<br>d          | 1<br>8 | 1<br>4<br>9<br>4      | 2<br>3<br>9 |                        | 3<br>9<br>8<br>3 | 8<br>3<br>1 |                        | 6<br>1<br>6 |             | 7<br>8<br>9       | 2<br>2<br>7 |                        | 3<br>7<br>2      | 0<br>7<br>5 |                   | 7<br>2<br>9<br>4 | 1<br>1<br>4<br>9 |                        |
| 3 | Mar-<br>ital<br>Sta-<br>tus                     | Mar-<br>ried                 | 3<br>7 | 1<br>4<br>0<br>8<br>9 | 2<br>0      | 1.<br>0<br>6<br>@      | 3<br>9<br>1<br>6 | 8<br>9<br>8 | 0.<br>1<br>4<br>@      | 6<br>2<br>3 | 1<br>4<br>9 | 7<br>7<br>0       | 1<br>9<br>4 | 0.<br>6<br>0<br>@      | 3<br>7<br>6      | 1<br>0<br>1 |                   | 7<br>1<br>1<br>4 | 1<br>2<br>2<br>8 |                        |
|   |   | Un-<br>mar-<br>ried          | 2<br>3 | 1<br>3<br>6<br>1      | 2<br>9<br>0 |                        | 3<br>9<br>4<br>8 | 7<br>2<br>1 |                        | 7<br>2<br>2 | 1<br>9<br>9 | 2.<br>2<br>1<br>* | 8<br>7<br>1 |                        | 3<br>8<br>3      | 0<br>7<br>8 | 0.<br>2<br>8<br>@ | 7<br>2<br>1<br>3 | 1<br>0<br>5<br>8 | 0.<br>3<br>2<br>@      |
| 4 | In-<br>come                                     | Low                          | 3<br>2 | 1<br>4<br>0<br>3      | 2<br>4<br>0 | 0.<br>7<br>6<br>@      | 3<br>8<br>2<br>5 | 9<br>4<br>4 | 1.<br>0<br>5<br>@      | 6<br>3<br>1 | 1<br>3<br>3 | 7<br>9<br>1       | 2<br>0<br>5 | 2.<br>4<br>1<br>@      | 3<br>7<br>2      | 0<br>7<br>7 |                   | 7<br>0<br>2<br>2 | 1<br>2<br>6<br>6 |                        |
|   |   | Mid-<br>dle                  | 1<br>0 | 1<br>3<br>6<br>1      | 2<br>6<br>2 |                        | 3<br>9<br>2<br>8 | 6<br>5<br>7 |                        | 7<br>0<br>6 | 2<br>4<br>8 | 1.<br>0<br>4<br>@ | 7<br>1<br>7 |                        | 3<br>5<br>6      | 1<br>0<br>4 | 3.<br>0<br>6<br>* | 7<br>0<br>6<br>7 | 1<br>0<br>0<br>5 | 1.<br>4<br>8<br>@      |
|   |   | Mor-<br>e                    | 1<br>8 | 1<br>4<br>8<br>0      | 2<br>0      |                        | 4<br>2<br>6<br>0 | 6<br>7<br>5 |                        | 6<br>7<br>0 | 1<br>3<br>4 | 8<br>7<br>0       | 0<br>8<br>2 |                        | 4<br>4<br>0      | 0<br>9<br>7 |                   | 7<br>7<br>2<br>0 | 9<br>6<br>0      |                        |
| 5 | Pre-<br>vi-<br>ous<br>Ex-<br>pe-<br>ri-<br>ence | Yes                          | 2<br>7 | 1<br>4<br>5<br>5      | 2<br>4<br>0 | -<br>1.<br>8<br>4<br>@ | 4<br>1<br>0<br>0 | 9<br>1<br>0 | -<br>1.<br>8<br>1<br>@ | 6<br>1<br>1 | 1<br>5<br>0 | 7<br>5<br>2       | 1<br>3<br>1 | -<br>1.<br>1<br>3<br>@ | 3<br>8<br>1      | 0<br>7<br>9 |                   | 6<br>8<br>0<br>4 | 8<br>9<br>1      | -<br>2.<br>1<br>7<br>* |
|   |   | No                           | 3<br>3 | 1<br>3<br>4<br>1      | 2<br>3<br>6 |                        | 3<br>7<br>1      | 6<br>7<br>5 |                        | 7<br>0<br>0 | 1<br>8<br>7 | 2.<br>0<br>0<br>@ | 8<br>0<br>6 |                        | 3<br>7<br>6      | 1<br>0<br>3 | 0.<br>2<br>4<br>@ | 7<br>4<br>3<br>6 | 1<br>2<br>8<br>1 |                        |
| 6 | Ex-<br>pe-<br>ri-<br>ence<br>(in<br>ye-<br>ars) | > 1                          | 7      | 1<br>3<br>1<br>4      | 1<br>0<br>7 | 1.<br>4<br>2<br>@      | 3<br>4<br>8<br>6 | 7<br>7<br>1 | 1.<br>1<br>4<br>@      | 6<br>4<br>3 | 2<br>2<br>3 | 7<br>4<br>3       | 1<br>2<br>7 | 0.<br>4<br>4<br>@      | 3<br>4<br>3      | 0<br>7<br>9 |                   | 6<br>5<br>2<br>9 | 1<br>0<br>2<br>1 | 1.<br>1<br>9<br>@      |
|   |   | 1-2                          | 3<br>0 | 1<br>3<br>7<br>7      | 2<br>9<br>2 |                        | 3<br>9<br>8<br>0 | 9<br>2<br>8 |                        | 6<br>6<br>7 | 2<br>0<br>2 | 0.<br>0<br>6<br>@ | 8<br>0<br>3 |                        | 3<br>7<br>0<br>6 | 1<br>0<br>6 | 1.<br>2<br>9<br>@ | 7<br>1<br>9<br>7 | 1<br>3<br>2<br>9 |                        |
|   |   | 2-3                          | 2<br>3 | 1<br>4                | 1<br>.      |                        | 3<br>9           | 6<br>.      |                        | 6<br>.      | 1<br>.      | 7<br>.            | 1<br>.      |                        | 4<br>.           | 0<br>.      |                   | 7<br>2           | 9<br>.           |                        |



|  |  |  |  |    |   |    |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  |    |   |
|--|--|--|--|----|---|----|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|----|---|
|  |  |  |  | .8 |   | .8 |   | 5 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |  | 0 | 7 |  | .1 |   |
|  |  |  |  | 6  | 7 | 9  | 7 | 7 | 4 |  | 5 | 9 |  | 0 | 4 |  | 8  | 4 |
|  |  |  |  | 5  |   | 6  |   |   |   |  |   |   |  |   |   |  | 3  |   |

