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From 2013 to 2016, curriculum developers at the Tanzania Institute of Education collaborated with researchers at the University of Dodoma, University of Bristol and Aga Khan University to develop and pilot bilingual textbooks that support language learning across the curriculum. This was the Language Supportive Teaching and Textbooks (LSTT) project.

For more information on LSTT project and to download our books visit: https://lstttanzania.wordpress.com/

Participants representing 18 organisations joined curriculum developers from Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE) and teacher educators from the University of Dodoma (UDOM) to debate the implications of LSTT findings for:

- implementation of the new language in education policy;
- the design of textbooks; and
- teacher education and professional development.

Participants represented different types of organisations, who are working to improve secondary education in Tanzania, including teachers, teacher educators, publishers, the Ministry of Education, media and projects/programmes.

Outline Programme

Morning
- Registration, welcome and opening by Dr. Elia Kibga, Acting Director General
- Presentations on LSTT project
  - Language learning across the secondary curriculum
  - Designing the LSTT textbooks
  - Using the LSTT textbooks
  - Emerging findings from evaluation of LSTT textbooks
- Participants invited to debate:
  - How can findings of this and similar work inform Language of Instruction (LoI) policy?
  - What can we learn from LSTT project: for classroom practice; design of learning materials and language in education research?
- What practical steps should we take to implement language supportive pedagogy on a large scale?

Afternoon
- Short presentation: Enabling teachers to support language learning across the curriculum
- Participants invited to debate:
  - What can be done to make INSET/PRESET more language supportive?
  - How can our proposed plans for phase two be improved to address language supportive needs of pre-service and in-service education?
Prof. Casmir Rubagumya (chair) opened the event by setting the LSTT project in the context of the language transition between primary and secondary education. He reminded participants that the recent Tanzania Education and Training Policy (URT 2014) had two paragraphs on language, which were contradicting sentences.

Dr. Angeline M. Barrett presented on objectives of the research, its basis in previous research on language in secondary education in Tanzania and theoretical basis in sociocultural and sociolinguistic theories of learning. She briefly outlined the process of baseline survey, drafting, reviewing and piloting chapters through which the books had been developed.

Two English teachers talked about their experience of using the textbooks. Mwl. Evarist Mkoba (Kiroka Secondary School) and Mwl. Florian Anastazi (Msanga Secondary School) confirmed that the books were helpful for students in rural community schools. They were easy to read and the glossaries were useful. However, there needed to be more words in the glossaries. Low income households have to prioritise their expenditure and if there were glossaries the students did not need to purchase extra dictionaries. The books had many activities. There was some discussion as to whether glossaries should appear on the page where the word first appears, in the back of the book or last. Mwl. Anastazi later commented that it took time to conduct activities in Kiswahili, making it difficult to complete the curriculum.

Dr. Francis William reported on findings from the evaluation of the books. They books had been piloted in 8 to 14 schools in Dodoma, Morogoro and Lindi. Emerging findings from initial data analysis show significant improvement in Mathematics vocabulary, in vocabulary, reading and writing in English.

Prof. Kalafunja Osaki presented findings for Biology showing significant improvements in reading and vocabulary and in writing about Biology.

Mwl. Omary Luzalia (Msanga Secondary School) confirmed that the books were useful for Biology. First because the students did not have any textbooks before. Second, they were able to read these books. Third, teaching became much easier as he could refer to illustrations in the books and ask students to talk about these.

Dr. Prosper Gabrieli presented findings from the verbal assessment conducted with groups of 8 students, showing that students gained the confidence to ask questions, discuss in pairs and in larger groups using either Kiswahili or English, and to produce written statements in English.

Dr. Angeline M. Barrett drew out conclusions from the research highlighting (i) allowing the use of Kiswahili seemed to reduce the atmosphere of fear in the classroom and allowed for students to start talking and participating; (ii) language supportive pedagogy appeared to be a better way of doing English Medium Instruction but the research did not compare language supportive teaching with Kiswahili medium instruction and cannot comment on this; and (iii) collaboration between subject and language specialists had been extremely productive.
Morning Session - summary of discussion

Participants divided into six groups to discuss the following questions:

- How can findings of this and similar work inform LoI policy?
- What can we learn from LSTT project: for classroom practice; design of learning materials; and for language in education research?
- What practical steps should we take to implement language supportive pedagogy on a large scale?

How can the findings of this and similar work inform LoI policy?

Report from Group 1

- Language is a challenge at all levels of secondary education and not just F1, so how can we develop and implement LSP across all levels of secondary? Should we use both Kiswahili and English in F1 or also in higher grades?
- Does teaching using English as LoI help learners learn English or does it just make the secondary education experience more difficult? If you want learners to learn English use a different strategy besides using English as the medium of instruction. You may have bilingual education but still teach English and Kiswahili language as disciplines so students can develop competence in these subjects.
- Teachers need to be trained in how to use both English and Kiswahili in instruction and materials need to be prepared BEFORE [a bilingual] policy is implemented.
- There is a great need for collaboration between subject teachers and language teachers.

