

**Nepal Basic and Primary Education Programme II**

**Textbook Provision Experiments**

**Progress at the End of Year 2**

**26 May – 7 June 2002**

**Carmelle Denning**

**Nepal Basic and Primary Education Programme II**

**Textbook Provision Experiments**

**Progress at the End of Year 2**

**26 May – 7 June 2002**

**Carmelle Denning**

International Book Development Ltd  
305-307 Chiswick High Road  
London W4 4HH  
tel: + 44 (0)20 8742 7474  
fax: + 44 (0)20 8747 8715  
e-mail: [enquiries@ibd.uk.net](mailto:enquiries@ibd.uk.net)

## CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. YEAR 2 OF THE TEXTBOOK PROVISION EXPERIMENTS
3. YEAR 2 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE EVALUATION
4. MOES FUTURE POLICY DEVELOPMENTS
5. RECOMMENDATIONS

### ANNEXES

- I Report To Advisory And Monitoring Committee, 6 June 2002
- II Suggested Contents Of The Comparative Evaluation Report
- III Review Of Report “Supplementary Books Distribution In 2057 B.S.” By EastConsult  
(15 January 2002)

The visit to Nepal for the textbook provision experiments took place from 27 May to 7 June 2002 and came after the end of Year 2 of the textbook provision experiments, the official end of the implementation of the experiments. The objective of the consultancy was to review the Year 2 Progress Report of EastConsult, the Nepalese company contracted to evaluate the four experiments.

The consultant worked closely with the PAT Danida Office, with the General Manager of the Experimental Distribution Management Group and with EastConsult. Since the General Manager was shortly relinquishing the post in order to concentrate on his job as chief of the Research and Evaluation Department at Keshar Mahal, the consultant met his successor and oriented her on the history and objectives of the experiments. At the end of the consultancy, the consultant attended a meeting of the Advisory and Monitoring Committee on 6 June to report on progress. Annex I reproduces the report submitted to the Committee.

In addition to the work on the textbook provision experiments, the consultant reviewed a report on the distribution of supplementary reading books to primary schools (see Annex III) and visited both the Primary Publishing Cell, established with Danida support, and the Secondary Publishing Unit, established with DFID support, to form a preliminary impression concerning the possible merger of the two CDC units. This is expected to be the subject of a study to evaluate the publishing capacity of the Curriculum Development Centre and to plan for merging the Primary Publishing Cell and the Secondary Publishing Unit in the context of the Secondary Education Support Programme which is being planned.

#### Abbreviations

BPEP II	Basic and Primary Education Programme II
CPE	Compulsory Primary Education
CDC	Curriculum Development Centre
DoE	Department of Education
DEO	District Education Office/Officer
EDMG	Experimental Distribution Management Group
JEMC	Janak Education Materials Centre
LPO	Local Purchase Order
PAT	Programme Advisory Team, Danida
RC	Resource Centre

The two-year experiments in four textbook provision systems, selected for testing by the Secretary of Education with the DoE in 1999, took place over a difficult period. This was partly due to the effects of the Maoist insurgency in some of the experiment districts (possible danger to field workers and a huge increase in enrolments due to the temporary closure of private schools) and partly due to the MOES's advancement of the date for the beginning of the school year both in 2000 and in 2001. The fact that Year 2 has come to an end with the four systems successfully implemented is therefore a good augury for the future: given commitment and support, any of the four systems could be implemented nationally, although it may well be the case that certain systems work better within certain ecological types of districts. The latter possibility will be clarified by the comparative evaluation.

The special problems linked to the advancement of the date of the new school year – teaching starting up to three months after the enrolment date/start of the school year, textbooks arriving in schools well after the enrolment date – should not be repeated. They were transition problems, according to the General Manager of the experiments, and the school year is now where the MOES wants it to be. Nevertheless, this change has an impact on the results of the experiments: all the textbooks, whether durable or ordinary, should be expected to last longer than the planned three school years (durable) and one school year (ordinary), simply because they were in use for a shorter time.

