

Vote Education Funding
for
Adult Education:

The New Zealand Experience

Paper presented by:

Jennie Harré Hindmarsh
Senior Lecturer in Continuing Education
Victoria University of Wellington
PO Box 600
Wellington
New Zealand

To: The NZARE-AARE Conference
Deakin University
Geelong
Victoria AUSTRALIA
22-26 November 1992

Vote Education Funding for Adult Education:
The New Zealand Experience

Over the past decade a series of education policy reviews have debated the role of adult education (variously defined) in the overall provision of post-compulsory education and lifelong learning. In stating a case for adult education, issues and questions immediately arise with regard to the role of the state in adult education provision. More specifically, questions arise with regard to the extent to which Vote Education ought to fund adult education provision; the distribution of any such funding between the diversity of providers and learners in the field; and the extent to which the state ought to control and direct the use of any Vote funding provided – especially in relation to principles of economic efficiency and benefit, equity and the honouring of the Treaty of Waitangi. In short, the role of the state is under constant debate and is ideologically driven – the answers depend on the views held regarding the most desired purposes of adult education and whether those purposes fit those of the government and the most powerful interest groups in the community.

At the same time, learners and providers have struggled both with increasing demands for adult education provision in a context of decreased funding from the state and with increasing recognition of the inequitable distribution of any funding that is received. Despite a decade or more of rhetoric espousing the honouring of the Treaty of Waitangi and equity as principles to guide service provision, many know or fear that funding distribution and participation by learners continues, in most instances, to

dishonour the Treaty of Waitangi and to be inequitable.

In this context, it has been argued that more detailed research is needed to identify trends and changes in the percentage of government funding allocated to adult education; the criteria for its use; by whom and how that funding has been used; the characteristics of learners receiving services so funded – especially in terms of age, ethnicity, socio-economic status and able-bodiedness; and the relative 'effectiveness' of funding distribution through tertiary institutions, schools and community organisations (McGray, 1991, Harré Hindmarsh, 1992; Benseman, 1991; Lenniston, 1991).

In this paper, I draw upon research in progress to address some of these areas designated as of high priority. The main purpose of the paper is twofold. Firstly, it is intended to provide a summary of initial analyses of data readily available which indicates trends and changes in Vote Education funding to the field as a whole, by whom that funding was used (1985–1992) and a brief critique of funding distribution in relation to government and providers' stated principles for funding distribution. Secondly, the issues and research problems which arise when attempting to undertake more detailed analysis and tracking of Vote Education funding in the field of adult education are summarised and raised for discussion. Before proceeding, however, it is important to note that the term 'adult education' is itself problematic, and its problematic nature creates both difficulties when preparing a short paper such as this, and exacerbates the difficulties of researching the field. The latter difficulty will be discussed later, but it is also important to note definition problems at the outset of this paper. As many have noted before, we are confronted by a plethora of terminology used for the adult learners (eg see Tobias, 1990, pp. 1–4; Lenniston, 1991, pp. 1–4; Harré Hindmarsh, 1991). For the purposes of this paper's title, I have used the term 'adult education' as that is the title of this symposium. In general terms, I use 'adult education' as defined by the NZ National Commission for UNESCO, 1972, p. 5): '... the education of those whose main occupational role is no longer that of a student'. However, as the paper proceeds the focus narrows to particular subgroupings of provision – especially provision of short courses through tertiary institutions (universities, polytechnics, colleges of education) and schools and via community organisations and groups. This excludes some of the activities referred to by law (1987, pp. 64–64) as labour market (adult) education – education provided directly to meet specific vocational and professional development needs and provided through

unemployment schemes (eg ACCESS, MACCESS, PIACCESS), work based training, and tertiary institution based courses. Although it is difficult to calculate, Tobias (1990, p. 4) calculates that the labour market programmes attract by far the highest levels of funding (from both the state and private sector), for example, in 1987–88 approximately 39% of Vote Education's post-compulsory education budget .

In effect, the focus of this paper (and much of the policy debates) is an analysis of the allocation and use of a minute percentage of that post-compulsory education (approx 2% in 1987–88) by institutions and community

organisations to meet a range of education development needs – and some of which are labour market related.