Group 2

- We must use Kiswahili as a resource towards learning English as a subject
- Language supportive pedagogy must be implemented in teachers colleges to prepare teachers
- Books only need to be prepared for F1 because this is the transitional year.
- TIE’s current curriculum review can take up the findings of this project

2 What can we learn from LSTT project for classroom practice; for designing learning materials; and for language in education research?

Group 3

(i) for classroom practice?

The books are written in friendly language that allows interaction between students and teachers. Because students are taught in simple language it gives them confidence to participate in discussion. Moving from the known (Kiswahili) to the unknown (English), gives students the ability to understand more.

(ii) for design of learning materials?

Presentation of the LSTT books is good. The materials are presented in a way that promotes activity based learning including observing, listening, reading talking and writing. This approach can be adapted in the preparation of other materials.

(iii) for language in education research?
Research could look into how to reorganise the materials for teaching and learning and how to better promote language skills in the teaching and learning environment.

**Group 6**
Groups 6 presented an evaluation of the LSTT textbooks:
- Both teachers and learners are learning when using these materials
- They take into consideration the student-centred approach and active learner participation
- Most of the materials are relevant to the Tanzanian context but there is gender bias and professional errors\(^1\) in some of the illustrations.
- The books indicate teaching methods as well as subject content
- Speaking, writing and reading skills are all covered
- The approach taken is supported by a large body of research that learning of a second language builds on mother tongue language competencies

When it came to implementing books they observed that examinations drive teaching. Teachers will not adopt new practices if they are not complemented with the exam. They may teach in simple language but the examination may continue to use complicated language.

**What practical steps should we take to implement language supportive pedagogy on a large scale?**

**Group 4**
Group 4 identified four steps:
1. Knowledge/ awareness: stakeholders should be given knowledge about this kind of pedagogy. Teachers should be aware, parents should be aware as well as policy makers and education managers.
2. Curriculum review: curriculum should be reviewed in order to be language supportive in all subjects, in sciences and humanities. The curriculum should give direction for the use of LSP.
3. LSP in teacher education: universities and TCs should design programmes that aim at providing prospective teachers and continuing teachers with necessary skills to use LSP in schools.
4. Preparation of books: Sufficient books need to be prepared, which are language supportive and compatible with the curriculum.

**Group 5**
Group 5 recommended the following five steps:
1. Language supportive pedagogy should be accepted by policy makers
2. So that TIE prepare teaching and learning materials, TIE and publishers should be trained in how to write language supportive books.
3. Train in-service teachers through Teacher Resource Centres in how to use language supportive materials.
4. Train preservice teachers by involving teacher educators and enabling them to practice the pedagogies they preach.
5. Seek collaboration of our government together with development partners.

\(^1\) One member pointed out privately that in the nursing pictures, a nurse is shown injecting a child from the back-against the norm; also another holding the syringe with two hands-these need to be corrected
Discussion

Culture of student silence in F1 classrooms: what is the cause?
There was some debate as to whether student silence in the classroom was entirely due to language competencies or was driven by culture, including the institutional cultures of schools. A secondary school student was quoted as saying that the school culture expected them to listen rather than speak in F1 and only to start to produce language in F4. Views ranged on this with participants drawing on their own experience as students, teachers and researchers. One participant, remembering his own school experience asserted, "Silence in the classroom is not because of culture but language and maybe I am one of the victims." Another told us that in her experience as a teacher in Dar es Salaam, participation depends on discipline and the activities that teachers prepare and culture is not a big factor. There were also observations that some teachers equated good teaching with a quiet ‘orderly’ classroom. There was agreement that culture is dynamic and cultures of classroom, school and wider society can and should be challenged.

The process of writing teaching and learning materials.
It was observed that material design needs a baseline study and to involve teachers and other stakeholders, such as curriculum experts and language experts rather than an author locking themselves in a room to produce materials. A publisher responded that ideally, a textbook is written by a practicing teacher and trialed in schools before being taken to TIE for approval.

The relationship between textbook and syllabus and the role of TIE.
It was observed that a good textbook needs a good syllabus and the methodology of LSTT books could inform syllabus design. TIE clarified that they were able to collaborate in writing the books in a spirit of innovation as a professional and academic institute and draw on LSTT findings to influence policy. However, TIE’s participation is not a guarantee that the completed books will be authorised for use in schools because authorisation is not an exclusive prerogative of TIE alone.

Demand from parents
Take up of language supportive materials depends on demand from parents. It was asked whether LSTT had attempted to engage parents. [We did not, but previous research on which we built, such as the EdQual research, has included surveys of parents’ views on language of instruction.]