The effect of the sudden increase in enrolments in the state schools was that there were too few textbooks for the students – understandably – and it is reported that full textbook provision in those districts was never achieved because the supply from the centre could not meet the sudden demand, nor was the Government budget for textbooks sufficient to pay the Sajha retailers in two of the LPO districts (Lamjung, Kailali) where payments are made locally. One district (Parsa) never received a second consignment of textbooks. (The procedure adopted for the textbook provision experiments to try to cater for an unknown enrolment was to have two distribution stages. The first stage distributed quantities of textbooks which corresponded to the data available in the field, including the number of students who sat the end of year examinations. The policy of liberal promotion allows the future enrolments for grades 2-5 to be fairly accurately estimated. The second stage distributed about a quarter of the first stage and was based on the EMIS information.)

Although the systems were successfully implemented, they were not all correctly implemented. As mentioned in earlier reports, the LPO system has not been understood and thus the difference between it and the JEMC Coupon system has been considered to be only the payment of Sajha in the districts (LPO) and in the centre (JEMC Coupon). (Interestingly, the MOES has just made a policy decision to pay for textbooks in all districts – see section 4 below.) There is one other difference which was supposed to make the LPO system more flexible than the JEMC Coupon: if a bookseller does not have sufficient stock to satisfy a school's order, the school can take the available stock and get a second LPO for the unsupplied copies. Unfortunately, although the Implementation Plan (February 2000) stated:

“If the sales agent/retailer does not supply all the books which the school has been allocated, the retailer can take the LPO and invoice to the DEO to receive cash for the number of books supplied. The school takes its copy of the LPO to the DEO to exchange it for another LPO for the missing books. This may be necessary because the sales agents/retailers may not have enough books in stock to supply the school with all the textbooks allocated. They may need to receive the cash for the books which they have bought and sold so that they can buy more books from Sajha.”

this has not been followed through because it was never noticed at the centre. Therefore, the LPO system has not been implemented fully. We have yet to find out if it is feasible or not to have a second round of LPOs.

Similarly, there was confusion about the stockholding of the durable textbooks in the Re-use system. The RCs had been supplied with cupboards and racking so that they could hold additional and replacement durable textbooks and quickly and conveniently re-supply schools. After Year 1 it was discovered that the remaining durable textbooks were still being held in the centre, by JEMC, who was asked to send them to the three experimental districts. It has now been revealed that only 10% of the original allocation of textbooks was sent to the RCs. The remaining books may be in the JEMC/Sajha regional offices. It is uncertain where they are or why only 10% was sent out to the RCs.

It was reported that in some places in the three Re-use districts, students were dissatisfied that they were not given any reward for returning their books at the end of Year 1. This had been promised to them in a poster that was sent out from the DoE. The Advisory and Monitoring Committee considered this and decided that it would not test the Re-use system fairly if there were rewards which could not be sustainable if the system were adopted nationally. There is, therefore, now a factor which could act against the Re-use system and it will be interesting to find out how many durable textbooks are returned at the end of Year 2. (They are supposed to last three years and so should currently be in use, even though the experiments are over.)

The problem of the Sajha agents not playing their new roles in some of the Bulk system districts was overcome in Year 2. The Sajha agent in Mustang district was particularly commended for his excellent work in Year 2.

It may be possible to overcome the misunderstandings and incorrect implementation of some aspects of the new systems, if they become the national systems. However, it is clear that a lot more training, supervision and monitoring are needed at all levels from the centre, to the regional offices of JEMC and Sajha, to the DEOs, RPs and Sajha agents in the districts. Since any training will be a cascade type, with the problem of increasing lack of clarity and accuracy as each subordinate level is reached, the training at the centre will be crucial and must be long and thorough.

EastConsult revised its Year 2 Progress Report while the consultant was in Nepal in order to add information on results from the field work in Year 2 which included visits to schools, “focus group” discussions, and discussions with central-level relevant organisations. This is particularly important because the data may be needed for others to study.

As it is, even the Year 1 Progress Report did not contain all the data from Year 1 and it was agreed at that time with EastConsult that all Year 1 data would be given in the final comparative evaluation report:

“The Year 1 findings (statistics and interpretation) will be part of the final comparative evaluation report.” (Appendix 1, PAT-EastConsult agreements on evaluation of textbook provision experiments in BPEP II, 19 December 2001, from the consultant’s Progress and Status Report, 10-21 December 2001)

Since the Year 2 Progress Report does not contain all the Year 2 data, it will also be necessary for EastConsult to include it in the final comparative evaluation report or to revise the Year 2 Progress Report so that it is complete. The consultant went through the Year 2 Progress Report with EastConsult and highlighted other areas which also needed attention. These should all be corrected.