VOTE EDUCATION FUNDING DISTRIBUTION – FACTS AND FIGURES

In this section I summarise, firstly, the facts and figures we have regarding the percentage of Vote Education funding to adult education (excluding most specific labour market funding) in general; and secondly, an analysis of how that funding has been and is now being distributed.

% Vote Adult to Adult Education

In 1985–86 the percentage of State expenditure on continuing and adult education from Vote: Education was approximately 1.03% (see figure one). In the He Tangata Report, IAGNE (1986) estimated that less than .001% of Vote: Education is delivered to those forms of education in which individuals and groups in voluntary associations control and direct their own learning. By far the largest proportion of funding which was allocated from Vote: Education to the broad field of community and continuing education was going to providers based in formal institutions such as schools, universities, colleges of education and polytechnics.

Figure One:

% Expenditure on Continuing and Adult Education from Vote: Education, 1985–86
from: NCAE (1985) Action for Learning and Equity: Opportunity for Change (p. 38)
Total Vote: Education = \$1,901,520,000

Notes:

*Community and Continuing Education figures are spread in all categories. The community and education total funding separated out is \$8,271,532 (ie 0.43% of the total Vote; 1.82% of the tertiary vote). However, this does not include funding to community and continuing education via universities and polytechnics. It does include Schools (\$5,622,000), Community organisations (\$630,532), Development Schemes (\$2,019,000).

*IAGNE (1987) in He Tangata (p. 6) estimated that less than 0.01% of Vote Education goes to those forms of education in which individuals and groups in voluntary associations control and direct their own learning. For the 1990–91 financial year, Marg Lenniston (1991) identified that the Vote Education funding allocated to the field of community education (including 05 EFTS and non EFTS distributions) was \$30 844 542; that is approximately 0.00072% of the total of Vote: Education and 0.0027% of dollars allocated to tertiary education. This was the situation prior to the 1991 and 1992 National Government budgets, and is represented diagrammatically in the pie graph in figure 2.

[1988–89 LFLG figures here]

Figure Two:

% Expenditure on Community Education from Vote: Education, 1990-91

Figures from: M. Lenniston (1991) Adult Learner/Community Education Review Funding Synopsis and Feasibility of Cost-Effectiveness Survey, Ministry of Education, Wellington.

Total Vote: Education = \$4,200,000,000,000 (\$4.2 billion)

* Notes:

- 05 EFTS = General Education in Tertiary Institutions (approx. \$15,572,000) is an inflated estimate, as 05 is a 'hold-all' category. Thus these figures include university and polytechnic funding.
- Non EFTS = REAPs, Literacy, Wairarapa CAP delivered via Polytechnics; School based community and continuing education; community organisations. (ARLA, CCANZ, WEA, Parent Centre Federation, Country Womens' Coordinating Committee).
- The 1991-2 Budget cut 78.7% of Community Organisation Non EFTS funding, thus the Non EFTS and 05 EFTS category is now less.
- July 1991 Budget cuts to this field were of \$1.2 million for 1991-2 and \$1.5 million 1992-3.

With the 1991-92 budget cuts, the funding allocated to the non EFTS groups was cut by 78.7% (Lenniston, 1991). In effect \$1 248 000 was removed from this field for 1991-92 and \$1 498 000 for 1992-93. Therefore the small section in Figure 2 allocated to community education (05 EFTS and non EFTS providers) has been even further reduced in the last two years.

This reduction is even greater than this, although figures are very hard to obtain to detail the exact amount of reduction. It is known that polytechnics, for instance, have reduced the amount of money they are allocating from their bulk funding to this field and many university Centres for Continuing Education are being required to raise more money to cover their programmes from the users of their services. Thus we can conclude, generally, that the share of resources from Vote: Education to continuing and community education is decreasing rapidly.

