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Introduction

Many of the values, habits, and techniques of literate social discourse originate in the home. Competent teachers reinforce and extend these through formal school activities. But the attitudes and skills children acquire in school become meaningful when teachers have the technical capacity to connect classroom learning to important people and real events in children’s daily lives, their families, and their communities. The true value of reading and writing emerges when these become tools children use to construct a richer understanding of themselves and the diverse people in their communities.

In many countries of the economically developing world nearly half the national populations are children and youth. Thus a strategic plan for bridging cultural divisions must include an organized educational approach aimed directly at youth and their families. Such an educational approach must provide teachers and learners with literacy techniques that promote critical thinking, reflection, and tolerance. Through pedagogy the values of critical literacy, cultural pluralism, and social cohesion can be introduced in the context of formal education and embedded in the cultural life of the community itself.

This report describes a staff development intervention conducted in three sites in Nigeria during 2004, with support of World Bank Headquarters (CEERD Initiative) and World Bank Nigeria mission. The purpose of this intervention was to test ideas about literacy, pedagogy, and social cohesion in Nigeria, a cultural context with sharp ethnic, linguistic, religious, and geographic features.

Multicultural Pedagogy, Literacy, and Social Cohesion

Enabling teachers, supervisors, and teacher educators to develop a multicultural literacy approach to social cohesion was the central organizing idea of the International Reading Association’s recent initiative in Nigeria and its collaboration with the Universal Basic Education Commission and the World Bank. Teacher professional development programs tend to focus on principles of constructivist teaching, without aggressively framing these activities in a multicultural perspective. This initiative was intended to develop and field test procedures for introducing the concepts and techniques of multicultural literacy pedagogy. It was an experiment to see how well teachers in Nigerian primary school classrooms might apply ideas of multiculturalism, student-centered literacy pedagogy, and critical thinking in pursuit of their goal of enhancing the reading achievement of their pupils, particularly those learning in a second language.
Materials and content drew from extensive evidence-based research carried out by International Reading Association’s membership.¹

Literacy pedagogy, the teaching of reading and writing, as well as the application of reading and writing strategies in the subject areas can be used to harmonize the dual objectives of basic education and social cohesion. Primary school teachers strive to enable their pupils to develop skills in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and composition. A multicultural literacy pedagogy helps guarantee learning outcomes pertaining to basic education.

When teachers ignore the influence of pupils’ unique cultural identity (their gender, mother tongue, ethnicity, etc.) they make learning to read and write more difficult. When teachers are aware of their students’ cultural identities and the impact these identities have on pupils’ cognitive, affective, and social development, and when they have specific teaching techniques to link learning and culture, they help to ensure that all pupils will succeed. Teachers must make a conscious decision to become responsible for supporting diverse learners. Then, they must have the practical knowledge to do so.

Constructivist teaching describes this concept of learning as the process of building on students’ cultural background knowledge and identity. In a sense, all learning is constructed by linking new information and experiences to one’s past knowledge and experience. This contrasts with the pedagogical alternative of rote memorization or behavioralist teaching. Behavioralist teaching makes no attempt to connect information to students’ lives. Information is learned perfunctorily and is often valued only by the teacher. Constructivism makes abstract ideas accessible. It makes new information meaningful.

We read a new story thinking about how this story is like other stories we know. We learn about story characters and compare them to real people we know. We predict ways story characters will solve problems by thinking about how people in our family or community solve similar problems. Our individual background experiences, our previous lessons in real life, are important lenses for processing new information. A teacher can guide pupils to making these connections between the new and the familiar or he can ignore these powerful cognitive processing supports.

The content of subject matter texts (e.g., science, history, geography, health, etc.) can pose a challenge for pupils. For pupils learning in a second language, vocabulary and grammar can be particularly difficult barriers to learning. A teacher may introduce new vocabulary using techniques that help learners attach meaning to their background experience. She can choose to ignore her pupils’ familiarity with their own mother tongue or she can help pupils explore cognates and conceptual connections between their first and second languages.

Teachers can facilitate their pupils’ development as writers by building on the pupils’ cultural backgrounds. Young children come to school with ideas about language. Skillful teachers harness this background knowledge to aid students’ development in spelling and sentence composition. Children develop experience with the way texts, spoken or written, are structured (e.g., as songs, prayers, games, reports, and stories). They have learned informally—by observing their parents and family—how language functions to inform, entertain, or command. Teachers can use pupils’ cultural background knowledge, traditions, and values to help them construct written texts along familiar patterns and purposes.

When teachers use techniques that build on students’ background knowledge and encourage diverse interpretations and productions, the constructivist approach becomes student-centered. A student-centered, constructivist multicultural literacy pedagogy enables pupils to achieve basic literacy competency by making the processes and content of learning meaningful. A student-centered classroom is a socially inclusive classroom. In such a learning environment all pupils are expected to achieve at high levels and all pupils receive appropriate pedagogical supports to ensure that this expectation is realized.

Multicultural literacy pedagogy is an effective way to leverage cultural competence. As learning tools, reading and writing cut across all disciplines and all grade levels. When teachers use a multicultural literacy pedagogy in the teaching of history, geography, science, or mathematics they open up important possibilities for critical thinking, reflection, cooperative learning, and social application. By infusing multicultural literacy pedagogy in the teaching of content area subjects (math, science, social studies, etc), teachers have multiple opportunities to use techniques that enable pupils to develop, practice, and expand their literacy skills. Learners also develop an understanding that reading and writing enable thought and expression to cross time, space, and culture.

Language and literacy can be used to divide people or to unite them. By developing both communicative and cultural competence, pupils become better suited to make sense of traditional school content and to develop an awareness of the traditions and histories of other cultures.

The outcomes described above are neither unrealistic nor limited to particular contexts. What is unrealistic, however, is to expect they will occur on their own. To achieve the basic cognitive, affective, and social goals of the national curriculum, teachers must have an understanding of the central features and purposes of multicultural literacy pedagogy. They must possess a working repertoire of student-centered constructivist teaching techniques. And they must have the ability to adapt these concepts and techniques to their existing curricula, instructional materials, and classroom contexts.

The multicultural literacy pedagogy introduced in this program was intended to achieve two important and reciprocal goals: to implement a pedagogy that builds on pupils’ diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds to improve basic literacy, and at the same time use students’ emerging skills with reading and writing to help them explore their
own culture and the cultures of others. Both goals, literacy and cultural competence are essential for creating stable, productive, and cohesive societies.

The remainder of this paper explores the promise and problems of multicultural literacy pedagogy and the lessons learned from the implementation of this approach. A brief summary is provided of the International Reading Association’s professional development activity in Nigeria (June-December, 2004), including a statement of goals and summary of procedures. A following section presents a discussion of the outcomes of this intervention. And a final section offers recommendations regarding the development and implementation of multicultural literacy pedagogy as a vehicle for creating social cohesion, and concrete steps recommended by the Universal Basic Education Commission and Primary Education Project II team in Nigeria.

