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SETTING THE STAGE: A key tension

Fields of language and literacy:
central importance of home language instruction for children’s learning, wellbeing and identity development.

Field of refugee studies:
Potential benefits of integrating refugee learners into national school systems for school access, quality, certification, sustainability (despite language ‘submersion’)


UNHCR & Global Monitoring Report, 2016; Dryden-Peterson, Adelman, Bellino & Chopra, under review; Dryden-Peterson, 2016
SETTING THE STAGE:
Education and refugees in Kenya

- Encampment policy
- Integration through curriculum and language of instruction
- Kalobeyei Settlement near Kakuma Refugee Camp
Research Questions

- Which *Tusome treatment option* improves learning outcomes on the Early Grade Reading Assessment?
  - English only
  - English and Kiswahili

- How do teachers, parents, and students think about, value, and weigh the benefits of the language options in the Tusome program, including for their current schooling and longer-term future opportunities?
Quantitative Research Design

- EGRA in English & Kiswahili
- All schools in Kakuma
- All schools in Kalobeyei
- All schools in Pelekech (Turkana)
  - Endline only
- Comparing two treatment groups
  - Randomly assigned
  - Tusome English v.
  - Tusome English and Kiswahili
- Comparing both treatment groups with Turkana
Qualitative Research Design

Four Schools

Interviews with
- Teachers
- Children
- Parents

Classroom observations
- Stallings-type tool
- Open-ended protocol

Table 2. Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lokitaung</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuji</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalobeyei</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudanese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-South Sudanese</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusome in Kakuma Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToTs trained</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head teachers trained</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers trained</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE teachers trained</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total teachers trained</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Learners</td>
<td>24,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Learners</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Learners</td>
<td>25,680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tusome literacy program (1:1 ratio, TG utilization)
Coaches doing Observations and Student Assessment
# Kakuma Turkana County Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Number of classroom visits (Percentage of Target Visits)</th>
<th>English - Class 1 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>English - Class 2 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>English - Class 3 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>Kiswahili - Class 1 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>Kiswahili - Class 2 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
<th>Kiswahili - Class 3 Correct per minute (Percentage at KNEC benchmark)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aba Kakuma 1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aba Kakuma 2</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aba Kakuma 3</td>
<td>25 (1250%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 (0%)</td>
<td>22 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aba Kakuma 4</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelina</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakuma 1</td>
<td>19 (211%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>37 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (11%)</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakuma 2</td>
<td>36 (900%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (7%)</td>
<td>28 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>14 (0%)</td>
<td>26 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakuma 3</td>
<td>25 (625%)</td>
<td>7 (13%)</td>
<td>11 (0%)</td>
<td>23 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (0%)</td>
<td>14 (16%)</td>
<td>12 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakuma 4</td>
<td>19 (475%)</td>
<td>13 (0%)</td>
<td>34 (22%)</td>
<td>40 (0%)</td>
<td>15 (16%)</td>
<td>33 (33%)</td>
<td>27 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Numbers of classroom visits** are defined as TUSOME classroom observations that include all forms and all 3 pupils assessments, with at least 20 minutes duration, and took place between 7AM and 3PM of any school days during the selected month.
2. **Targeted number of classroom visits** is equivalent to the number of schools in each zone.
3. **Correct per minute** is the calculated average out of all individual assessment results from all qualifying classroom visits in the selected month to date, divided by the total number of assessments conducted.
4. **Percentage at KNEC benchmark** is the percentage of those students that have met the KNEC benchmark for either Kiswahili or English, and for either class 1, class 2 or class 3, out of all of the students assessed for those subjects. The benchmarks for class 3 are yet to be defined.
School Level Data Collection in Kakuma
Sampling from Large Classes
Baseline Reading Outcomes by Country of Origin

Overall (724)  
South Sudan (302)  
Somali (62)  
Congo (64)  
Burundi (30)  
Ethiopia (12)  
Sudan (121)  
Rwanda (11)  
Uganda (14)  
Eritrea (1)  
Other (107)

English  
Kiswahili

Oral Reading Fluency

Country of Origin

- Overall
- South Sudan
- Somali
- Congo
- Burundi
- Ethiopia
- Sudan
- Rwanda
- Uganda
- Eritrea
- Other