Vote Education Distribution Within Adult Education

Distribution to Providers

Figure 3 represents the allocation of funding amongst provider groups who received funding in 1990-91 (Lenniston, 1991). In summary, in 1991 the 05 EFTS tertiary institution category received approximately 50.5% of the Vote: Education funding that was allocated to the field of community and continuing education. As noted previously this figure is somewhat inflated as the 05 category is a hold all category that includes courses other than community education. School-based providers received approximately 38% of the funding and the remaining 11.5% was divided between those who received non EFTS funding via polytechnics (REAPs, literacy and Wairarapa CAP) and 4.5% to the community organisations listed earlier in figure 2. CLANZ distributed the bulk of its funding to non

formal groups in the community. However, since the 1991 budget that 11.5% has been reduced by 78.7%. In effect, community based organisations now receive 2.53% of all Vote: Education funding available to community and continuing education. In addition, there are many other provider groups (eg Te Ataarangi) who receive none of this Vote: Education money.
[Add in 1985, 1989 figures here]

Figure Three:

Who gets what from Vote: Education in community and continuing education?
(1990-91)

Source: Marg Lenniston (1991)

Notes:

- 1991 Budget:
Reduced Non EFTS funding by 78.7%
hence their 11.5% reduced to approx 2.0%
- Reflects 1983 National Government cuts

'Distribution' to Learners

We do not have many facts and figures which detail this. However in the short time available I want to make the following key points.

Firstly, we do have studies that show it has been – like all education services provided in this country – most likely for community education resources to be captured by middle class, white participants, and also by females – not the norm in other education sectors (Boshier, 1970, 1971; Waghorne, 1975; Wagemaker, 1978; Benseman, 1980). However, we lack up to date research (Benseman, 1992) to ascertain the impact of providers' attempts to address this issue over the past decade.

Secondly, if we run our eye down the list of providers who have, at least over the last decade, received Vote: Education funding it is easy to note that all are Pakeha based organisations, except the Pacific Island/multi-cultural resource centres. It is also significant to note that not one of the community organisations receiving such funding has been a Maori based organisation. Some of the organisations (for example ARLA) have been changing their programmes and delivery formats in order to better serve Maori participants and their percentage of Maori participants is increasing (Benseman, 1992). However few, if any of us, providers could claim that all Maori wanting or requiring programmes are receiving access to services, let alone services designed and provided by Maori.

Trends

This brief synopsis of the current state of affairs leads me to conclude that:

- institutional control over the small amounts of Vote: Education funding allocated to community and continuing education is increasing; and
- access to resources for women, Maori, lower socio-economic groups, ethnic minority groups and probably the less abled is decreasing.

Rhetoric and Realities

Three particular principles have been promoted as a basis for the distribution of community education funding resources in Aotearoa/New Zealand over the past decade. These are the principles of equality of opportunity, equity, and ethnic distributivism on the basis of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Equality of opportunity became a popular idea from the 1960s. Basically, under the principle of equality of opportunity, it is believed that dollars provided by the State should be used to compensate for the disadvantage or underprivilege some groups and/or persons experience. This concept is based on a philosophy of liberal egalitarianism. In popular New Zealand language, it means giving a fair go to all people. The rhetoric of equality of opportunity emphasises that elitism is undesirable and that all groups who experience some form of disadvantage or deprivation should be treated fairly and similarly. Maori should not be treated any differently

than any other groups or persons who are being disadvantaged or underprivileged.

Around the mid 1980s, the term equity began to take over from that of equality of opportunity. Equity is taken to mean equality plus fairness and justice. This rhetoric emphasises that persons or groups who are in some way underprivileged or who experience inequalities should be given a disproportionate share of the resources in order for them to achieve equal outcomes. Thus a catch phrase, unequal input for equal outcomes, was coined. The language of equity is evident in the New Zealand Labour party's education policy (1984) and the National Council for Adult Education 1985's policy document, Action for Learning and Equity: Opportunity for Change. The latter report argued that priority be given to the educational interests of those who are economically and socially vulnerable, both as learners and contributors to learning (Tobias, 1990, p. 9).