The Project: Literacy Development Across the Curriculum

Project Goals

The professional development project designed and implemented by the International Reading Association was situated within a larger and ongoing action research activity organized by the Universal Basic Education Commission in Ile-Ife, Kaduna, and Owerri, carried out under the Government of Nigeria’s Primary Education Project (PEP) in 2001-2003. The main goal of that activity was to help states and local governments manage and implement Universal Basic Education efficiently and effectively. In an effort to improve educational quality, facilitators conducted research on how primary school teachers might structure learning more effectively in bilingual environments. Findings of a preliminary needs assessment showed that teachers were in need of methodologies that enable children to use language meaningfully and purposefully in both their mother tongue and in English in all subjects of the curriculum. The action research brought up issues that were directly related to the cultural components that make up Nigeria’s complex social fabric.

“Three major problems were tackled in this project. First is the problem of low professional output of the teachers at primary school level. The second is the problem associated with the teaching of reading, writing, mathematics, social studies, and primary science, using the English medium. And thirdly, the problem of using the mother tongue or language of the immediate community to achieve effective teaching and learning in classes 1-3 of primary school. Findings of the previous action research studies indicated the need for the improvement of the teachers’ academic and professional skills in order to promote literacy development in classes 1-6. They also pointed to the limited and inappropriate texts and materials in the primary school system.” (p. 2-3. Teacher-led Professional Support and Mentoring Project Phase III, Kaduna.)
The PEP research looked at current levels of student learning. The findings reinforced the need for technical intervention and professional support. Problems teachers cited included:

- *Pupils' inability to read, write, and speak in English*
- *Pupils' lack of textbook materials*
- *Lack of teaching facilities and materials*
- *Large classes*
- *Pupils' poor numeracy skills*
- *Poor teaching methods*

(p. 14 Teacher-led Professional Support and Mentoring Project Phase III, Kaduna.)

The PEP action research project had been in operation for over two years and had nearly completed its activities when the World Bank and the Universal Basic Education Commission approved an extension of activities to allow the implementation of the multicultural literacy initiative by the International Reading Association (IRA).

IRA’s program was intended to address three broad goals:

1. To provide classroom teachers strategies to help pupils develop literacy competence in their mother tongue or regional language;
2. To provide classroom teachers with strategies to help pupils develop literacy and content learning in English medium instruction; and
3. To provide classroom teachers with strategies to help pupils develop respect for diversity both within Nigerian culture and abroad.

The program proposed by IRA was developed to conform to the original goals identified by the teachers in the PEP research. These goals were aimed generally at improving pupils’ literacy levels. IRA’s technical approach also introduced social cohesion as an additional goal with the idea that cultural identity was linked to both basic education goals and social cohesion.

The project initiated by IRA in collaboration with the UBE and PEP facilitators was intended to help teachers and teacher educators develop some very specific technical and conceptual knowledge that would enable them to achieve their goals. Project outcomes proposed that all participants would:

- Acquire a set of constructivist, student-centered teaching methods to stimulate active learning, high levels of literacy achievement, critical thinking, reflection, and discussion;
- Use cooperative learning as a tool for stimulating opinions and promoting individual responsibility;
- Determine ways of using realistic fiction and non-fiction, reading comprehension, and composition to enable learners to identify attitudes, values, and beliefs relative to ethnic diversity, gender, and social cohesion;
- Acquire a set of research strategies used in assessing student learning, teacher behavior change, classroom dynamics, effective applications of teaching
methodologies, and effective use of existing teaching-learning resources for student achievement;

- Refine pedagogical approaches based on observation data; and
- Develop mentoring relationships that illuminate and support teacher needs.

The IRA intervention plan was expected to provide specific benefits to enable individuals from the UBE Commission and Federal Ministry of Education to document and disseminate methodologies that are appropriate for specific Nigerian contexts (e.g. classrooms with various language mediums, and resource levels). The initiative was also intended to inform scaled-up activities for key education personnel, within various education sectors, at the institutional level (e.g. teacher training colleges, curriculum developers, inspectors, assessors) and at the individual school level.

The introduction of a multicultural, student-centered pedagogy was expected to have immediate and direct impact on student learning, students’ self-concepts, motivation, and tolerance for diversity. Specifically, the program was intended to enable students to:

- Learn to read with fluency, understanding, and enjoyment;
- Develop basic inquiry skills, skills of observation and communication;
- Work independently and collaboratively on problems;
- Use critical thinking skills to identify alternatives and solutions;
- Engage in discussions that value diverse perspectives; and
- Apply all the above skills in all school subjects and real-life contexts.

**Program Preparation**

Draft program materials were developed from January to May 2004. Volunteers from the International Reading Association, experts in the field of teacher education and with background experiences in teaching from a multicultural perspective, started culling “best-practice” literacy pedagogy and developing model demonstration lessons. The IRA writing team included three teacher educators with extensive experience living and working in Nigeria.

A three-workshop series, with IRA technical volunteers acting as facilitators, was planned for June to December 2004. The program was integrated into the Primary Education Program by the Universal Basic Education Commission in Nigeria (UBEC), which was conducting action research on school-based professional development and mentoring in three Nigerian states (Osun, Imo, and Kaduna). Feedback on IRA’s draft materials was gathered during workshops and through an interim schedule of regular meetings with the action research teams’ school clusters. The action research teams included teacher educators and education researchers from Nigerian universities. The UBEC worked with IRA and World Bank Nigeria mission (which funds UBEC) to integrate the IRA piece as a value-adding component, in anticipation of future state-level professional development programs.
Workshop Content

A *three-part framework for interactive teaching and learning* provided an organizational structure for presenting all lessons regardless of grade level or subject area. Two key ideas form this pedagogical framework. First, learning is an interactive and constructive process. Learners engage with new ideas and information to create meaning and understanding and this engagement can occur before information is introduced, during the time when information is introduced, and after information has been introduced.

Second, the three-phase framework underscores the idea that teachers are responsible for insuring that all pupils are successful. The teacher uses specific, evidence-based teaching techniques at each phase to model, guide, and support strategic thinking and learning. For many teachers, the sense that responsibility for learning is shared between the teacher and learner (and may include parents and community, too) is a new conceptualization of the teacher's job. Interestingly, given the highly effective learning outcomes that result when such framework and techniques are implemented, teachers typically find renewed satisfaction, interest, and motivation in their jobs.

Finally, all training materials were developed to model ways that teachers might use a multicultural perspective in their lessons, using their existing curriculum and instructional materials. All training techniques were designed to be used by classroom teachers with a minimum requirement of experience and expertise in teaching or content background.

Each IRA workshop followed a *demonstration-debiefing-adaptation cycle*. PEP facilitators adapted this format when sharing techniques in their school cluster meetings. The basic components of the intervention include:

**Demonstration Lessons/Debriefing** - Facilitators used specific teaching techniques to stimulate adult learning, either in reading, writing, or discussion. Immediately following each demonstration of technique, the workshop facilitator led a thorough discussion in order to a) identify the technique and procedural steps, b) fit the technique within the three-phase framework, c) discuss how techniques guided their thinking, d) make connections between aspects of culture and learning to read and write, e) compare the techniques with current ideas about teaching and learning, and f) identify ways of
adapting techniques to fit different grade levels, subject areas, local texts, contexts, and curricular goals.