Baseline Reading Outcomes by Country of Origin

- English
- Kiswahili
Endline Treatment Group Comparisons

Learning Outcomes at Endline

- English Letter Fluency
- English Nonword Fluency
- English Segmenting
- English Oral Reading Fluency
- English Reading Comprehension
- Kiswahili Letter Fluency
- Kiswahili Syllable Fluency
- Kiswahili Nonword Fluency
- Kiswahili Oral Reading Fluency
- Kiswahili Reading Comprehension
- Kiswahili Sentence Comprehension

Legend:
- English Only
- English and Kiswahili
- Turkana (Tusome)
Qualitative Findings

• Home languages critical but for outside of school

One student noted: “For me, I love my language [Turkana], but I would also like it if I know English, if I know Swahili.”

Teachers expressed how home languages fit within the community and schools: “This local language, the one you speak at home, you will never forget it whether you go where, you just remember that. But it’s advantageous when you learn English and Kiswahili, so you speak three languages...Whenever you go anywhere, you’ll communicate. When those people don’t speak your language, you speak English and Kiswahili.”
• Tusome Intervention, Language of instruction: preference for English and Kiswahili

• Need for Kiswahili to “get by” in the present in Kakuma

• Value of English to “get ahead” for the present and the future
Qualitative Findings

- Language of instruction: preference for English and Kiswahili
- Need for Kiswahili to “get by” in the present in Kakuma

A Burundian teacher said, “Without Kiswahili you can’t survive [in Kakuma]”
- Daily life
- Relationships

A 9-year old Somali student said, “[With] Swahili you can speak everyone” in Kakuma.
Qualitative Findings

• Language of instruction: preference for English and Kiswahili

• Value of English to “get ahead” for the present and the future

A Ugandan teacher said, “You must know the meaning of everything (in English)...You must take English to be the first priority. Wherever you go, you will not be stuck...You’re free to speak”

A Somali parent described how English competence divides people into two groups, those who are “sweating from the back” versus those who “sweat from the brain”
Implications & Recommendations

- Impacts in Kakuma are possible
- Significant differences by country of origin
- Demand for English
- Interest in Kiswahili to “get along”
- Gains in Kiswahili and English were both larger when Kiswahili was taught
- Provided Kiswahili materials in Treatment 2
- Is one year of intervention is insufficient?
- Children in camps need quality education
- Thanks to UNICEF Kenya
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Qualitative Language Mapping Findings

Home
- Many students described using a combination of the home language and either Kiswahili or Arabic, depending on their country of origin, at home. In some cases, Arabic or Kiswahili is more frequent than the home language, as for Beni, from DRC, who speaks Kiswahili and Mashi at home and finds Kiswahili easier.
- Other students use only the home language. These include Saleem, who uses Somali at home. Farah’s mother is Somali and her father Oromo, from Ethiopia. Farah’s siblings only speak Oromo, and her mother only Somali, so she serves as the linguistic bridge at home, speaking both Somali and Oromo.

Community/ Market
- All the children across the sample described speaking Kiswahili in the market. They also speak their home languages in the market, including Dinka and Turkana in Kalobeyei Settlement and Somali in Kakuma Refugee Camp, depending on who they are interacting with.

School
- The children who attend Kalobeyei Primary School explained that they speak Arabic and Kiswahili at school with their peers. They note that their teachers use English during school as well, so that they are exposed to the language, but no student mentioned using it outside of class.
- Similarly, the children in the three schools inside Kakuma Refugee Camp described using Kiswahili and various home languages at school, including Somali and Arabic. In some cases, English was not mentioned even after prompting from the interviewer; in others, students mentioned that the teachers use English during school. Here again, no student described using English for communication with peers at school.

Relationships outside of Kakuma
- Most students had contact with someone outside of Kakuma. These students communicated with family members and former neighbors from the country of origin using home languages to do so. For example, Amburo, a student at Lokitaung Primary School speaks to her grandparents, who are still in Somalia, in Somali.

In the future
- All of the students pointed to the importance of English for the future, wherever they saw themselves and whatever the profession. The vast majority of students noted that they would like to be doctors and teachers, professions they saw as linked to English.
- In some cases, students also noted that they would need to speak languages in addition to English. For example, Adongo, a Kenyan student at Kalobeyei Primary School aspired to work in construction in Kenya in the future, and felt that he would need Kiswahili to do so.