Among the data missing from the Year 2 Progress Report were the following concerning the Re-use system:

- How many durable textbooks were stored in the RCs and when were they received?
- How many additional (for increases in enrolment) and replacement (for lost or destroyed durable textbooks) durable textbooks were given out in Year 2 in the Re-use districts?

EastConsult said that they would visit some schools in the Re-use districts before the draft comparative evaluation report is written in order to gather information on the number of durable textbooks given to students at the beginning of school year 2002. This information is important and will give the numbers of durable textbooks used for 3 years, 2 years and only 1 year.

The Year 2 Progress Report gave data which show that there were the following ratios of students to sets of textbooks in Year 2:

		<b>Grade 1</b>	<b>Grade 2</b>	<b>Grade 3</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 5</b>
<b>BULK</b>	<b>Chitwan</b>	1:2.95	1:2.96	1:2.99	1:4.91	1:4.91
	<b>Surkhet</b>	1:2.66	1:2.65	1:2.67	1:4.37	1:4.68
	<b>Mustang</b>	1:2.94	1:2.94	1:2.92	1:4.84	1:4.86
<b>RE-USE†</b>	<b>Jhapa</b>	-	1:2.47	1:2.55	1:4.40	1:4.48
	<b>Kavre</b>	-	1:2.91	1:2.89	1:4.77	1:4.32*
	<b>Darchula</b>	-	1:3	1:3	1:5	1:4.95
<b>JEMC COUPON</b>	<b>Parsa</b>	1:2.78	1:2.7	1:3	1:4.65	1:4.62
	<b>Kathmandu</b>	1:2.93	1:2.94	1:2.95	1:4.95	1:4.91
	<b>Taplejung</b>	1:2	1:2.7	1:2.77	1:4.62	1:4.6
<b>LPO</b>	<b>Kailali</b>	1:2.92	1:2.95	1:2.95	1:4.89	1:4.98
	<b>Lamjung</b>	1:2.81	1:2.96	1:2.89	1:4.7	1:4.74
	<b>Jumla</b>	1:2.04	1:2.71	1:2.92	1:4.1	1:3.82

\*Error in the table in the Report: “total students” and “girls” are reversed

†No information given about age of textbooks in use

The targets are 1:3 (each student has the set of 3 textbooks) in grades 1-3, and 1:5 (each student has the set of 5 textbooks) in grades 4-5. But the EastConsult Year 2 Progress Report does not give any information on when the observations in schools were made and so we do not know how long the textbooks had been used and how much opportunity there had therefore been to lose or destroy them.

The above table seems to indicate that the book supply was best in Darchula (mountainous and re-using durable textbooks) and the worst supply was found in Jumla in grades 1, 4 and 5 (mountainous, restricted version of LPO) and also in Taplejung in grade 1 (mountainous, JEMC Coupon). But what were the reasons for this?

- Incorrect initial estimates of enrolments which were not made good with the second stage textbook distribution?
- Severe fluctuations in enrolments during the school year, such as students leaving Darchula so there were enough textbooks? – but emigrating students would not be joining schools in Taplejung or in Jumla! – or such as students joining the state schools because some private schools were forced to close by the Maoists?
- Accurate enrolment estimates but insufficient textbooks supplied to the district by Sajha or through JEMC or authorised by CDC?
- Too little money allocated to textbooks in some districts by CDC?
- Enough textbooks supplied to the district but not distributed to the schools because too few Sajha agents or because of local administrative confusion?
- Enough textbooks supplied to the schools but students lost or destroyed a large number?

The EastConsult comparative evaluation report (draft expected by 30 June) must analyse the reasons for the results. It should be possible for them to do a distribution audit to identify where the problems arose. It was to enable them to do such book-tracking that the experiments had all the books stamped once they reached the school with the school's name and date of receipt:

“In each school, all the textbooks will be stamped with a rubber stamp provided by the Experiment Manager and the date when the school received the book will be recorded on it as follows:

**Rubber stamp**

- |  |
|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> name of school<br>.....               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> district                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BPEP II                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> date book received by school<br>..... |

After the books are stamped and dated, the school can give them to the parents/ guardians/ students.” (Implementation Plan, February 2000)

The policy environment has developed since the textbook provision experiments began in 2000. The textbook system which the MOES adopts must be planned to fit in with new policy developments.