**Guided Adaptation** - Participants worked in groups to create adapted lesson plans using samples of Nigerian primary school textbooks and the learning goals of the Nigerian curriculum for science, mathematics, social studies, and English as a foreign language. Sample lesson plans were reviewed by the whole group. Participants received feedback from the group on their work. Implementation lesson plans were evaluated in terms of several criteria:

(a) to what extent did the lesson contain the three-phase framework?
(b) to what extent did the lesson contain the appropriate application of the demonstrated teaching techniques in each of the three phases?
(c) to what extent did the lesson address the learning goals of the national curriculum and the teacher’s instructional materials, and
(d) to what extent did the lesson build on ideas about culture?

Participants were encouraged to revise their lesson plans after receiving such feedback.

While this process supported local preparation of highly successful lessons, it also provided an important “performance-based assessment” of whether the project’s concepts and techniques were appropriate and whether a learning transfer had occurred.

**Classroom Observation and Visits** – Participants had an opportunity to test their sample implementation lessons with primary school pupils. While individual participants taught sample lessons (approximately 30 minutes each), groups of participants watched and recorded comments using a classroom observation form. Such forms also provided feedback to individual participants and added to the data on the efficacy of the multicultural literacy approach.

At the end of each workshop, participants received reference books that reflected key ideas and teaching techniques presented in the workshop. This material included a summary of the pedagogical framework, a brief discussion about literacy and culture, a sample lesson, and detailed procedures for each teaching technique demonstrated.

*In order to promote the sustainability of this professional development activity, the International Reading Association intervention introduced no additional pupil texts, no new instructional materials, or special equipment. Activities were implemented in the existing contexts of class time and class size. Instead of changing classrooms to fit the pedagogy, this intervention showed teachers how to fit the pedagogy to their classrooms.*

**Workshops and Interim Meetings**

The PEP team and visiting IRA volunteers discussed and modified the training materials over the course of the series of three workshops and interim meetings. Throughout the process of developing teacher-training materials, an IRA program officer maintained
contact and communication with World Bank colleagues (both in Washington and in Nigeria) as well as representatives from the Nigerian Universal Basic Education Commission. A core group of PEP team members (Imo-1; Osun-2; Kaduna-2) served as local facilitators throughout the program, with members of the Reading Association of Nigeria assisting workshop facilitation and creating additional content for final materials.

Specific program activities included:

1) An initial 5-day training workshop held in June 2004 in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. The purpose of this workshop was to introduce the multicultural perspective; the three-phase model of interactive, student-centered teaching and learning; and to test whether the model demonstration lessons were appropriate to enable participants to adapt training techniques to specific local texts and contexts. Although this was a relatively brief workshop and not intended as a training of trainers, the UBE facilitators attending this workshop viewed this as an opportunity to learn about and practice teaching techniques they could then disseminate to teachers in their PEP learning teams.

Approximately 25 Nigerian educators, administrators, and supervisors participated in this initial workshop. Participants included representatives from the PEP action research project as well as representatives from projects on language policy and representatives from the Nigerian National Curriculum and Assessment bureaus. Representatives from World Bank and the Universal Basic Education Commission were in attendance as observers. Volunteer teacher educators from the International Reading Association who had participated in the initial development of workshop materials facilitated the workshops. The workshop provided demonstration lessons, de-briefing discussions, guided lesson planning, and school-based implementation, using the format described above.

2) Sensitization. Due to some logistical delays in planning this first workshop, activities began shortly before the long holiday break for schools, and at the scheduled end of the Primary Education Project II team’s existing contracts with World Bank and Universal Basic Education Commission. They had to work with the teams on extending contracts and funding to accommodate the program.² The PEP II teams seized this holiday break time to conduct adequate sensitization at the local level, to ensure this program might be integrated into state-level teacher professional development plans for 2005-2008.

Following the May workshop, the PEP II team leaders from the Northern (Kaduna), Southeastern (Owerri-Imo), and Southwestern (Ife-Osun) zones each visited with Local Government Education Agency leaders and officials to obtain cooperation in extending their action research program. District Education Officers were then introduced to the program, and requested to participate in the next IRA workshops and in interim school

² World Bank Nigeria and UBEC limited the scope of activities IRA and its counterparts Reading Association of Nigeria could conduct, given funding levels available for local costs and numbers of parties already involved in the PEP II project. The project was also modified to adjust to the school holiday schedule, and to brief time available between May 2004 and the World Bank Nigeria mission’s review of state-level teacher professional development proposals, and the requisite activities already planned.
cluster meetings. Pre-project workshops for local education officials and headteachers in each zone focused on aims, objectives, modalities and demands of the action research, analysis, planning of school visits and weekly meetings, and modification of district working papers for the action research program."

3) *Follow-up* workshops were held by IRA in Owerri (Imo), Ilesha (Osun), and Zaria (Kaduna) in September and October 2004. These workshops provided opportunities for local facilitators to review specific teaching techniques and conceptual issues, and to learn additional techniques. It also enabled IRA technical volunteers to work directly with the action research teams and classroom teachers in the three zones.

Approximately 40 teachers and 5 local education supervisors/staff developers attended each workshop, or a total of 200 participants. These included Social Studies, English, Geography, Mathematics, Hausa/Yoruba/Igbo, and Science teachers drawn from a subgroup of PEP II schools which participated in their recent action research projects (Osun-6; Kaduna-5; Imo-5). This enabled a concentrated local focus on field-testing techniques, and for the teams to manage interim research more efficiently.

Each workshop lasted five days, and followed the same format and materials as introduced in the initial workshop. Action research teams and IRA volunteers provided feedback on techniques that were resonating strongly with teachers, in terms of mastery. The IRA volunteers and action research team members focused on concretizing a new lesson planning format, incorporating the three-phase "Before-During-After" framework, and specifying both curricular and literacy objectives. IRA volunteer teacher educators collected sample lesson plans for informal review of progress.

4) From July to November, *interim meetings* were held weekly involving PEP facilitators and the teachers in their regional teams in Ile-Ife, Kaduna, and Owerri. Demonstration, discussion, review, and sharing of experiences regarding the techniques and ideas of the Multicultural Literacy project provided additional opportunities for facilitators and classroom teachers to expand their familiarity with these techniques and education concepts. Interim activities were intended to help mentor and monitor implementation of workshop techniques, enable local facilitators to evaluate the participants as trainers and teachers, collect data on student learning, sustain momentum and interest in the intervention strategy, and to enable local facilitators to work effectively with IRA facilitators on the workshop agendas and revision of the project materials and approach.

5) A *review and consolidation* workshop was held in Owerri (Imo) in November 2004. The purpose of the workshop was to review progress of the action research program, assess local outcomes and achievements, and to devise a plan for sustainability of this program at the state level. A select group of PEP action researchers and consultants from Reading Association of Nigeria prepared new trainers' demonstration lessons, incorporating techniques that resonated well with teachers, and facilitated the workshop. Participants (30) included PEP action research consultants, local education supervisors from their school clusters, and UBEC and World Bank representatives. In terms of finalizing training materials, a significant outcome of this meeting was the ranking of
techniques by grade and subject level, based on PEP team members’ field experience at school cluster meetings. In addition, demonstration lessons using sample texts from Nigerian textbooks were produced locally for the final training materials.

