

Knowledge is wisdom? Observations from primary classrooms in the Maldives

DAVID FITTELL, *National Institute of Education, Maldives*

I saw a school that has the motto Knowledge is Wisdom on its front gate (Figure 1). I had recently observed lessons in many primary classrooms and the misconception embodied in that motto helped to explain some of the problems I had identified.

I am an Australian Aid volunteer, working in schools in the Maldives during 2013 as a Teacher Trainer for the National Institute of Education. My project is to identify key issues of classroom practice that needed to be addressed, and



Figure 1. School motto 'Knowledge is Wisdom'

then design Professional Development (PD) strategies that can be facilitated by the Teacher Resource Centres in each atoll.

My main source of data for the needs assessment was observation of teachers' practice. Many aspects of the teaching practices I observed were consistent across subjects, grades, and in different islands and atolls. The following article outlines some key issues I identified and these observations have formed the basis of my subsequent PD programs.

Didactic Teaching

The teaching I observed is almost always *didactic* – a one-way transfer of facts from teacher or textbook to student. It aligned with the simplistic model of learning that Cohen (1989) described as “[i]f knowledge is facts, then teaching is telling and learning is remembering” (p. 42). However, data is not information, information is not knowledge, knowledge is not understanding, understanding

is not wisdom. The *Knowledge is Wisdom* school motto fails to recognise that teaching children to remember facts does not make them educated or wise. Knowledge alone is not wisdom.

Initially I focused my observations on lessons in Environmental Studies for Grades 1 to 5 and General Science for Grades 6 and 7. Both of these syllabuses contain advice for teachers about the need for active, inquiry-based modes of learning. The Environmental Studies syllabus mandates that the teaching "... is based in the inquiry method of learning, predicting possible solutions to problems, constructing hypotheses, considering different approaches, and designing methods for gathering, organizing and processing information" (Education Development Centre, 2003a, p. 4).

The General Science syllabus has a similar requirement that "[p]ractical work should include series of open investigations. Students need the opportunity to do open investigations if they are to develop the investigation and problem solving skills that are at the heart of scientific literacy" (Educational Development Centre, 2003b, p.1). Those syllabus statements, intended to shape the pedagogy for both subjects, are not evidenced in the lessons I have observed. In fact when I show them to teachers they report having never seen them before and are often quite surprised by them.

The Shrinking Curriculum

In the Maldives National Curriculum, each subject syllabus typically has a set of key objectives. For example, the General Science syllabus is structured around (a) knowledge and understanding, (b) skills, and (c) values and attitudes. The syllabus clearly states that all of these must be taught and assessed, but nearly all lessons concentrate on teaching and assessing knowledge (memorised facts). I have seen very little evidence of teachers addressing other syllabus objectives such as skills.

A key reason for this is that virtually all teaching I saw was directly from textbooks, which concentrate on factual knowledge and largely ignore the other objectives. This goes against the advice in syllabus documents, such as this example from the Social Studies Syllabus of Grades 6 and 7 stating that "[t]he textbook is only a basic guide. The success of this syllabus lies in the vigilance of the teacher towards the syllabus and through teaching with the effective use of appropriate teaching aids" (Educational Development Centre, 2002, p. iii).

If the teacher uses no other activities or sources of information, they cannot fulfil their role of teaching the syllabus. When I ask primary teachers if I can see a copy of the syllabus, they hand me the textbook. High school teachers usually direct me to a website of past-papers of the Cambridge University International or Edexcel examinations at Ordinary or Advanced Levels (OL or AL). No teacher indicated that they had read the actual syllabus and I have not yet found a teacher who has a copy available. Teachers' planning typically involves a scheme of work term outline, which is a list of fact-based topics copied from the textbook's table of contents. I have not seen any planning that addresses the more challenging syllabus objectives that are not covered by the textbook. Similarly, I have not seen objectives other than knowledge being assessed.