Chair round up (Prof. Rubagumya)
1. We need teachers to be involved as they are at the ‘class roots’ and without them an innovation is doomed to fail. This involves engaging with teacher training - both INSET and PRESET - as well as teachers on the ground. All of which implies planning.
2. The language supportive innovation depends on collaboration between subject teachers and language teachers. Every teacher should see themselves as a language teacher because in education, knowledge is imparted through language.
3. Kiswahili is a resource for learning English, it is not a problem. A language cannot be a problem.
Afternoon session

Dr. Noah Mtana briefly presented on the importance of teachers, teaching practice and therefore teacher education in the implementation of language supportive practices. Dr. Angeline Barrett briefly outlined plans for Phase Two of LSTT.

Participants were invited discuss the following questions:

1. What can be done to make INSET/PRESET more language supportive? [Teacher education (communication skills & other courses); In service education and training]

2. How can our proposed plans for phase two be improved to address language supportive needs of pre-Service and in-service education and training?

Question 1: What can be done to make INSET/PRESET more language supportive? [Teacher education (communication skills & other courses); in-service education and training]

Group 6

PRESET

- Language supportive methodology should be incorporated into the methodology course within the training.
- TV programmes and videos could be used to demonstrate language supportive practice
- Language supportive pedagogies could be integrated into communication skills courses
- The PRESET courses should be taught in interactive ways and not as lectures
- Teachers themselves will have large classes when they are posted to schools, so PRESET should model participative teaching with large classes

INSET

- INSET is more difficult. The cascade model fails because of the per diems culture and dilution of course content down the road.
- Teacher Resource Centres might provide a good structure through which to cascade [the language supportive] methodology.
- It could be incorporated into modules that teachers need to pass in order to gain an increment or promotion. (This strategy could also work with gender awareness and other areas of professional knowledge/development.)

Group 5

PRESET

Include language supportive pedagogy as a module or topic in one of curriculum courses and within Communications Skills because these are core courses for all students.

INSET

Training through Teacher Resource Centres is less costly than other ways such as school based approach. But who will do the training and how frequently?

Group 4

PRESET

- Seminars and tutorials are important for pre-service.
- A ‘language supportive’ philosophy should pervade pre-service. Every subject teaching methodology course should incorporate this ‘philosophy’.
• Demonstration schools can model LSP.
• Teaching Practice, can be supported by experienced teachers e.g. those involved in the Baseline programme, who provide mentorship.

INSET
• Seminars, workshops and short courses designed by educational institutions.
• Universities as research agents can embark on research on LSPs. Knowledge from research can be disseminated to raise stakeholders' awareness.
• Baseline has a language course for subject teachers that has been handed to the Ministry.

How can our proposed plans for phase two be improved to address language supportive needs of pre-service and in-service education and training?

Group 3
• Design and improve materials for training teachers both in the colleges and during programmes.
• Team up between teacher educators and facilitative team (wherever they are)
• INSET - very few teachers attend these programmes. Design a way of reaching these teachers. E.g. Cascade model, a good number attend.
• INSET for all teachers, not a few.
• If teachers attend workshops, how do we know they have achieved our objectives? Assess them.
• A good number of teachers are involved in the orientation programme but in schools it is not yet implemented.
• Bring awareness that everyone in the school or college is responsible for teaching communication skills or baseline.

Group 2
PRESET
• Incorporate LSP in universities, for lecturers or tutors. Use more efforts to change mindset of lecturers and tutors, especially those who are not language experts. Some colleagues believe that LSP should be left to language teachers.

INSET
• Use the pilot schools. Teachers in those schools can invite teachers from nearby schools.
• Teacher Resource Centres are time consuming but can have an impact on resources.

Group 1
• Build a network team that involves all stakeholders, including education officers, 'those who have authority’
• There are other ways of disseminating besides cascade - posters, advertising in magazines, radio.
Discussion

Drawbacks of cascade are well known.
We need to include inspectors and education officers
How can we sustain the impact, interest and momentum stimulated by a workshop?
INSET may be achieved through professional learning groups that have commitment and ownership from teachers, who are supporting each other.

There are positive and negative incentives. Money is a negative incentive. Positive incentives include promotion and non-financial incentives (prizes, recognition), which can keep teachers interested in what they are doing.

Can teachers be organised or self-organise into clubs or professional groups to sustain an interest in pedagogy? These could be facilitated and recognized by the district authority. Zimbabwe has a teacher reward system that could serve as a model, whereby increments are awarded when a teacher not only completes an INSET course but also has demonstrated a level of proficiency.

Close

Dr. Elia Kibga closed the workshop. He noted that material development is cumbersome but has the potential to develop the capacity of people in different fields, making people change their paradigms and way of doing things.

TIE is happy to be part of the project. The output will come to TIE for approval and dissemination will involve TIE. TIE is oriented towards disseminating innovations. It has a mandate to write curriculum material and a department providing training in curriculum implementation to teachers.

Language supportive pedagogy could be included within the institutionalised system of INSET that is popular and effective. Designed in 2009, it involved many people, including universities. It has a special document approved by the government, includes ICT as part of pedagogy and methods for translating competencies based project.

For more information on LSTT project and to download our books visit: https://lsttttanzania.wordpress.com/