6) A guidebooks revision meeting was held in Abuja, Nigeria in December 2004 to consolidate ideas about the project, and to revise materials based on field experiences and local and foreign technical expertise. This meeting also led to the development of a series of recommendations to the Universal Basic Education Commission on a training model and criteria for trainers at the state level. Participants in these discussions included representatives from UBEC, the core PEP team members, the Reading Association of Nigeria, and the International Reading Association. In addition to a summary report, the working group also prepared major training materials for workshop facilitators and a reference guide for workshop participants. These draft materials were delivered to the representatives of the Universal Basic Education Commission for dissemination at state and district levels. (See Appendix D “Ensuring Quality of Training for the Proposed Programme”)

Data Collection & Results

How effective was this brief intervention? Were there measurable and observable outcomes? If so, of what nature? To review, the International Reading Association developed a brief intervention model intended to achieve several specific objectives toward improving basic literacy pedagogy and promoting social cohesion. These objectives included:

1. to provide classroom teachers strategies to help all pupils develop literacy competence in their mother tongue or regional language;
2. to provide classroom teachers strategies to help all pupils develop literacy and content learning in English medium instruction; and
3. to provide classroom teachers strategies to help pupils develop respect for diversity both within Nigerian culture and abroad.

This pilot project was implemented somewhat differently than originally proposed, owing to the need to configure activities within the existing framework, schedules, and goals of the PEP project. Where the original plan called for direct contact with a consistent cohort of participants, the actual plan combined direct and indirect contacts with teacher trainers and classroom teachers. Where the original plan called for structured interim activities, the actual plan conformed to existing patterns and expectations of weekly meetings. Where the original plan called for a three-module course of workshops, the actual plan consisted of one module, with a set of regional follow-up workshops that were largely review and consolidation.

Despite these limitations, the model intervention did produce some interesting results. These results should help inform the Nigerian Ministry of Education, education representatives the World Bank, and others about the feasibility of applying a multicultural literacy approach to raise student literacy levels and to promote social
cohesion. The goal of social cohesion is not likely to be achieved in a single workshop or even a series of three staff development workshops. Neither are significant gains in pupil performance likely to occur after such a brief and limited intervention. Achieving such complex goals certainly requires more engagement and more time. However, a reasonable question for this pilot study remains:

To what extent did the concept and pedagogy of multicultural literacy lead to an observable shift in teachers’ approach to classroom teaching and the pursuit of their goals for improving basic pupil achievement?

A data collection system was designed to be integrated with the workshops and field activities. Data collection was built into the project design and implemented throughout the process. An inventory of data collection techniques includes the following:

1. *Exit Cards* collected at the end of each workshop day. These provided brief feedback on participants’ understanding of key workshop content.

2. *Workshop Evaluation Forms* collected at the conclusion of each workshop. These provided information regarding participants’ perceptions of the quality and utility of the workshop content.

3. *Lesson Plans* created by participants were collected throughout the workshops. These work samples provided evidence of information transfer and participants’ ability to adapt concepts and techniques to local context.

4. *Classroom Observation Forms* were completed and collected after in-class field-testing of participants’ lesson plans. These peer-review and trainer assessments provided data regarding the impact of innovative teaching techniques on classroom routines.

5. *Student Work* was observed and collected to provide evidence of impact on student learning and attitudes.

6. *Teacher Surveys* were given and collected to assess participants’ perspective on the utility of project framework and techniques.

7. *Anecdotal Observations* from IRA volunteers, PEP facilitators, and representatives of UBE/World Bank were collected throughout the activities and provided reflections on program effects. These reflections were further refined and consolidated during the culminating meeting in December 2004.

The data can be considered in terms of the overall project goals of enhancing basic literacy (in mother tongue and English mediums) and promoting social cohesion and respect for diversity. Although fundamental shifts in personal and organizational perspectives is beyond the scope of this small pilot study, several intermediate objectives seem to be appropriate precursors and pre-requisites to these long-term expectations for teachers and their pupils. These intermediate objectives might be addressed in the following research questions:

1. To what extent did Nigerian teachers grasp the pedagogical framework for interactive, student-centered and constructivist teaching?
2. To what extent were Nigerian educators able to adapt the specific techniques of multicultural literacy pedagogy to their existing texts, curricula, contexts, and previous ideas about teaching and learning?
3. To what extent were Nigerian educators able to grasp the connection between literacy and culture and to use culture as a perspective to promote students’ literacy development and social cohesion?

This section presents results in terms of each of these intermediate objectives, the data collection methods used, and a discussion of how these intermediate results combine to support the larger and long-term goals of improved literacy acquisition and attitudes and habits that promote social cohesion.

To what extent did Nigerian teachers grasp the pedagogical framework for interactive, student-centered and constructivist teaching?

Data suggest the project materials and facilitation was successful in this regard. The materials were presented on two different levels. During the first workshop, the participants were largely PEP II facilitators; these were highly skilled teacher educators or field supervisors. In follow-up workshops, participants were largely classroom teachers and local education officials. Data suggests that the program content was accessible on both levels.

Participants’ perception of the workshop ideas and techniques were positive. Responding to an opinionnaire, twenty-one out twenty-three facilitators rated the topics and techniques presented in the workshop as “very useful.” Open-ended comments from participants included:

- Easy to use...useful...innovative...enriching...fits well in current situation...relevant
- Used some of these in the past, but the workshop added new details on using them
- I am more aware of literacy development and multiculturalism
- Provided insight into alternative approaches
- Will contribute to radical transformation of readers
- Techniques were well-illustrated and everyone carried along
- All new to me...happy to see how effective they will be in classroom

The perceptions were equally positive when the program was introduced in regional workshops. A similar proportion of teacher participants in Kaduna, Owerri, and Ile-Ife reported the workshop content as “very useful.” Written comments from classroom teachers and local education authorities provide general feedback about the program quality. These include:

- Excellent lesson in use of modern ways of teaching reading and writing in the primary school.
- Presented a good suitable topic and teaching techniques
- Topics clearly presented, techniques straightforward and not confusing
- We improved knowledge about new techniques.
- Very successful and interesting. I’m going to adopt all the techniques.
These participant comments point out specific aspects of the workshop content they found most valuable. There are interesting differences between the facilitators (trainers) and the teachers. When asked to identify aspects of the workshop that were most valuable to them, teachers tended to list specific teaching techniques and were able to identify the techniques by the names used during the workshop (e.g., Literature Circles, Language Experience, Directed Listening-Thinking Activity, etc.)

When the teacher educators of the PEP team were asked to identify important features of the model program they commented on techniques, but also on the pedagogical framework, and the more conceptual issues of culture and literacy. This suggests that the model intervention was successful in transferring conceptual understanding. This conceptual knowledge would provide an important foundation if local facilitators had been able to provide more long-term staff development or coaching sessions. It remains to be seen whether classroom teachers would also have developed this conceptual knowledge given longer exposures, practice, and reflection.

**To what extent were Nigerian educators able to adapt the specific techniques of multicultural literacy pedagogy to their existing curricula, texts, contexts, and previous ideas about teaching and learning?**

Understanding new concepts and techniques is an important and necessary stage of professional development. The participants’ ability to transform these universal ideas and techniques to fit their local contexts, classrooms, curricula, and instructional materials was seen as a test of both the workshop training, the extent of information transfer, and the applicability of the program content. Data from classroom observations of teachers’ implementation lessons offered compelling evidence that teacher participants were able to adapt techniques from the workshop into their own classroom context.