@ not significant; \* Significant at 0.05 level; \*\* Significant at 0.01 level

*(f) Competencies of the Mandal coordinators vs. personal characteristics*

The competencies in all the areas puttogether indicates that there is no significant difference among different groups of Mandal Coordinators belonging to caste, education, marital status, income and experience in years. However, there is a significant difference between the competency scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators belonging to possession of previous experience in the field of adult education and those who are not having experience. However, the trend of the obtained mean competency scores shows that Mandal Coordinators belonging to backward castes, post graduates, unmarried, more income group, having previous experience and more than three years of experience in the present position possessed more competencies than the other groups.

*Classification of the Mandal coordinator based on the competencies*

Based on the competency scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators on five different areas viz., knowledge, training management, evaluation and valorization, motivation and counselling, personal and professional development and total as a whole have been calculated and classified them based on the criteria of mean competency scores  $\pm 1/2$  SD. The classification has been done to study whether the instrument is able to distinguish the Mandal Coordinators based on their competency levels. The obtained results are presented in the table. The Mandal coordinators were classified based on their competency levels as low, medium and highly competent in all the areas and as a total. The division of the Mandal coordinators in the area of knowledge shows

that 41.66 % of the coordinators were rated themselves as low competent with a mean of 11.88 rating followed by 35 % as moderately competent. Contrary to the above, 23.33 % of them rated themselves as highly competent in the area of knowledge. This clearly indicates that two thirds of the Mandal coordinators have rated themselves as medium and low competent. In the area of training, again, 65 % of the Mandal coordinators rated themselves as medium and low competent in the area of training management. To be specific, one third of them as low, 31.67 % of them are moderate. On the other hand, 35 % of them rated themselves as highly competent in the area. In the area of assessment and valorization of learning, 75 % of them have rated themselves as moderate and low competent. To be specific, 38.33 % of them rated as low and 36.67 % of them are medium. On the other hand, one fourth of them have rated themselves as highly competent in the area. Contrary to the above, 83.33 % of them have rated themselves as medium and low in the area of motivation and counselling and 16.67 % of them have rated themselves as more competent. In the personal and professional development, only 11.67 % of them have rated themselves as more competent and 56.67 % were rated themselves as moderate. On the other hand, 31.67 % of them have rated themselves as low competent in the area. On the whole, 28.33 percent were rated themselves as highly competent adult education trainers followed by 35 % as moderate and 36.67 % as low competent. The trend of the mean competency scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators were presented in the graphical form in the following

*Assessment of competencies by external observer*

The competencies of the Adult Education Facilitators were measured based on the external observer's ratings and consolidated ratings of the external evaluators' observation and interaction with the sample. The findings are presented in two sections viz., competencies possessed by the Mandal Coordi-

nators as per the external observer ratings and consolidated ratings given by the external evaluator with the interaction of the sample. In both the sections, an attempt has been made to relate the competencies with their personal characteristics so as to identify the extent of influence exerted by these characteristics on their competencies. The details are presented below. The

trained external observer has studied the performance of the Mandal Coordinator in their day-to-day activities and also in a given particular task. The observer has recorded his observations on the observer's rating scale consisting of five units viz., knowledge, planning and organization, social relationships, mentoring and reflection, assigned work. The ratings provided by the observers have been consolidated and interpreted.

*(a) Knowledge vs. personal characteristics*

The adults are voluntarily participating in the educational activity so as to improve their literacy and personal competencies. The adult educator should be knowledgeable about the background of the participants and their environment so as to conceive and deliver the teaching learning inputs suitable to them. The evaluator observed the performance of the Mandal Coordinator and rated their competencies in the area of knowledge and presented in the table. The mean competency scores in the area of knowledge possessed by the Mandal Coordinators presented in the table show that the Mandal Coordinators from backward castes possessed more knowledge than the other groups. It is also evident from the above that the Mandal Coordinators from scheduled caste and scheduled tribes possessed low competency in knowledge. However, the calculated  $F$  value revealed that there is no significant difference among the three groups of Mandal Coordinators in the area of knowledge. In other words, the caste does not play a role in influencing the knowledge of the Mandal Coordinators.

The Mandal Coordinators were classified into four groups based on their educational qualifications, and the obtained mean competency scores show that lower the qualification, higher the knowledge and also revealed that there is no significant difference in their mean competency scores. The influence of the marital status demonstrated that unmarried Mandal Coordinators have more knowledge than the married. In the case of different income groups, the middle income group Mandal Coordinators possessed more knowledge than the low and no income groups. From experience point of view, those who have experience in adult education possessed more knowledge than those who entered without any experience. In the case of experience in current position too those who have more experience possessed more knowledge. However, the calculated t/F value among different groups of Mandal Coordinators demonstrated that there is no significant difference between them in the area of knowledge.

On the whole, the trend of the mean knowledge scores shows that Mandal Coordinators belonging to backward castes, graduates, married, middle income, experienced in adult education and more experience in the current job possessed more competency in the area of knowledge.

*(b) Planning and organization vs. personal characteristics*

The Mandal Coordinator being the intermediary functionary between the administration and field functionaries is responsible for planning and organizing the literacy promotion, skill development, awareness programmes, organizing extension activities, dissemination of developmental information etc., Being a key person in the programme, he is involved in planning and execution of the programme. The competency of the Mandal Coordinator depends on his functioning. After closely observing the performance of the Mandal Coordinators, the ratings provided by the external observer has been consolidated and presented in the following table. The findings presented in

the table relating to the competency in the area of planning and organization in relation to the personal characteristics of the Mandal Coordinators and the calculated t/F values between different groups of sample demonstrated that there is no significant difference between the Mandal Coordinators belonging to different groups based on their characteristics. It indicates that the personal characteristics do not play any role in the competencies of the Mandal Coordinators. However, the trend of the competencies score shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to other caste groups, degree holders, married, middle income group, more than two years of experienced groups possessed more competency in the area of planning and organization.