School principals tell me that children who gain high marks up to Grade 7

usually do less well once they begin the Cambridge syllabus in higher grades. A typical set of objectives for a Cambridge University OL subject, helps to explain why (Table 1). Students who have only been taught knowledge for most of their schooling do not have the skills required by the other 70% of the course.

Table 1
Example of Weighting of Assessment Objectives for the OL Subject Business Studies

Assessment Objective	Weighting (%)
Knowledge and understanding	30
Application	30
Analysis	30
Evaluation	20

Note. From University of Cambridge International Examinations (2010)

Single Source

I was surprised by how often I saw the same, simplistic lesson structure. Typically, lessons fit a model something like this:

- Teacher presents a set of facts.
- Children do a group activity that records those facts.
- Groups report back on the facts and are judged right or wrong.
- Children individually record the set of facts in books or a test sheet.

The facts selected for the lesson come directly from the textbook. I rarely saw any information presented that was *not* in the textbook. When I looked at tests that teachers were preparing, they required students to memorise exact statements from textbooks, rather than more general applications and understanding of topics.

One of the problems with this approach is illustrated by the question of heart rate given in the Grade 7 General Science test (Figure 2). I had a look in the relevant textbook and found this sentence, which had clearly prompted the teacher's question. "Your heart rate beats about 70 times each minute." The teacher marked A as the only correct answer, but notice that word *about*. It means that option B (80 beats/minute) is also a reasonable answer. I explored another source, as a dedicated student might when doing revision. It took ten seconds to type the words *normal heart rate* into Google and get the following response from a reasonably reliable source. "A normal resting heart rate for adults ranges from 60 to 100 beats a minute" (www.mayoclinic.com/health/heart-rate/AN01906).

So answers A, B and D are correct if we are assessing *understanding* rather than *memorising* words from a textbook. Not only is this assessment low-order, it actually discriminates against a student who has gained a good understanding of the topic from other sources. This effect continues through to university. A teaching colleague showed me a Masters level exam question that asked her to describe the three kinds of listening skill. She had read widely enough

- Question: Our normal heart rate is about
- (A) 70 beats per minute
 - (B) 80 beats per minute
 - (C) 50 beats per minute
 - (D) 90 beats per minute

Figure 2. Multiple choice question on heart rate in a Grade 7 General Science test.

to understand that many aspects of listening are described in the education literature, but she may have got the question wrong because she had not memorised *which* three were listed in this course's text.

Another example was a Grade 3 class learning from the textbook about parts of a bird (Figure 3). They were taught that birds have a beak, legs and wings and the students copied a diagram from the textbook into their notebooks. How many Grade 3 children did not know those facts before they started Grade 1? On the island, there are chickens running around and many people have birds in cages.

Consider how much more interest and depth of learning would have occurred if the teacher had simply brought one or two live birds into the classroom and said, "Observe closely, write what you've noticed about the bird's features and behaviour, and draw close-ups of some of its parts. Then we will talk about what you've learnt." Similarly, I saw children copying their teacher's simplistic sketch of a tree from the whiteboard when there were several real trees in plain view beside their room.




Figure 3. Parts of a bird illustration from the Grade 3 Environmental Studies textbook (Ismail & Samad, 2007).

Lower-order Thinking

In March 2013, all Grade 4, 7 and 9 students in Maldives were tested in the Phase 1 of a *Longitudinal Study on the Impact of Curriculum Reforms*. A preliminary finding of this study was that children in Maldives do not use higher-order thinking skills (National Institute of Education, 2013). Higher-order thinking skills were described in Bloom's Taxonomy (Bloom, 1959) and revised by Anderson et al. (2000). Figure 4 shows the hierarchy with the simple skill of *remembering* on the bottom and progressively more complex thinking skills in the levels above.