At the outset, baseline assessment suggests that PEP facilitators observed minimal evidence that teachers had any working knowledge of how to use cultural connections to promote literacy, or how to use literacy to enhance students’ understanding of their own cultures. This was evident in the lack of connection between home and school. In instances where pupils come from a mother-tongue home environment that differs from the language of the school, teachers failed to recognize the value of helping pupils connect new language skills with their background knowledge. One observer commented during the initial baseline assessment:

“There was no single child who displayed work that had been done through solo effort in which the child drew from the home, community or school environment. There was no occasion in which we saw a child exhibit work done through the support of parents, peers, or siblings at home. Our inescapable conclusion is that for the pupils, they saw the school as a unique place or institution that had no relevance to their homes and communities. They made no efforts to connect their lives and the world around them to the school and class environment. We therefore saw to our chagrin that the pupils’ learning was not connected to the real world around them. Thus the relevancy of learning in the school to the day-to-day lives of the pupils was not made known to them.”
This ability shifted as a result of the IRA model workshops. Lesson plans developed by workshop participants offered evidence of their ability to adapt techniques to their existing classroom contexts and their own traditions and experiences as teachers or teacher educators and supervisors. The following sample lesson plan, developed by a teacher in one of the regional workshops, is typical of the work participants produced with guidance from PEP facilitators and IRA volunteers (additional samples can be found in Appendix A). The lesson plan reflects the teacher’s grasp of the program content and her ability to transform program ideas and techniques to fit her local context.

SAMPLE LESSON PLAN

Class: Primary 5  
Age: 10 years  
Period: 35 minutes  
Date: 23/9/2004  
Content: Reading Passage (Reward of Diligence)

Specific Objective: At the end of the lesson, the pupils will:
- be able to narrate the story in the passage (cognitive domain)
- agree to change their attitude towards learning by putting more effort to their studies (affective domain)
- be able to answer written questions from the passage (psychomotor domain)

Entry Behavior: They have been seeing pupils rewarded for their hard work.  
Instructional Material: Textbook (The Reward of Diligence)

Lesson Development:
Phase 1: Guided Imagery  
Phase 2: Shared Reading  
Phase 3: Word Detective

Evaluation:
1. Read the passage
2. Answer selected comprehension questions

Closure
Teacher goes round to check the pupils’ work, give corrections and mark their work.

The sample lesson contains evidence of the pedagogical framework introduced in the IRA workshop. In this sample, the teacher has divided the lesson into pre-reading, during reading, and post-reading segments. The teacher appropriately identified specific
teaching techniques demonstrated during the workshop. She uses these teaching techniques appropriately according to their position in the lesson and the effect she wants to achieve in guiding pupils' thinking and learning. The strategies she has selected are also appropriate to the text in her curriculum.

Although it is difficult to determine how the actual lesson was delivered in class, the plan provides insight into the teacher's thinking and her understanding of the basic ideas presented in the program. It reflects that the teacher may have acquired technical knowledge while conceptual understanding is still in development. For example, the lesson objectives in this sample plan are mainly performance outcomes and not strategic or process-oriented. The lesson lacks an explicit responsibility for teaching students "how to be able to..." Although such procedural information may very well have been modeled or explained in the actual lesson. On another point, the lesson objectives do not explicitly connect the topic of the text to issues of culture despite the fact that the topic is value-laden with ideas about "diligence."

Nigerian education tradition appears to require routine lesson objectives or dimensions: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. Considerable practice and coaching are likely to be required to help teacher educators, head teachers, supervisors, and classroom teachers map the objectives of a multicultural literacy pedagogy onto these traditional constructs. That is not to suggest that such innovative ideas are incompatible with traditional formats. In some cases labels might be expanded to accept new multicultural, critical literacy pedagogy. Affective objectives might specify motivating pupil’s engagement by linking prior experience, or personal values, to text. Cognitive objectives might be expanded to identify specific reading and writing strategies or critical thinking skills the pupil is intended to learn in addition to the content objectives. Nevertheless, the production of adapted lesson formats templates for local use represented a significant achievement in the project (See sample “Adapted Format for Lesson Writing,” Appendix B).

The ability to fit innovative pedagogy into the existing curriculum is further evidenced by the curriculum matrix developed by the PEP team and participants. This matrix matches specific teaching techniques introduced in the workshop to specific curricular objectives in social studies, science, health, language, etc. (see Curriculum Matrix in Appendix C)

The classroom observations of implementation lessons suggest that classroom teachers were able to implement the specific teaching techniques in their classrooms regardless of grade level or subject area. Class size did not appear to be a factor determining whether program concepts could be adapted. None of the PEP facilitators reported the classroom teachers in their clusters lacked sufficient competence in pedagogy to implement the techniques and concepts. None of the participating teachers reported that their pupils lacked sufficient language and literacy skills to use the techniques presented in the program.

One concern was whether the current textbooks and instructional materials used in Nigerian classrooms were suitable for implementing a multicultural literacy pedagogy. Participants’ lesson plans revealed a broad range of topics and texts that lent themselves
to cultural connections. These included math lessons about geometric shapes; social studies lessons about foods, holidays, and types of transport; science lessons about storms; and language lessons about family members. Teachers’ sample lesson plans also suggest they were able to use students’ home and background experiences to generate new classroom texts. These student-dictated texts were also used for instructional purposes.

Classroom observations by PEP facilitators and surveys of teacher participants suggested that teachers were successful in implementing workshop ideas and techniques presented in this multicultural literacy project. Observations further suggested that these innovative techniques had an immediate impact on the classroom environment and student learning. Facilitators reported observations of increased levels of student participation and engagement in learning activities. Survey responses collected from participating teachers suggested high levels of perceived effectiveness of teaching methods and program concepts. One consulting team summarized these teacher surveys as follows:

*The receptive rate of the techniques by the participating teachers was relatively high. For instance, KWL technique was rated as highly successful by 33.3% and successful by 50% of respondents (total favorable: 83.3%). Techniques that received the highest rating were Discussion Web (56.7% highly successful and 40% successful; total favorable=96.7%); list-pair-share (56.7% highly successful and 40% successful; total favorable=96.7%). Basically, every technique was found usable and successful at some level.*

(p. 34 Teacher-led Professional Support and Mentoring Project Phase III, Kaduna.)

**To what extent were Nigerian educators able to grasp the connection between literacy and culture and to use culture as a perspective to promote students’ literacy development and social cohesion?**

Both groups, PEP facilitators and teacher participants, found the technical approach easy to grasp and easy to implement. They also reported perceptions of impact of these techniques on student learning.

Survey results suggest that the techniques had a positive impact on student motivation and literacy performance. Classroom teachers identified the following changes in their pupils:

- 55% of participating teachers reported their pupils enjoy lessons more
- 45% of participating teachers reported their pupils develop ideas in a better way
- 43% of participating teachers reported their pupils used English better, and
- 40% of participating teachers reported pupils now read and write English better

(p.35. Teacher-led Professional Support and Mentoring Project Phase III, Kaduna.)

Teachers and PEP facilitators observed that the program intervention also had an impact on pupils’ strategic thinking and cognitive development, fundamental first steps toward the goals of social cohesion. For example, one local team observed,

“Perhaps the most important contribution is the critical, self-discovery thinking ability that the techniques stimulated in the minds of the pupils and their teachers. As they
thought in an acrostic way, formulated brainstorm web, cluster and concept maps, their
critical thinking acumen was greatly enlarged.”
(p.40, Teacher-led Professional Support and Mentoring Project Phase III, Kaduna.).