**Table 2.** Mean competency scores, SDs and t/F value obtained by the MCOs belonging to different groups in the area of Knowledge in relation to their personal characteristics

| S . No | variable  | Group             | Knowledge |        |      |        | Planning & Organization |      |      | Social Relationships |      |      | Mentoring & Reflection |      |      | Assigned work |      |      | Total |      |      |
|--------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------|------|--------|-------------------------|------|------|----------------------|------|------|------------------------|------|------|---------------|------|------|-------|------|------|
|        |           |                   | N         | Mean   | SD   | t/F    | Mean                    | SD   | t/F  | Mean                 | SD   | t/F  | Mean                   | SD   | t/F  | Mean          | SD   | t/F  | Mean  | SD   | t/F  |
| 1      | Caste     | OC                | 17        | 94.137 | 1.07 | 19.88  | 1.07                    | 1.98 | 1.07 | 1.07                 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.07                   | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.07          | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.07  | 1.07 | 1.07 |
|        |           | BC                | 20        | 95.00  | 2.00 | 19.70  | 1.38                    | 0.88 | 1.38 | 1.38                 | 0.25 | 1.38 | 1.38                   | 0.07 | 1.38 | 1.38          | 0.07 | 1.38 | 1.38  | 0.07 | 1.38 |
|        |           | SC                | 23        | 93.30  | 1.52 | 18.65  | 1.36                    | 0.50 | 1.36 | 1.36                 | 0.36 | 1.36 | 1.36                   | 0.43 | 1.36 | 1.36          | 0.43 | 1.36 | 1.36  | 0.43 | 1.36 |
| 2      | Education | De-gree           | 20        | 99.564 | 1.26 | 20.00  | 1.06                    | 0.06 | 1.06 | 1.06                 | 0.08 | 1.06 | 1.06                   | 0.08 | 1.06 | 1.06          | 0.08 | 1.06 | 1.06  | 0.08 | 1.06 |
|        |           | PG                | 15        | 91.333 | 1.73 | 19.189 | 1.39                    | 0.55 | 1.39 | 1.39                 | 0.66 | 1.39 | 1.39                   | 0.43 | 1.39 | 1.39          | 0.43 | 1.39 | 1.39  | 0.43 | 1.39 |
|        |           | De-gree with B.Ed | 7         | 94.390 | 1.90 | 19.020 | 1.44                    | 0.00 | 1.44 | 1.44                 | 0.35 | 1.44 | 1.44                   | 0.02 | 1.44 | 1.44          | 0.02 | 1.44 | 1.44  | 0.02 | 1.44 |
|        |           | PG with B.Ed      | 18        | 90.00  | 1.84 | 18.888 | 1.22                    | 0.84 | 1.22 | 1.22                 | 0.22 | 1.22 | 1.22                   | 0.22 | 1.22 | 1.22          | 0.22 | 1.22 | 1.22  | 0.22 | 1.22 |

|   |  |                         |        |              |              |                    |                   |              |  |                   |                   |              |              |                   |              |  |                   |              |              |  |                        |                   |                   |  |                        |
|---|--|-------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|------------------------|
|   |  |                         |        |              | 1            |                    | 3                 | 8            |  | 2                 | 1                 |              | 2            | 1                 |              |  | 9                 |              | 9            |  |                        |                   |                   |  |                        |
| 3 | Mar-<br>ital<br>sta-<br>tus  | Mar-<br>ried            | 3<br>7 | 9.<br>3<br>2 | 1<br>.4<br>5 | -<br>0.<br>45<br>@ | 1<br>9.<br>5<br>9 | 2<br>.9<br>4 |  | 0.<br>7<br>4<br>@ | 1<br>6.<br>9<br>2 | 2<br>.7<br>1 |              | 1<br>6.<br>9<br>2 | 2<br>.7<br>1 |  | 0.<br>5<br>2<br>@ | 4.<br>6<br>8 | 1<br>.1<br>8 |  | -<br>0.<br>2<br>1<br>@ | 5<br>7.<br>7<br>3 | 8.<br>2<br>8      |  | 0.<br>4<br>1<br>@      |
|   |  | Un-<br>mar-<br>ried     | 2<br>3 | 9.<br>5<br>2 | 1<br>.9<br>3 |                    | 1<br>8.<br>9<br>6 | 3<br>.7<br>0 |  |                   | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>2 | 3<br>.1<br>3 |              | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>2 | 3<br>.1<br>3 |  |                   | 4.<br>7<br>4 | 1<br>.0<br>1 |  |                        | 5<br>6.<br>7<br>4 | 1<br>0.<br>3<br>0 |  |                        |
| 4 | In-<br>co-<br>me   | Be-<br>low<br>3000<br>0 | 3<br>2 | 9.<br>2<br>8 | 1<br>.5<br>5 | 0.<br>79<br>@      | 1<br>9.<br>1<br>6 | 3<br>.4<br>7 |  | 0.<br>3<br>2<br>@ | 1<br>6.<br>2<br>2 | 3<br>.0<br>0 |              | 1<br>6.<br>2<br>2 | 3<br>.0<br>0 |  | 3.<br>7<br>3<br>* | 4.<br>6<br>3 | 1<br>.1<br>3 |  | 0.<br>4<br>3<br>@      | 5<br>6.<br>3<br>1 | 9.<br>6<br>5      |  | 1.<br>6<br>2<br>@      |
|   |  | 3000<br>0-<br>5000<br>0 | 1<br>0 | 1<br>0.<br>0 | 1<br>.4<br>1 |                    | 2<br>0.<br>1<br>0 | 2<br>.6<br>9 |  |                   | 1<br>8.<br>9<br>0 | 1<br>.6<br>0 | 3<br>.7<br>3 | 1<br>8.<br>9<br>0 | 1<br>.6<br>0 |  |                   | 5.<br>0<br>0 | 1<br>.2<br>3 |  |                        | 6<br>2.<br>0<br>0 | 6.<br>2<br>0      |  |                        |
|   |  | 51<br>and<br>above      | 1<br>8 | 9.<br>2<br>8 | 1<br>.9<br>0 |                    | 1<br>9.<br>2<br>8 | 3<br>.2<br>0 |  |                   | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>6 | 2<br>.7<br>1 |              | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>6 | 2<br>.7<br>1 |  |                   | 4.<br>6<br>7 | 0<br>.9<br>7 |  |                        | 5<br>6.<br>6<br>1 | 8.<br>8<br>3      |  |                        |
| 5 | Pre-<br>vious<br>Ex-<br>pe-<br>ri-<br>ence   | Yes                     | 2<br>7 | 9.<br>2<br>2 | 1<br>.7<br>8 | -<br>0.<br>76<br>@ | 1<br>8.<br>7<br>8 | 3<br>.8<br>4 |  | -<br>1.<br>2<br>4 | 1<br>6.<br>1<br>1 | 3<br>.3<br>4 |              | 1<br>6.<br>3<br>3 | 1<br>.4<br>3 |  | -<br>0.<br>9<br>2 | 4.<br>5<br>9 | 1<br>.1<br>2 |  | -<br>0.<br>6<br>8      | 5<br>5.<br>7<br>3 | 1<br>0.<br>8<br>5 |  | -<br>1.<br>3<br>1<br>@ |
|   |  | No                      | 3<br>3 | 9.<br>5<br>5 | 1<br>.5<br>2 |                    | 1<br>9.<br>8<br>2 | 2<br>.6<br>2 |  |                   | 1<br>7.<br>3<br>0 | 2<br>.3<br>1 |              | 1<br>7.<br>3<br>7 | 1<br>.1<br>8 |  |                   | 4.<br>7<br>9 | 1<br>.1<br>1 |  |                        | 5<br>8.<br>7<br>3 | 7.<br>1<br>5      |  |                        |
| 6 | Ex-<br>pe-<br>ri-<br>ence<br>in<br>the<br>cur-<br>ren-<br>t<br>po-<br>si-<br>tio-<br>n | Be-<br>low 1<br>Year    | 7      | 9.<br>1<br>4 | 1<br>.5<br>7 | 0.<br>61<br>@      | 1<br>8.<br>8<br>6 | 4<br>.1<br>8 |  | 0.<br>2<br>4<br>@ | 1<br>6.<br>8<br>6 | 4<br>.4<br>1 |              | 1<br>6.<br>8<br>6 | 4<br>.4<br>1 |  | 0.<br>2<br>1<br>@ | 4.<br>4<br>3 | 0<br>.9<br>8 |  | 0.<br>3<br>4<br>@      | 5<br>6.<br>8<br>6 | 1<br>2.<br>4<br>8 |  | 0.<br>3<br>1<br>@      |
|   |  | 1-2<br>Years            | 3<br>0 | 9.<br>2<br>3 | 1<br>.8<br>3 |                    | 1<br>9.<br>2<br>0 | 3<br>.4<br>8 |  |                   | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>3 | 2<br>.8<br>5 | 0<br>.2<br>1 | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>3 | 2<br>.8<br>5 |  |                   | 4.<br>8<br>0 | 0<br>.9<br>2 |  |                        | 5<br>6.<br>5<br>7 | 9.<br>5<br>3      |  |                        |
|   |  | 2-3<br>Years            | 2<br>3 | 9.<br>7<br>0 | 1<br>.4<br>0 |                    | 1<br>9.<br>7<br>0 | 2<br>.6<br>7 |  |                   | 1<br>7.<br>0<br>4 | 2<br>.4<br>0 |              | 1<br>7.<br>0<br>4 | 2<br>.4<br>0 |  |                   | 4.<br>6<br>5 | 1<br>.3<br>7 |  |                        | 5<br>8.<br>5<br>2 | 7.<br>3<br>7      |  |                        |
|   |  |                         |        |              |              |                    |                   |              |  |                   | 1<br>6.<br>7<br>7 | 2<br>.8<br>6 |              |                   |              |  |                   |              |              |  |                        |                   |                   |  |                        |