The lessons and assessments I have observed are located on the ground floor, *remembering*. They occasionally go upstairs to *understanding*, but almost never challenge students to climb the heights of *applying*, *analyzing*, *evaluating* or *creating*. However it is the higher levels of the taxonomy that carry most of the weighting in OL and AL syllabuses, and many subjects, such as the example in Table 1, use terms directly from Bloom to structure their objectives.

The Longitudinal Study's finding that these skills are not used is a natural




Figure 4. Revised Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson et al. 2000).

outcome of the kind of teaching and assessment I have already described. The facts being taught are simplistic and a student's role is to just remember them. Test papers I have sampled consist of simple questions that usually require direct quotes from the textbook. Questions tend to begin with terms like *name*, *list*, *define*. Most do not include higher-order terms like *explain*, *compare*, *evaluate*, or even a simple *why*?

Sadler (1988) explained that student reports should describe the *quality* of their achievement, not just a *quantity* of questions answered correctly. The tests I have seen do not cover a range of quality. Consequently I have been advising teachers and administrators that if all exam questions are based on memorized textbook facts, students should be graded no higher than a C, even if they gain 100%, because there has been no opportunity for them to demonstrate a higher quality of work. In tests and in classroom questioning there is typically only one correct answer. Exploring alternative ideas - *how else?* or asking *why?*

can support richer learning but I seldom saw this happen. The observation given in Figure 5 illustrates this point.

I was very impressed by a little girl who was determined to present her own piece of knowledge, which she knew to be true from her own observation, although she knew it was not an answer the teacher wanted. What an opportunity for the teacher to ask, “Children, what else have you seen growing in black soil?”

Chilli Story

In a Grade 2 Environmental Studies lesson about soils, four facts from the textbook were taught:

1. black soil is for growing trees;
2. fine white sand is for making bricks;
3. coarse white sand is for decorating outside houses;
4. muddy soil is for growing yams.

After these facts had been presented and repeated in several activities, the teacher questioned the children.

Teacher: What is the black soil for?
 Girl: Growing chillies.
 Teacher: Everyone, is she right?
 Class: No!!!
 Teacher: Try again - what is black soil for?
 Girl: It's good for growing chillies.
 Teacher: No, that's not right. Black soil is for growing trees.
 Girl: But at my house we use it to grow chillies!
 Teacher: Oh yes, you can use black soil for growing trees and chillies.

Figure 5. Example from a classroom on the lack of higher-order thinking.

Teaching to the Test

I have talked with teachers about how limiting the textbook can be if they do not use other sources and activities. Some replied that they have been told by supervisors to only teach what will be in the test. And what will be in the test? Simple facts from the textbook. That scenario hints at a solution: why not change the tests?

I have observed that teachers write tests by looking through the textbook and writing questions from facts they find there. They do not refer to the syllabus objectives. As noted earlier, I have yet to meet a teacher who knows where to find a copy of the syllabus. A fundamental change that needs to occur is that assessments are based on the syllabus objectives – *all* of them, not just the ones that are easiest to teach. The challenge is stated clearly in this quote: “Assessment efforts should not be concerned about valuing what can be measured but, instead, about measuring that which is valued” (Banta, Lund, Black & Oblander, 1996, p.5).

My observations suggest that schools are putting a high value on things that are easy to measure, and are devaluing or completely ignoring aspects of each syllabus that are not. Teachers, students, administrators, parents, private tutors are all focused on getting high numbers of marks, without considering whether those marks are evidence of quality work or of students learning the more challenging aspects of the curriculum.

Wiggins (1989) explained that it is what and how teachers choose to assess that communicates to students what learning to value. Students are given a powerful lesson on what to value by the many tests they do, and the lesson is that they need to memorize simple facts. Classrooms run on the principle that *learning is remembering*. This view of learning does not prepare them for life, or even for an OL exam. Assessments need to value the more complex aspects of learning. This is not an easy thing to do. It is much easier to test recall of a fact than to judge whether a student can *apply* knowledge to solve a problem, *analyze* a solution, use evidence to *evaluate* which side of an argument is strongest, or use their learning to create something original.