Although the traditional curriculum, the traditional lesson format, and the textbooks did not explicitly focus on the development of critical thinking skills, use of the teaching techniques presented in this program appeared to have shaped student behavior and student cognition. What’s more, due to limited experience with the techniques and minimal staff development, the participating teachers may have been unable to identify the development of critical thinking strategies as explicit learning objectives in their lesson plans. And yet, to some extent the techniques themselves may have led to these as inevitable outcomes.

The PEP team in Kaduna observed the use of program techniques to support critical thinking strategies by both teachers and students to articulate opinions or diverse perspectives. The facilitators identified specific teaching techniques with critical thinking outcomes.

“Certain techniques have been found to be useful for teaching at the primary school. Some of these are KWL, cluster map, concept map, story map, discussion web, vocabulary logs, think-pair-share, etc. These techniques should be built into the National Primary Education Curriculum and should form a part of all primary education teacher-training programmes.”
(p.43, Teacher-led Professional Support and Mentoring Project Phase III, Kaduna.).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The activities in this model intervention were designed and implemented with the goal of promoting social cohesion in mind. It did not seem realistic to expect that fundamental shifts in deeply held values or traditions would be achieved in a relatively brief span of time and within the overwhelming dominant cultural context. Many aspects of social cohesion pertain to personal values and attitudes that remain largely unseen. Nevertheless, this pilot program identified observable shifts in teachers, pupils, and classrooms.

In general the following observable behaviors evidenced preliminary positive shifts in perception, values, and attitudes. Participation in the project led to:

- Changes in instructional style of teacher educators and teachers
- Changes in classroom dynamics, such as level of peer exchange or group activity
- Classroom experiences that focused specifically on gender and cultural diversity in teaching techniques, lesson content, and classroom interactions

Findings from the various data collection activities and their analysis by PEP facilitators and IRA volunteers suggest that to some extent these shifts did take place, that they were widespread, and they were observable. The results confirm the validity of some important assumptions about the relevance of a multicultural pedagogy to the essential goals of improving primary literacy instruction and learning. The results also confirm the
accessibility and applicability of the teaching techniques presented in the program. That such positive and definite shifts were observable after only minimal staff development training suggests the possibility at least that a more extensive and large-scale training program could have important implications for student achievement and for shifts in social cohesion.

Learning to become an effective teacher is a developmental process. Like any learners, teachers go through various stages as they move toward mastery of their content and their craft. This pilot project illustrates that a developmental process is not necessarily linear. Some participants approached the program from a part-to-whole perspective, grasping first the essentials of the practical and specific teaching techniques; others proceeded from whole to part, beginning with the theoretical and conceptual issues of language, learning, and culture. Some participants were able to develop conceptual awareness of the relationship between culture and literacy.

The implications seem rather obvious. Can literacy pedagogy be used to promote social change? Even this brief pilot project seems to suggest this is absolutely so. As we have seen, pedagogy itself can be a power strategy for transforming teachers and classrooms. But truthfully, pedagogy alone is insufficient. Can teachers move from technical pedagogy to the sort of professional decision-making necessary to develop powerful classrooms and create social change? Based on this model intervention, the answer seems very likely so. The question is, under what conditions can literacy pedagogy transform teachers and transform classrooms? Four critical conditions should be addressed to insure that the potential of multicultural literacy is fully realized as a transformative pedagogy. Generally speaking, these are time, curriculum, support, research.

Teachers need considerable time to develop both technical and conceptual knowledge. The techniques of teaching are first learned as routine procedures. Over time teachers adapt routines to fit their individual styles, students, and the context in which they teach. The standard for effective staff development is typically about 100 hours of instruction. But this is only a portion of the time that needs to be invested. The sorts of fundamental technical and conceptual shifts required to effectively implement a multicultural literacy approach will require additional time spent on classroom experimentation and peer discussion. In other words, we might expect teachers to grasp the procedures of multicultural pedagogy rather quickly, as they did. But we should expect that mastery of such concepts; indeed, the ability to go beyond basic procedures will require consistent attention over several years.

Along the same lines, we might assume that pupils need considerably time in classrooms with such teachers before we should expect fundamental shifts in their achievement and their cultural values. Culturally, the information and values a learner brings to school develop over years and are deeply held. Linguistically, many pupils are learning to read in a second language. These cultural and linguistic backgrounds are considerable factors influencing pupil progress. It would be naïve to think that significant shifts in literacy or cultural competence could be changed without a long-term commitment.
A multicultural literacy approach requires strong curricular foundations and connections. Teachers and teacher educators who participated in this pilot study are obliged to follow the mandates of the official school curriculum. Pedagogy provides teachers with choices about how they will teach, not what they will teach. This pilot study pointed up two important directions for curriculum developers. Effective literacy instruction is directed by a literacy curriculum. In fact, an explicit literacy curriculum was missing in this context. Teachers are often charged to improve basic literacy, but given relatively few guidelines, goals, and benchmarks to help them plan their lessons and monitor their students’ progress and their own effectiveness. This lack of literacy curriculum was revealed in the sample lesson plans collected and classroom lessons observed. Teachers had difficulty identifying specific literacy information or strategies they wanted students to learn. If policymakers are sincere in their desire to improve primary school literacy, they must begin with a well-articulated development path for teachers to follow. The same holds for the cultural goals of social inclusion. If students are to develop positive attitudes for diversity, to learn how to work collaboratively in a community that includes people of different gender, language, religion, and background, teachers must have a set of explicit curriculum expectations.

While literacy should have its own developmental 1-8 curriculum, multiculturalism and social inclusion should not. But the concepts of social inclusion must be embedded within the content and subject curriculum at all levels 1-8. We would suggest that a multicultural approach must be reflected in the textbooks, literature, and assessments that guide instruction. Finally we would point out that the goal of social inclusion and cohesion needs to be visibly displayed to students and teachers throughout the school environment. This would extend as well to pupils’ families and the community that surrounds the school.

The pilot project pointed out the important role of mentoring and professional support. Few people embrace change eagerly, and teachers are no different. Support, in the form of information, permission, assurance, even commiseration, helps individuals cross these sea changes. Changing the way teachers understand and make use of culture in the classroom can be particularly difficult. The pilot project demonstrated that both teacher educators and classroom teachers benefited tremendously from mentoring. It was also very clear that peer-support played a very important role in sustaining teacher change. This support needs to be built into the regular school lives of teachers and teacher educators. This includes participation by school administrators, inspectors, supervisors, and other education officials. The PEP II facilitators’ regularly scheduled meetings with teachers offer an excellent model for creating a professional learning community. Schools should have a plan for institutionalizing this sort of activity.

We would also point out the value of the Reading Association of Nigeria (RAN) in terms of its potential source of professional support. This well-established professional society has had extensive experience organizing conference, conducting professional development programs, and creating and disseminating professional materials for teachers. In this activity, a number of the key participants were members of RAN. Individually, they provided informed leadership to the project. However, a local reading
association can continue to provide professional support long after these projects conclude. It is important that professional associations such as RAN stay independent of the local and national government (and from trade unions), however to do so they too need support from public and private donors.