@ not significant; \* Significant at 0.05 level; \*\* Significant at 0.01 level

### (c) Social relationship vs. personal characteristics

The adult education functionaries were chosen from the same social milieu where the programme is organized for the adult learners. In other words, the functionaries are also from the same community with same social background. The adult learners except in their backwardness in literacy and education, they are involved in all the activities of the society and interacting with different groups. The adult educator in order to attract and retain the

adult learners has to have good social relationships and interaction with the adult learners so as to make the programme successful. The competencies of the Mandal Coordinators as rated by the external observer in this area are consolidated and presented in the table. The social relationships possessed by the Mandal Coordinators with the other functionaries and stakeholders of the programme shows that the Mandal Coordinators from other caste groups, graduates, married, middle income group, with more experience in the current job possessed more social relationships than the other groups. However, the trend of the mean competency scores in the area of social relationships obtained by different groups of Mandal Coordinator do not differ significantly in their competencies indicating that the social relationships has not being influenced by the personal characteristics of the Mandal Coordinators.

*(d) Mentoring and reflection vs. personal characteristics*

The success of the functionaries in adult education lies in their counseling and guidance to the adult learners as well as functionaries to identify and overcome their problems. In the case of Mandal Coordinators, being a coordinator between the adult education and other developmental programmes on one hand, administration and field and grass root level functionaries and learners on the other hand need to be sharp in advising the people and reflecting on the problems identified. The external observer assessed the competency of the Mandal Coordinators in the area of mentoring and reflection and the scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators based on their characteristics are presented in the table. The findings presented in the table indicate that there is a significant difference between the Mandal Coordinators belonging to different income groups in the area of mentoring and reflection. The Mandal Coordinators with middle income group have possessed more competencies in the area than the low and more income groups. In the case of other characteristics, the calculated  $t/F$  value indicated that there is no significant difference be-

tween the groups belonging to personal characteristics. However, the overall trend of the mean competency scores in the area of mentoring and reflection indicated that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to other caste groups, graduates, married, middle income and more than two years of experience in the current job groups were found to be more competent in the area of mentoring and reflection.

*(e) Assigned work vs. personal characteristics*

The efficiency of the functionary also depends on the completion of the assigned tasks prescribed to them. In the case of Mandal Coordinator, the external observer is also a superior to him and regularly interacting and assigning the works to him so as to make the programme run smoothly and to attain the objectives for which it has been implemented. As per the guideline, the mandal coordinator has been assigned the tasks of survey, training, regular monitoring, reporting and interaction with other developmental ages to seek their cooperation in disseminating the information relating to the developmental programmes for the benefit of the community. The obtained mean competency scores in the area of assigned work as per the external observer shows that all the groups belonging to different characteristics performed similarly as there is no significant difference between the obtained mean competency scores. However, the trend of the mean competency scores shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to other caste groups, graduation with BEd degree, unmarried, middle income group and having experience between 1-2 years groups were found to be more competent in performing the assigned tasks than the other groups of mandal coordinators.