Where to from here?

I have described a number of significant problems with the teaching I have seen. I do not want to finish this article without making some suggestions about a way forward, although I acknowledge that further research is needed to properly guide future strategies. This final section gives examples of how some teachers in the Maldives are addressing the issues I have discussed.

I have found many teachers who are keen to improve their teaching and assessment practice. Figure 6 shows the initial and the ‘new improved’ project challenge one group planned for their Grade 5 students. The initial project could be completed by simply copying facts from books or Wikipedia, so we talked about how we could challenge the students to use higher-order thinking. Notice that in the new challenge, students are required to use evidence to justify their evaluation – they cannot look up those answers, they have to create them by using higher-order thinking.

How do students know what is valued?

Sadler (1989) talked about letting students in on the secret of what teachers would value when assessing their work. That is “the student comes to hold a concept of quality roughly similar to that held by the teacher, is able to monitor continuously the quality of what is being produced during the act of production itself” (Sadler, 1989, p.121). Marking guides are an important way to show students and parents what to value. The Grade 5 project given in Figure 6 started out with the marking criteria given in Table 2.

Initial Project challenge:	Improved Project challenge:
Find out about the climate in Maldives and of one other country of your choice. Include the following about climates: location of country; temperature; rainfall; seasons; other information about the climates in both places.	<p>Compare the climate of (1) the Maldives and (2) another location where the climate is very different.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For each location, a) Describe the climate; b) Explain why the climate is like that; and c) Give examples of how climate influences lifestyle, e.g. houses, food, clothing, leisure. • Evaluate which location has the best climate to live in. List evidence for and against each location, then choose the climate you think has the best lifestyle. Explain your reasons for choosing which is best.

Figure 6. Grade 5 student project showing improved assessment to use higher-order thinking.

Table 2
Initial Marking Criteria for the Grade 5 Project Challenge

Criteria	Score
Neatness	2 marks
Creativity	2 marks
Content	5 marks
Completion	1 mark

The marking criteria gives students no clues about what is required for the *content* marks, and it gives 50% of the marks for other things that are not even in the syllabus. This means a student could pass without demonstrating any subject knowledge. A revised criteria developed by the teachers is given in Table 3. It gives separate grades for *understanding* and *skills*, and states what actions match each grade. It sends a strong message to students, parents and tutors that *thinking* is more important than a set of facts in a neatly published booklet.

Note that this model of marking guide differs a little from typical rubrics, which usually have the same core statement in each box and just change or add adjectives as the level goes up. For example, satisfactory, good and excellent. This model is additive, i.e. to achieve a B it is assumed the work matches the B descriptor but also includes the qualities listed in the grades below it. Table 4 shows another step forward by a group of teachers.

Table 3
Revised Marking Criteria for the Grade 5 Project Challenge

	Understanding (Compare climates in two places)		Skills (Investigate and communicate findings)
A	Uses evidence to evaluate which climate has the best lifestyle.	A	Uses multiple, reliable sources to investigate. Uses words and pictures to present evidence and ideas accurately.
B	Explains the causes of different climates and how they affect lifestyle.	B	Booklet is clear, interesting and easy to understand.
C	Describes differences between two climates.	C	Finds information about climates and uses it to answer questions accurately.
D	Knows simple facts about climates.	D	Finds and presents some facts about climate.
E	Booklet contains facts.	E	Submits booklet.