Finally, this pilot project points up the need for local, independent research. Classroom teachers, administrators, teacher educators, and policymakers depend upon reliable and accurate information to plan, implement, and monitor education initiatives such as this. The Universal Basic Education Commission’s action research project illustrates the dual nature of research. On one level, research informs policymakers and practitioners. It captures lessons learned and measures outcomes. On another level, though, research is a valuable way for educators to reflect on their own experiences. In this case, the action research activities enabled local teacher educators and classroom teachers to construct their own meaning from this experience. The teachers’ response to this aspect of the project was very positive. This suggests that such research can be embedded within teachers’ daily lives and routines and that it need not be viewed as an extraneous or disconnected activity.

Hopefully, the teacher educators also profited from the research aspect of this activity. Field research can be a remarkably invigorating experience. It can help teacher educators re-connect with the realities of the classroom. It can also inform them in ways that should improve their programs of teacher education. As teacher-researchers continue to work, to publish and present their findings, their efforts will certainly contribute to the local knowledge base for educational quality improvement.

Implementing a widespread multicultural literacy program need not wait until policymakers have revised the national curricula, or until schools have restructured themselves as professional communities, or until local research agendas have been designed and funded. The pilot project has shown that it is possible for teachers to adapt the concepts and techniques of multicultural literacy to the existing context. (See “Ensuring Quality of Training for the Proposed Programme” in Appendix D)

We believe this pilot project confirmed the appropriateness of a technical (pedagogical) approach to social cohesion. A multicultural literacy pedagogy contributes to pupils’ development of reading and writing competence. It offers a way for contributing to their understanding of themselves and their world. This approach, when sustained over time, and guided by well-developed curricula, supported by teachers, administrators, and parents, and reflected in research will yield the only sorts of school results that truly matter—informed, engaged individuals with values and attitudes that build on a celebration of diversity and promote tolerance and social cohesion.

(Note: A videoconference discussion of this project can be found on WB’s B-Span page).
FURTHER INFORMATION

For further information, please see the following local reports generated on Universal Basic Education Commission and World Bank-assisted Action Research on Literacy Development Across Primary Levels -


APPENDICES
## Appendix A: Additional Lesson Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Osuji C. (Mrs.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>LEA Primary School Ja’afaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>6A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in class</td>
<td>38, 32, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>45 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Advantages and disadvantages of inter-ethnic marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Objectives</td>
<td>By the end of the lesson pupils should be able to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mention at least two advantages and disadvantages of inter-ethnic marriages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare and differentiate advantages and disadvantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Objectives</td>
<td>By the end of the lesson pupils should be able to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Read and explain the points noted down fluently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss what was read meaningfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarize the concept one after the other in few lines for retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous lesson</td>
<td>Pupils have learnt the definition of inter-ethnic marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual Materials</td>
<td>Brainstorm Web Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>KWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Use think-pair-share to help the pupils think about what they already knew about inter-ethnic marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>Let pupils write 5 things they know about inter-ethnic marriage. Share text to pupils in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Reading</td>
<td>Pupils should find out for themselves what they want to know about the advantages/disadvantages of inter-ethnic marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let pupils read information silently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow pupils to write down 10 things the notes talk about on the concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils should read what they have written down aloud with the aid of the teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Reading</td>
<td>Use discussion web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group them into two – boys and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competition carried out. Let them come onto the board according to representatives for judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let it be based on what they have learnt. Anyone who writes correctly is awarded two marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Full Participation: KWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation of teacher: KWL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction at all levels: Reading, writing and debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Evaluation</td>
<td>Pupils and teacher worked together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Performance</td>
<td>Pupils ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment</td>
<td>Pupils observe at home and write report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Pupils write up on the board, teacher corrects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Ladi Bature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>LEA Primary School Ja'afaru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number in class</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Extended Family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Curricular Objectives**

By the end of the lesson pupils should be able to:
- Mention at least four responsibilities of the family
- Say the importance of the responsibilities of the family
- Say the consequences of not carrying out one's responsibilities
- Discuss what aspects of these responsibilities their family has neglected

**Literacy Objectives**

By the end of the lesson pupils should be able to:
- Read about the extended family
- Discuss what was read

**Previous lesson**
Pupils have learnt about the nuclear family

**Audiovisual Materials**
Show the pupils a cluster map or chart of family responsibilities

**Introduction**
The teacher groups the class into four. Then show the pupils pictures of family.

**Presentation**

**Before Reading**
Tell pupils to read the text unit 1 to find out new information about the roles of each family member

**During Reading**
Pupils read the entire unit silently

**After Reading**
Pupils re-read silently the part of the unit that tells about roles of family members

**Method**
Think-Pair-Share

**Activities**

1. Pupils in group “A” are asked to discuss and list down responsibilities of the father
2. Group “B” to discuss and write down responsibilities of the mother
3. Group “C” discuss and write down responsibilities of girls in the family
4. Group “D” discuss and write down responsibilities of boys in the family

**Evaluation**
Teacher actively involved in activities with the pupils. The pupils actively discuss functions of their parents. Pupils participate fully, helping one another with spellings, etc. as the group leader lists functions of the family.

**Assignment**
Pupils observe roles of their family members. They write the names of their family and observe roles of each person.

**Conclusion**
Pupils say what they learnt, and the teacher writes down on the blackboard. These become lesson notes for pupils to copy.

*Note:* Teachers observed in this lesson that pupils were extremely active. In Group “B” an argument broke out with one student insisting it is the mother's responsibility to pay school fees.
Appendix B: Adapted Format for Lesson Writing
(Alvan Ikoku College of Education-Owerri)

Name of Teacher: Amadi, Nkemdilim R.
School: Central School Emekuku
Class: Primary 6
Average: Age of Pupils: 11 years
Date: November 4, 2004
Time: 40 mins
Lesson: Reading Comprehension
Topic: Two Strange Villages

Instructional Objectives: By the end of the lesson the pupils will be able to:
Cognitive Domain: 1. Read the passage fluently.
                 2. Discuss what was read.
Affective Domain: 3. Demonstrate interest in the lesson by participating in class activities.
Psychomotor Domain: 4. Use the techniques learned to write their own stories.

Literacy Objectives: 1. Identify/Define new vocabulary words from the story.
                      2. Discuss the main events in the story.
                      3. Identify and discuss supporting events in the story.

Entering Behaviour: Pupils live in villages or have visited relations and friends who live in villages, and can discuss their experiences.

Instructional Materials: Venn Diagramme
Before Reading: Set induction using predictive questions.
During Reading: Do guided reading and shared reading of text.
After Reading: Create Venn Diagramme of ideas, using Questioning method.

Pupil Evaluation: Pupils answer questions based on the text. Who are the main characters? What is the problem? What are the different events in the story? How did the story end?

Teachers Evaluation: Teacher reflects on her performance. Did pupils learn the message of the text? Were they interested? Did they participate in class activities?

Closure: The pupils help the teacher conclude the lesson by saying what they have learned and the teacher writes them on the chalkboard as summary.

Assignment: Pupils answer the following questions at home.
➢ If you have to write a story like the one you read, what will the title be?
➢ What characters will you have? What will be the problem?
➢ How many major events do you intend to include in your story?
➢ How will the story end?