*Sum up*

The competencies of the Mandal coordinators were measured based on their performance in five areas vis., knowledge, planning and organization,



social relationships, monitoring and reflection and assigned work as through external observer. The mean competency scores obtained by the mandal coordinators belonging to different groups based on their personal characteristics are presented in the table. The findings presented in the table shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to other castes, graduates, married, middle income, without prior experience, having two to three years of experience in current position are found to be more competent in the external observer point of view. On the other hand, the Mandal Coordinators belonging to backward castes, post graduates, unmarried, more income, with prior experience and having one to two years of experience in the current position are found to be low competent.

#### *Competencies of the Mandal Coordinators*

For the purpose of the measurement of the competencies, the Valid Pack provided scope for obtaining competency scores from different sources such as external observation and interacting with the sample keeping in view of his observation in the performance of the functionary. In other words, the tool provides scope to obtain information from more than one source. In the present case, the investigators trained the external observers for a day in getting the observation scores and consolidated scores based on their interaction with the sample. In order to study the influence of the personal variables on the consolidated competency scores of the Mandal Coordinators, they were classified into different groups based on their personal characteristics and their mean competency scores were calculated in the areas such as knowledge, training management, assessment and valorization of learning, motivation and counselling and personal and professional development and presented in the following pages.

**Table 3.** Competencies in the area of knowledge in relation to the personal characteristics of the MCOs

| S .<br>No | var<br>iable               | Grou<br>p               | Knowledge |                  |        |         | Planning &<br>Organiza-<br>tion |        |         | Social<br>Relation-<br>ships |        |         | Mentoring<br>& Reflec-<br>tion |        |         | Assigned<br>work |        |         | Total            |        |         |
|-----------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------------|--------|---------|---------------------------------|--------|---------|------------------------------|--------|---------|--------------------------------|--------|---------|------------------|--------|---------|------------------|--------|---------|
|           |                            |                         | N         | M<br>e<br>a<br>n | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n                | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n             | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n               | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n | S<br>D | t/<br>F | M<br>e<br>a<br>n | S<br>D | t/<br>F |
| 1         | Caste                      | OC                      | 17        | 9.41             | 1.37   | 0.07@   | 19.88                           | 1.90   | 0.88    | 17.00                        | 2.01   | 0.88    | 17.00                          | 2.01   | 0.88    | 4.88             | 1.05   | 0.07@   | 58.35            | 6.17   | 0.49@   |
|           |                            | BC                      | 20        | 9.50             | 2.01   |         | 19.70                           | 3.67   | 0.88@   | 16.95                        | 3.10   | 0.25    | 16.95                          | 3.10   | 0.25@   | 4.85             | 0.99   | 0.07@   | 52.20            | 1.33   | 0.49@   |
|           |                            | SC                      | 23        | 9.30             | 1.52   |         | 18.65                           | 3.60   |         | 16.43                        | 3.16   |         | 16.43                          | 3.16   |         | 4.43             | 1.24   |         | 55.87            | 9.75   |         |
| 2         | Educa<br>tion              | Degree                  | 20        | 9.95             | 1.64   | 1.26@   | 20.00                           | 3.06   |         | 17.40                        | 2.78   |         | 17.40                          | 2.78   |         | 4.80             | 1.11   |         | 59.65            | 8.46   |         |
|           |                            | PG                      | 15        | 9.13             | 1.73   |         | 19.33                           | 3.89   | 0.5@    | 16.40                        | 4.08   | 0.66    | 16.40                          | 4.08   | 0.66@   | 4.47             | 1.19   | 0.43@   | 55.93            | 1.97   | 0.70@   |
|           |                            | Degree<br>with<br>B.Ed  | 7         | 9.43             | 1.90   |         | 19.00                           | 4.20   |         | 17.14                        | 3.44   |         | 17.14                          | 3.44   |         | 5.00             | 0.82   |         | 57.57            | 1.15   |         |
|           |                            | PG<br>with<br>B.Ed      | 18        | 9.00             | 1.41   |         | 18.83                           | 2.48   |         | 16.22                        | 2.21   |         | 16.22                          | 2.21   |         | 4.67             | 1.19   |         | 55.89            | 7.09   |         |
| 3         | Marri<br>tal<br>statu<br>s | Married                 | 37        | 9.32             | 1.44   | 0.45@   | 19.59                           | 2.94   | 0.7@    | 16.92                        | 2.71   | 0.52@   | 16.92                          | 2.71   | 0.52@   | 4.68             | 1.18   | -0.21@  | 57.73            | 8.28   | 0.41@   |
|           |                            | Un-<br>married          | 23        | 9.52             | 1.93   |         | 18.99                           | 3.70   | 0.4@    | 16.55                        | 3.12   |         | 16.55                          | 3.12   |         | 4.74             | 1.01   |         | 56.74            | 1.30   |         |
| 4         | Inco<br>me                 | Be-<br>low<br>3000<br>0 | 32        | 9.28             | 1.55   | 0.79@   | 19.16                           | 3.47   |         | 16.20                        | 3.00   |         | 16.20                          | 3.00   |         | 4.63             | 1.13   |         | 56.31            | 9.65   |         |
|           |                            | 3000<br>0-<br>5000<br>0 | 10        | 10.00            | 1.41   |         | 20.00                           | 2.69   | 0.32@   | 18.90                        | 1.60   | 3.73*   | 18.90                          | 1.60   | 3.73*   | 5.00             | 2.03   | 0.43@   | 62.00            | 6.20   | 1.62@   |
|           |                            | 51<br>and<br>above      | 18        | 9.22             | 1.99   |         | 19.22                           | 3.22   |         | 16.57                        | 2.71   |         | 16.57                          | 2.71   |         | 4.67             | 0.97   |         | 56.61            | 8.83   |         |
| 5         | Pre<br>vious<br>Ex         | Yes                     | 27        | 9.22             | 1.78   | 0.76@   | 18.88                           | 3.84   | -1.24   | 16.13                        | 3.14   | -0.96   | 16.13                          | 3.14   | -0.96   | 4.59             | 1.12   | -0.68   | 55.67            | 1.82   | -1.31   |