Sharp (1990) uses this term to refer to the principle for the sharing of resources that has emerged in Aotearoa/New Zealand in relation to issues of inequalities between ethnic groups. Initially, ethnic distributivism argued for multicultural distributivism, but in more recent years the idea of bicultural distributivism under the Treaty of Waitangi has become a prominent principle upon which to base the sharing of resources. Sharp (1990) defines bicultural distributivism as:

The doctrine that distributions should be made primarily between the two main cultures, Maori and Pakeha, and that since Maori and Pakeha were

ethnie worthy of equal respect, the distributions should be equal between them. It was not numbers of persons within each ethnue that weighted the balance; it was the equal value of each culture.

(Sharp, 1990, p. 227)

This argument is made on the basis of the Treaty of Waitangi and respects the position of Maori as tangata whenua. It is argued that the sharing of community education funding resources must be based on principles of equity PLUS special rights for Nga Iwi Maori as tangata whenua.

Concepts of biculturalism first appear in community education policy statements in He Tangata (IAGNE, 1986). The Learning for Life Working Group on Nonformal and Community Education took this a step further and based its arguments for the distribution of funding on principles of partnership, protection and participations as embodied in the Treaty of Waitangi and upon equity, along with other principles such as accessibility and cooperation.

More recently, upon entering as Minister of Education, the current National Government Minister Lockwood Smith, has suggested that the concept of fairness guide the sharing of resources. As yet we have no official, current government statements regarding the sharing of resources in this area so I must leave a question mark as to what the current principles are. The Adult Education Policy Project being undertaken by the Ministry of Education at this point in time should produce some clarity.

The preceding analysis indicates that distribution of funding has not achieved the principles of honouring the Treaty of Waitangi and equity.

The following conclusions can thus be drawn:

- equity in the sharing of resources is decreasing;
- Pakeha power and control of the resources is increasing despite the biculturalism rhetoric;
- thus the honouring of the Treaty of Waitangi and Maori rights is decreasing even further.

Therefore the initial analysis of available data suggests that fundamental changes are required in funding distribution and criteria for the use of funding by those allocated Vote Education money is required if these two principles are to become real in operational terms. However, it must also be noted that we require more detailed data regarding the profiles of learners who use the services so funded and of the outcomes of that educational participation for them.

ISSUES IN FUNDING RESEARCH

REFERENCES:

- Benseman, J. (1980) The Community College as an Extension of Educational Provision, *Continuing Education in NZ*, 12, 2.
- Benseman, J. (199)
- Benseman, J. (1992) Participation Revisited: Who gets to Adult/Community Education 1970-1990? *NZ Journal of Adult Learning*, 20, 1, pp. 11-19.
- Boshier, R. (1970, 1971) The Participants: A Clientele Analysis of Three NZ Adult Education Institutions, Parts 1 and 2, *Australian Journal of Adult Education*, X, 3, and XI, 1.

Harré Hindmarsh, J. (1991) – Masterton
– Terminology & defs

Interim Advisory Group on Nonformal Education (1987) He Tangata, IAGNE,
Wellington.

Learning for Life Nonformal and Community Education Working Group (1989)
Lifelong Learning – Nonformal and Community Education, Wellington.

Lenniston, M. (1991) Adult Learner/Community Education Review Funding
Synopsis and Feasibility of Cost-Effectiveness Survey, Ministry of
Education, Wellington.

McGray, D. (1991) Funding Trends in Nonformal and Community Education,
(Paper presented to Research Seminar/National Resource Centre), Masterton.

National Council for Adult Education (1985) Action for Learning and Equity:
Opportunity for Change, NCAE, Wellington.

Sharp, A. (1990) Justice and the Maori: Maori Claims in New Zealand
Political Argument in the 1980s, Oxford, University Press, Auckland.

Tobias, R. (1990) Adult Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand – A Critical
Analysis of Policy Changes, 1984–90, Unpublished paper, University of
Canterbury.

Waghorne, M. (1975) Adult Learning Activities in the City of Learning,
Department of Extension Studies, University of Canterbury.

Wagemaker, H. (1978) Participation in Three Adult Education Institutions in
Dunedin, MA Thesis, University of Otago.