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>STRATEGIES/ SKILLS</th>
<th>TEACHERS' PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>PUPILS' PERFORMANCE ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEP 1 Introduction: Before Reading</td>
<td>Set induction using Predictive questions</td>
<td>The teacher focuses attention of pupils to the passage through such predictive questions as: From the title of the story, what do you think the story is about? Will there be male and female characters? What do you think is the problem? What do you expect this story to tell you?</td>
<td>The pupils predict the answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP II During Reading</td>
<td>Guided Reading and Shared Reading</td>
<td>The teacher divides the passage into two parts. She reads the first part and asks pupils to read aloud guiding them to pay attention to key events. She allows half the class to read while others listen, and vice versa. The teacher asks them to check their predictions. The teacher reads the second part of the story and calls on groups and individuals to read. The teacher asks pupils questions on key points and from their answers she illustrates and compares ideas in the story using a Venn diagram.</td>
<td>The pupils listen attentively to the teacher's reading. They listen and take turns to read in groups and/or individually paying attention to the main ideas in the passage. They also check their predictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venn Diagramme and Questioning</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Venn Diagram" /> No Sleeping No Eating</td>
<td>The pupils answer the teacher's questions and participate in the comparisons of ideas in the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP III After Reading</td>
<td>Venn Diagramme</td>
<td>The teacher asks the pupils to form groups of five and using the Venn diagramme to illustrate and compare the events in the story.</td>
<td>Pupils form groups, illustrate and compare the main events using Venn diagramme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Curriculum Matrix (developed locally)

**TEACHING NIGERIAN LANGUAGES (PRIMARY 1, 2 AND 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>English Language</th>
<th>Nigeria Languages</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Primary Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  Acrostic Poetry</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Anticipation Guide</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Cluster Map</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Concept Map</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Directed-Listening/Reading-Thinking-Activity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  Discussion Web</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Dramatization</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Echo Reading</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Group Language Experience Method</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Guided Imagery</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 KWL</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Literature Circle</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Paired Brainstorming</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Read-Pause-Retell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Picture Walk</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Readers’ Theatre</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Role Playing</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Shared Reading</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Shared Writing (incl. Big Books)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Story Map</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Story Pyramid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Think-List-Pair-Share</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Quick Write (or 3-Minute Essay)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Venn Diagramme</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Visit-Other-Groups</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Visualisation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Word Detective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TEACHING ENGLISH ACROSS THE CURRICULUM (PRIMARIES 4, 5, 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
<th>Primary Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highly Applicable</strong></td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Applicable</strong></td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Acrostic/Poetry</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Anticipation Guide</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Cluster Map</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Concept Map</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Directed-Listening/Reading-Thinking-Activity</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Discussion Web</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dramatization</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Echo Reading</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Group Language Experience Method</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Guided Imagery</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 KWL</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Literature Circle</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Paired Brainstorming</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Read-Pause-Retell</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Picture Walk</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Readers’ Theatre</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Role Playing</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Shared Reading</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Shared Writing (incl. Big Books)</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Story Map</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Story Pyramid</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Think-List-Pair-Share</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Three-minute essay</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Venn Diagramme</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Visit-Other-Groups</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Visualisation</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Word Detective</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6 +</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
<td>+ 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Ensuring Quality of Training for the Proposed Programme: Literacy Development Across the Curriculum

Recommendations to World Bank and Universal Basic Education Commission
Prepared by Primary Education Project II Team Leaders and International Reading Association representatives
December 2004

This working group encourages World Bank to consider these Recommendations when selecting criteria for approval of state-level World Bank proposals. Given pressure will grow to implement state-level training quickly, it is important that policies and criteria related to locating high-quality trainers are prepared well ahead of state-level implementation. The Recommendations have immediate implications for planning.

Materials Distribution and Promotion

- National Teachers’ Institute should consider that these Guidebooks are adaptable for use in both in-service and pre-service contexts, and for training at multiple learning levels (secondary; tertiary)

- (International Reading Association) When integrating the Guidebooks with other programs, care needs to be taken to maintain all workshop components, consistency in terms, and to retain conceptual framework (Before-During-After framework)

Monitoring and Evaluation

- The guidebooks provide easy-to-use, multi-purpose observation tools which include qualitative measures for teaching/learning – use of tools will need to be advocated at multiple levels

- Other current observation tools for pre-service and in-service teachers will need to evolve/be modified in order to fall in line with approaches to teaching/learning represented in the Guidebooks

- Include interim follow-up and monitoring of teachers – a multi-purpose instrument is included in the guidebooks to be used consistently by all literacy facilitators during and between professional development workshops

Train-the-Trainer and Teacher Training Plans

- Training for this Programme can take place at state level and national level
• Training of trainers (TOT) programme, and training of teachers should not be less than one week; consider two weeks for teacher training (one week demonstration, one week guided practice at schools)

• A Core Consultant Team for “Literacy Development Across the Curriculum” should include - Adeyanju, Olaofe, Amadi, Emejulu, Onukaogu, Adelabu, Umolu – given their leadership in developing format of programme

• National Consortium of Colleges in Education should give Core Consultant Team strong advisory or governing role in identifying first two levels of trainers

• Recommended Trainer Criteria for Core Trainers (1st level) would include:
  - Mentors and Facilitators from the PEP II action research project on school-based mentoring (College of Education teachers, university teachers, members of Reading Association of Nigeria-RAN)
  - Participated in at least two (2) of the RAN/IRA workshops in 2004

(IRA and RAN members recommended that professional background in pedagogy and reading instruction be given high emphasis when identifying trainers; professional competency in these areas is highly important for program quality/success)

• A Review workshop can be produced and implemented for Core Trainers by the Core Consultant Team

• Another group of Mentors and Facilitators from PEP II did NOT participate in the RAN/IRA workshops. They are the 2nd level of Trainers in need of training.

• RAN/IRA could offer support in a) preparing and co-facilitating workshop(s) for Core Trainers by Core Consultant Team, and (depending on scope) b) support training of next level of trainers – proposals will need to be submitted to IRA and RAN by state-level representatives

• RAN/IRA will draw from similar programs carried out within IRA’s African network to provide co-facilitators

• Facilitators from other Nigeria Teacher development programmes that implement constructivist approaches should be considered for resource help and partnership

**IMMEDIATE TASKS/ACTIVITIES:**

• Provide opportunity for PEP II Team Members to present Literacy Development guidebooks to NTI

• The total training package/plan needs to integrate Literacy Development with the other PEP II components, including this working group’s recommendations
- Create TOT module/guidebook for training future Literacy Development Trainer teams

- An instrument needs to be prepared to monitor/observe trainers, with systematic implementation plans

- First trainer cohort needs to receive TOT, if possible, before state level activities begin implementation

- Develop criteria for trainers who have not participated in the RAN/IRA workshop (for the level after the Core Trainer Team)

- Suggestions for IRA and RAN involvement need to be fielded at state-level

- Proposals for IRA and RAN need to be submitted to IRA International Development Division and RAN President (copying Incoming President) in a timely manner to allow both groups to dialogue on collective resources (including IRA volunteers) they could provide (suggested 3-5 months ahead of teacher development implementation at state level)

- Planning for above needs to keep in mind where federal and state-level money should/could be earmarked