|   |  |                      |        |              |              |               |                   |              |                   |                   |              |              |                   |              |                   |              |              |                   |                   |                   |                   |
|---|--|----------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|   | pe-<br>rie-<br>nce   | No                   | 3<br>3 | 9.<br>5<br>5 | 1<br>.5<br>2 |               | 1<br>9.<br>8<br>2 | 2<br>.6<br>2 |                   | 1<br>7.<br>3<br>0 | 2<br>.3<br>1 | 3            | 7.<br>2<br>7      | 1<br>.1<br>8 |                   | 4.<br>7<br>9 | 1<br>.1<br>1 |                   | 5<br>8.<br>7<br>3 | 7.<br>1<br>5      | @                 |
| 6 | Ex-<br>pe-<br>rie-<br>nce<br>in<br>the<br>cur-<br>ren-<br>t<br>po-<br>si-<br>tio-<br>n | Be-<br>low 1<br>Year | 7      | 9.<br>1<br>4 | 1<br>.5<br>7 | 0.<br>61<br>@ | 1<br>8.<br>8<br>6 | 4<br>.1<br>8 |                   | 1<br>6.<br>8<br>6 | 4<br>.4<br>1 |              | 1<br>6.<br>8<br>6 | 4<br>.4<br>1 |                   | 4.<br>4<br>3 | 0<br>.9<br>8 |                   | 5<br>6.<br>8<br>6 | 1<br>2.<br>4<br>8 |                   |
|   |  | 1-2<br>Years         | 3<br>0 | 9.<br>2<br>3 | 1<br>.8<br>3 |               | 1<br>9.<br>2<br>0 | 3<br>.4<br>8 | 0.<br>2<br>4<br>@ | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>3 | 2<br>.8<br>5 | 0<br>.2<br>1 | 1<br>6.<br>5<br>3 | 2<br>.8<br>5 | 0.<br>2<br>1<br>@ | 4.<br>8<br>0 | 0<br>.9<br>2 | 0.<br>3<br>4<br>@ | 5<br>6.<br>5<br>7 | 9.<br>5<br>3      | 0.<br>3<br>1<br>@ |
|   |  | 2-3<br>Years         | 2<br>3 | 9.<br>7<br>0 | 1<br>.4<br>0 |               | 1<br>9.<br>7<br>0 | 2<br>.6<br>7 |                   | 1<br>7.<br>0<br>4 | 2<br>.4<br>0 |              | 1<br>7.<br>0<br>4 | 2<br>.4<br>0 |                   | 4.<br>6<br>5 | 1<br>.3<br>7 |                   | 5<br>8.<br>5<br>2 | 7.<br>3<br>7      |                   |
|   |  |                      |        |              |              |               |                   |              |                   | 1<br>6.<br>7<br>7 | 2<br>.8<br>6 |              |                   |              |                   |              |              |                   |                   |                   |                   |

@ not significant

#### (a) Knowledge

The knowledge of the Mandal Coordinators about the programme, background of the beneficiaries, aspects relating to the learning measurement, dissemination of information etc., are essential for a field functionary to perform effectively. The external evaluator after observing the performance of the Mandal Coordinators and interacted with them to measure their knowledge about the background of the stakeholders and programme etc., The competencies in the area of knowledge in relation to their characteristics are presented in the table. The obtained mean competency scores in the area of knowledge and the calculated  $t/F$  values shows that there is no significant difference in the mean scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators belonging to different groups. In other words, it demonstrates that the personal characteristics of the Mandal Coordinators do not have any role in their knowledge. However the trend of the competency scores shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to other castes, graduates with B.Ed qualification, married, low income group, prior experience in adult education and more experience in the current position demonstrated more knowledge than the other groups.

*(b) Training management*

The Mandal Coordinator being a trainer of other functionaries should have the knowledge about the training and its management so as to promote the competencies among the field functionaries to perform their jobs effectively. This is the key role played by the Mandal Coordinators in promoting the human resources required by the programme functionaries. Keeping its importance in view, the information generated through observation of the external observer and his interaction with the sample, the obtained scores were analyzed based on the personal characteristics and presented in the table. The findings presented in the above table shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to different groups have performed more or less similarly in the case of training management as the calculated t/F values between the mean scores obtained by different groups were found to be not significant. It also discloses that the personal characteristics of the Mandal Coordinators are not contributing for their competencies in the area of training management. However, the trend of the mean competency scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to other castes, graduates with B.Ed qualifications, married, more income groups and low experienced were found to be more effective in the area of training management.

*(c) Assessment and volarisation of learning*

The Mandal Coordinators being a trainer, administrator, coordinator requires the competency of identifying the needs of the functionaries and area and able to perform the functions to satisfy the objectives of the programmes. In other words, he should be competent enough to assess the performance of the individual and the programme, evaluate the outcome of the programme etc., Keeping this in view, the competencies possessed by the Mandal Coordinators in the area of assessment and evaluation has been measured through consolidation of the scores obtained by the external observers and interaction

with the sample has been analyzed according to the background characteristics of the sample and presented in the table. The findings, presented in the Table 3, clearly show that there is no relationship between personal characteristics and the competency in the area of assessment and evaluation (calculated  $t/F$  value is lesser than the table value). However, the trend of the competency scores shows that the Mandal Coordinators belonging to scheduled castes / tribes, post graduates with B.Ed qualification, unmarried, low income group and with low experience in the current job were found to be more effective in the area of assessment and evaluation.

*(d) Motivation and counselling*

The Mandal Coordinator should motivate the functionaries working under him in organizing the adult education programme and the actual target i.e., adult learners to participate in the programme. The participants need to be motivated to share the resources made available for their welfare through developmental programmes by creating awareness through extension programmes. In the case of functionaries, he has to coordinate them with the developmental departments to seek the information and to disseminate it for the benefit of the community. Further, he should counsel both the groups to make use of the programmes and to contribute for the effective implementation of the programme. The information generated about the competencies possessed by the Mandal Coordinators have been analyzed and presented in the table. The trend of the mean competency scores in the area of motivation and counselling obtained by the Mandal Coordinators shows that they do differ significantly among different income groups. However, in the case of other groups, such differences are not significant. However, the trend of the mean competency scores clearly shows that the scheduled castes / tribes, post graduates with BEd qualification, unmarried, high income low experienced in the current job possessed more competencies in the area.