Table 4
Active Assessment Marking Guide for Grade 3 Environmental Studies Activity Observing Soil

	Understanding (Recall and explain scientific ideas about soil)		Skills (Observe differences in soils; Communicate with scientific words and diagrams)
A	Gives scientific reasons for why the layers are different.	A	Draws accurate scientific diagrams with labels.
B	Explains how the layers are different.	B	Uses scientific words to describe differences in soils.
C	Describes different soils and lists what is in them.	C	Uses words and diagrams to describe soil.
D	Records simple facts about soil.	D	Answers questions in everyday language.
E	Writes about soil.	E	Draws non-scientific pictures

The teachers started out with a simple test of facts about soil based on the Grade 3 textbook. After we discussed the syllabus objectives, they replaced that test with a more active assessment where students dug in the soil, looked closely at what they found, and applied communication skills to record their findings in words and diagrams. The marking guide they created does not produce a set of ‘marks’ to measure and label students, but it does clearly describe the standard of their learning. More importantly, it values what students can *do*, not just what they can *remember*.

Conclusion

This article is based on observations made during the course of my work as a teacher trainer; it is not part of a formal study. However, it was interesting to see how consistent the teaching style was across different classrooms, islands and atolls. In particular, I was surprised at how little influence the Maldives National Curriculum has on what teachers actually teach and test. With a new national curriculum about to be implemented, one is prompted to ask, *Will it make any difference? Will teachers continue to use textbooks as a de facto curriculum?* The style of education I have been observing aligns with this description from Tony Wagner given in an interview by Friedman (2013) “We teach and test things most students have no interest in and will never need, and facts that they can Google and will forget as soon as the test is over” (para. 6).

It is important for teachers to understand that knowledge is not wisdom but only a small part of the curriculum, the easy part, and their job of preparing students for life in the 21st century may be more complex than they realize. Wagner in Friedman (2013) describes that the challenge for schools is to develop the capacity to innovate, skills like critical thinking, communication and collaboration.

Because knowledge is available on every Internet-connected device, what you know matters far less than what you can do with what you know. The capacity to innovate — the ability to solve problems creatively or bring new possibilities to life — and skills like critical thinking, communication and collaboration are far more important than academic knowledge (Friedman, 2013, para. 3)

There is a need for more detailed information about why teaching in the Maldives is the way it is and *how* to manage the necessary change process. Where should the focus of reform strategies be placed? Further research is warranted to identify how best to support teachers in rising to the challenge of a new way of working.

References

- Anderson, L., Krathwohl, D., Airasian, P., Cruikshank, K., Mayer, R., Pintrich, P., Raths, J. and Wittrock, M.C. (Eds.). (2000). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Banta, T., Lund, J., Black, K., & Oblander, F. (1996). *Assessment in practice: Putting principles to work on college campuses*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bloom, B. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cohen, D. (1989). Teaching Practice: Plus QueCa Change. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Contributing to Educational Change: Perspectives on Research and Practice* (pp. 27-84). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan. Retrieved from <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~dkcohen/downloads/CohenTeachingPractice.pdf>
- Educational Development Centre. (2002). *Social studies syllabus 6 & 7*. Republic of Maldives: Author
- Educational Development Centre. (2003a). *Environmental studies in the national curriculum*. Republic of Maldives: Author
- Educational Development Centre. (2003b). *Science in the national curriculum Grade 6 & 7*. Republic of Maldives: Author
- Friedman, T. (2013, March). Need a Job? Invent It. *New York Times*. Retrieved August 12, 2013 from www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/opinion/sunday/friedman-need-a-job-invent-it.html
- Ismail, A. and Samad, A.A. (2007). *Environmental Studies 3B*. Republic of Maldives: Education Development Centre
- National Institute of Education. (2013). *Longitudinal study on the impact of curriculum reform (2012-13)*. Educational Initiatives. Maldives: Author
- Sadler, R. (1988). ROSBA Discussion paper 21 - *The place of numerical marks in criteria-based assessment*. Queensland Studies Authority. Retrieved from www.qsa.qld.edu.au/downloads/publications/research_qbssss_rosba_11.pdf
- Sadler, R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18, 119-144.
- University of Cambridge International Examinations. (2010). *Cambridge O Level Business Studies Syllabus code 7115*. UK: University of Cambridge
- Wiggins, G. (1989). Creating tests worth taking. *Educational Leadership*, 49(8), 26-33.