*(e) Personal and professional development*

One of the important competencies to be possessed by the Mandal Coordinators is the zeal for personal and professional development. The personal and professional development in terms of participation in the programmes, self-evaluation, rectification of deficiencies if any etc., The external evaluator's observation and his interaction with the Mandal Coordinators with regard to the competency possessed in the area of personal and professional development were consolidated and presented in the table. The trend of the mean competency scores in the area of personal and professional development obtained by the Mandal Coordinators shows that the Mandal Coordinators have similar competencies among all the groups. Further, the calculated *F/t* value is not significant as it is lower than the table value. However, the trend of the mean competency scores shows that the scheduled castes/tribes, post graduates with BEd qualification, unmarried, high income group and low experience in the current job groups possessed more competencies in the area of personal and professional development.

*Sum up*

The competencies of the adult educators constitute the elements such as knowledge, training management, assessment and valorization of learning, motivation and counseling and personal and professional development. The total competencies possessed by the Mandal Coordinators as per the external observation and consolidation of scores have been classified according to their personal characteristics show that there is no significant difference in their competency scores belonging to different groups of personal characteristics. It shows that the Mandal Coordinators as a whole or classified into different strata perform similarly without any significant differences. However, the trend of the mean competency scores revealed that the Mandal Coordinators

belonging to scheduled castes/tribes, post-graduation along with BEd married, low income with previous experience in adult education, with minimum experience in the current job have possessed more competencies than the other groups. However, the Mandal Coordinators belonging to backward castes, graduation, unmarried, middle income group, without previous experience with one to two years of experience possessed low competencies. Hence, efforts need to be taken to improve the competency level of the above group through in-service and pre-service training programmes to accelerate the pace of the progress of the programme.

*Competency levels possess by the Mandal coordinators*

Based on the competency scores obtained by the Mandal Coordinators on five different areas viz., knowledge, training management, evaluation and valorization, motivation and counselling, personal and professional development and total as a whole have been calculated and classified them based on the criteria of mean competency scores  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$  SD. The classification has been done to study whether the instrument is able to distinguish the Mandal Coordinators based on their competency levels. The obtained results are presented in the table. The Mandal Coordinators were classified based on their competency levels as low, medium and highly competent in all the areas and as a total. The division of the Mandal Coordinators in the area of knowledge shows that 41.66 % of the coordinators were rated themselves as low competent with a mean of 11.88 rating followed by 35 % as moderately competent. Contrary to the above, 23.33 % of them rated themselves as highly competent in the area of knowledge. This clearly indicates that two thirds of the Mandal Coordinators have rated themselves as medium and low competent. In the area of training, again, 65 % of the Mandal Coordinators rated themselves as medium and low competent in the area of training management. To be specific, one third of them as low, 31.67 % of them are moderate. On the other hand,

35 % of them rated themselves as highly competent in the area. In the area of assessment and valorization of learning, 75 % of them have rated themselves as moderate and low competent. To be specific, 38.33 % of them rated as low and 36.67 % of them are medium. On the other hand, one fourth of them have rated themselves as highly competent in the area. Contrary to the above, 83.33 % of them have rated themselves as medium and low in the area of motivation and counseling and 16.67 % of them have rated themselves as more competent. In the personal and professional development, only 11.67 % of them have rated themselves as more competent and 56.67 % were rated themselves as moderate. On the other hand, 31.67 % of them have rated themselves as low competent in the area. On the whole, 28.33 percent were rated themselves as highly competent adult education trainers followed by 35 % as moderate and 36.67 % as low competent.

#### *Observers rating*

The competencies of the facilitators as viewed by the external observer show that 16.17 % of them were rated as low competent and 20 % of them were found to be highly competent. Further, 63.33 % of them were rated as moderately effective facilitators. The competency scores generated by the competency scale were more or less normally distributed.

The area-wise classification of the facilitators based on the competency scores presented in the table shows that in the area of knowledge, 26.67 % were rated as low competent and 23.33 % as more competent and half of them were rated moderately competent. The distribution of the competency scores was found to be more or less normally distributed. In case of the training 20 % of the facilitators were rated as low and 15 % of them as high and 65 % of them are moderately competent. In the area of the evaluation, 16.67 percent of them were rated low and 23.33 % of them as high and 60 % of them as moderately efficient. However, 40 % of them were rated high followed by moder-



ate (31.67 %) and low (28.33 %) in the area of motivation and counseling. The personal and occupation competencies of the facilitators revealed that 45 % of them rated as low and 30 % of them as high. Further, one fourth of them were rated as moderate. On the whole, majority of the facilitators were rated as moderate in the areas of knowledge, training, evaluation and low in case of the personal and occupational competencies and high in the areas of motivation and counseling. Further, the distribution of the competency scores is more or less same.

**Table 4.** Mean competency scores, SDs, *F* values obtained by the Facilitators with low, medium and high competencies in different areas as per observers rating

| S. No | Area of competency        | Group  | N  | Mean  | S.D  | t/F      |
|-------|---------------------------|--------|----|-------|------|----------|
| 1     | Knowledge                 | Low    | 16 | 7.44  | 0.89 | 100.84** |
|       |                           | Medium | 30 | 9.47  | 0.51 |          |
|       |                           | High   | 14 | 11.50 | 1.09 |          |
| 2     | Planning and Organization | Low    | 12 | 14.33 | 2.61 | 100.69** |
|       |                           | Medium | 39 | 19.89 | 1.17 |          |
|       |                           | High   | 9  | 23.67 | 1.12 |          |
| 3     | Social relations          | Low    | 10 | 12.20 | 2.20 | 84.94**  |
|       |                           | Medium | 36 | 16.75 | 1.40 |          |
|       |                           | High   | 14 | 20.07 | 0.83 |          |
| 4     | Mentoring and Reflection  | Low    | 17 | 5.53  | 0.87 | 129.37** |
|       |                           | Medium | 19 | 7.00  | 0.00 |          |
|       |                           | High   | 24 | 8.38  | 0.49 |          |
| 5     | Work Assigned             | Low    | 27 | 3.67  | 0.68 | 143.92** |
|       |                           | Medium | 15 | 5.00  | 0.00 |          |
|       |                           | High   | 18 | 6.00  | 0.00 |          |
| 6     | Total                     | Low    | 10 | 43.10 | 7.72 | 83.43**  |
|       |                           | Medium | 38 | 57.50 | 3.85 |          |
|       |                           | High   | 12 | 68.75 | 3.57 |          |

**Table 5.** Mean competency scores, SDS, F values obtained by the Mandal Coordinators with low, medium and high competencies in different areas

| S. No | Area of competency                      | Group  | Self Ratings |       |      |          | Consolidated Ratings |        |       |          |
|-------|---|--------|--------------|-------|------|----------|----------------------|--------|-------|----------|
|       |   |        | N            | Mean  | S.D  | F value  | N                    | Mean   | S.D   | F value  |
| 1     | Knowledge                               | Low    | 25           | 11.88 | 1.33 | 94.47**  | 14                   | 24.57  | 4.97  | 165.93** |
|       |   | Medium | 21           | 14.43 | 0.51 |          | 33                   | 40.36  | 3.78  |          |
|       |   | High   | 14           | 17.29 | 1.59 |          | 13                   | 50.46  | 1.45  |          |
| 2     | Training Management                     | Low    | 20           | 30.15 | 3.33 | 176.85** | 13                   | 110.38 | 12.73 | 109.28** |
|       |   | Medium | 19           | 38.63 | 1.95 |          | 36                   | 165.83 | 18.07 |          |
|       |   | High   | 21           | 48.57 | 3.76 |          | 11                   | 210.00 | 15.49 |          |
| 3     | Assessment and Valorization Of Learning | Low    | 23           | 5.04  | 0.83 | 61.65**  | 12                   | 21.17  | 3.35  | 92.08**  |
|       |   | Medium | 22           | 6.77  | 0.43 |          | 39                   | 35.64  | 4.92  |          |
|       |   | High   | 15           | 8.73  | 1.67 |          | 9                    | 50.33  | 6.38  |          |
| 4     | Motivation and Counselling              | Low    | 25           | 6.12  | 0.97 | 104.58** | 16                   | 13.69  | 1.85  | 189.53** |
|       |   | Medium | 25           | 8.40  | 0.50 |          | 28                   | 19.64  | 1.93  |          |
|       |   | High   | 10           | 10.60 | 1.27 |          | 16                   | 25.50  | 1.03  |          |
| 5     | Personal and Professional Development   | Low    | 19           | 2.74  | 0.45 | 236.43** | 14                   | 10.57  | 1.22  | 142.07** |
|       |   | Medium | 34           | 4.00  | 0.41 |          | 30                   | 16.07  | 1.86  |          |
|       |   | High   | 7            | 5.57  | 0.54 |          | 16                   | 21.38  | 1.93  |          |
| 6     | Total                                   | Low    | 22           | 60.32 | 5.44 | 122.32** | 11                   | 186.55 | 29.33 | 66.75**  |
|       |   | Medium | 21           | 71.38 | 3.11 |          | 41                   | 278.59 | 32.92 |          |
|       |   | High   | 17           | 86.18 | 6.52 |          | 8                    | 352.38 | 27.16 |          |

\*\*Significant at 0.01 level

### *Consolidated ratings*

The consolidated ratings in terms of self-ratings and external observation ratings reveals that 68.33 percent of them were rated as moderate followed by low, (8.33%) and high (13.33%). The area-wise distribution of the competency scores shows that majority of the facilitators were found to be moderately effective in the areas of knowledge (55%), training (60%), evaluation (65%), personal and occupational (50%) and motivation and counseling (46.67%). The distribution of competency scores among low and high groups is more or less same. On the whole, 68.33 percent of the facilitators were found to be moderately effect followed by low and more effective. The calculated 'F' test between three groups of facilitators clearly shows that there is a

significant difference between their competency scores indicating that the competency scores generated by using the valid pack were distributed more or less normally.

### **Recommendations**

(1) The valid pack can be used for assessing the competencies of the adult education facilitators in the Indian Context and it is able to segregate the facilitators based on their competencies.

(2) It is suggested that the sections on self-ratings and consolidated ratings should have similar attributes so as to compare the source of ratings and to arrive the uniform competency levels.

(3) The external observation and consolidated observations are yielding more or less similar trend and hence, only one source of ratings may be considered to reduce the time and manpower.

(4) In order to apply it in a massive scale, only self-ratings and external observer ratings need to be considered and the scale should yield a score so as to enable to classify the facilitators based on their competencies. The present scale does not have such facility. Hence, there is a need for modification and adoption depending on the local context.

(5) While choosing the Mandal Coordinators, priority may be accorded for those who belong to scheduled castes / tribes, post graduates with B.Ed qualification, unmarried, low income, with prior experience.

(6) The in-service training programmes may be organized for those who are less competent in the above selected areas such as knowledge, training management, assessment and valorization of learning, motivation and counselling and personal and professional development so as to equip them with the required competencies and to improve the quality of their participation in the programme.

## REFERENCES

- Axford, R.W. (1969). *Adult education: the open door*. Scranton: Intern. Text-book Co.
- Cass A.W. (1971). Materials and methods for adult literacy programmes, *Literacy Discussion*, 2(3), 22-23.
- Cobley, L.S. (1976). The qualities required of teachers of agriculture, training of agriculture and rural development. Paris: UNESCO.
- Knox, A.B. (1971). *In – service education in adult basic education*. Tallahassee: Florida State University.
- Malakondaiah, C.C. (1980). Characteristics of an effective instructor. *MSc Thesis*. Tirupati: S.V. University.
- Reddy, A.P. (1992). *Determinants of adult education - instructor effectiveness*. New Delhi: Uppal Publishing House.
- Reddy, A.P. & Devi, D.U. (2005). Personal factors relating to the performance of preraks. *J. Adult Education & Extension*, 1(1), 29-38.
- Reddy, P.A. & Kumaraswamy, T. (1984). Qualities of an effective adult education organizer from supervisor point of view. *Experiments in Education*, 12(1), 10-14.
- Tripathi, V. (1977), Training of instructors for non-formal education programme. *Literacy Work*, 6(2), 35-50.
- Yesanna (1986). A study of certain factors relating to the instructors effectiveness in the adult education programme. *MSc Thesis*. Tirupati: S.V. University.

✉ Prof. Dr. P. Adinarayana Reddy, Director,  
Department of Adult and Continuing Education,  
S.V. University, Tirupati, INDIA  
E-Mail: [pareddysvu@yahoo.co.in](mailto:pareddysvu@yahoo.co.in)

✉ Dr. D. Uma Devi, Assistant Professor,  
Centre for Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy,  
S.K. University, Anantapur, INDIA  
E-Mail: [umadevi\\_doddapaneni@yahoo.co.in](mailto:umadevi_doddapaneni@yahoo.co.in)

© 2013 BJSEP: Authors