#### Timing

The new textbook provision system/s for the country is needed by November 2002 to present to the next donors review mission. The system should then be implemented for 1 Baishakh/mid-April 2003, the start of the school year. It would be helpful to offer the MOES/DoE technical assistance to draw up the national implementation plan.

#### Reimbursement system

At the meeting with the Advisory and Monitoring Committee, the Chairman (Director General DoE) explained that the MOES had asked the DoE to recommend a textbook provision system urgently so that the November timetable could be met. He mentioned that some officials thought that the best system had been the Reimbursement system and that the MOES should revert to that. However, there was severe criticism of that system within the Committee meeting expressed by an official who had had experience of it as well as its replacement, the JEMC Coupon system. In addition, the *BPEP Master Plan, 1997-2002* (MOE, HMG, 15 May 1997) stated:

“18. Ministry of Education has implemented new policy of textbook distribution since FY 1992/93 under which the parents have to buy the books first on their own and the reimbursements are made later upon submission of the purchase bills to the relevant school authorities. Positive as well as negative effects of this policy have been discerned in these years. The demand of the books in the initial grades of primary level appeared to have declined (Dali, nd), whereas cases of delayed reimbursements or even non-reimbursements to parents have been reported from various districts (VaRG, 1993:82). The reimbursement scheme has created a blizzard of paper work and bureaucracy. There are thousands of invoices and claims to be scrutinized and authorized by the DEOs in their respective districts. Reimbursement finance from CDC is not paid in one tranche but in three or four tranches spread over the year. Thus there is usually insufficient finance in the DEO's reimbursement budget early in the academic year to pay all claims at the same time. In sum, this reimbursement policy is reported to be not operating smoothly (BPEP, 1996:4). Several remedial measures have often been discussed of which introduction of a coupon system has drawn the attention of relevant authorities in the Ministry. However, the detailed modalities and implications of the system have yet to be examined.” (pp. 309-310)

The MOES had therefore already soundly rejected the Reimbursement system in 1999 when deciding on the textbook provision systems to be tested in the two-year textbook provision experiments.

It is reported that the Reimbursement system, inexplicably re-introduced in 2000, seems to be costing the Government less than the JEMC Coupon system. However, this is not comparing like with like, because some parents are not being reimbursed and are therefore subsidising the Government. In addition, some parents are unable to buy the books in the first place as they do not have the cash and therefore they do not even request reimbursement. Both of these factors reduce the apparent bill for textbooks. But in the classrooms there are students without textbooks. Since the Government has committed itself to Education For All, it is imperative that students have textbooks without hurdles being put in their way.

Finally, the Committee agreed that some rapid information was needed on the results of the Reimbursement system and would ask the Danida PAT Office to support a study of it in 10 districts. Specifically, there were two important questions to be answered:

- Did all the students have textbooks?
- Did parents get their money back?

#### Decentralisation

From school year 2003, all the textbook money will be paid in the districts and not from the centre, from CDC. (It is important to note that, since the LPO system had not been fully implemented in the textbook provision experiments, this policy change now removes the *apparent* only difference between the LPO and the JEMC Coupon systems!)

Other responsibilities will be transferred to the districts so that there will be local governments with various departments, including an education department (Local Self-Government Act). The Village Education Committees should play a more important role in the future. It is expected that the number of districts will be reduced to about 30-40 (from 75).

#### Responsibility for planning textbook provision

The DoE will be taking over the responsibility for planning textbook provision from CDC which will be concerned with the content of the textbooks. The DoE has the important EMIS department whose statistics the textbook provision experiments had been using for the “second stage” text book distribution.

#### Textbook combining idea

The former General manager of the Textbook Provision Experiments (former Deputy Director, Educational Material Development Section, DoE) and the former Re-use Experiment Manager, both now in CDC, have put forward the idea of combining the three subject textbooks into one for each of the grades 1-3 to CDC and JEMC. If successful, this would have the advantage of ensuring that each student received the whole “set” of textbooks – or none at all – and would reduce the cost of production. They discussed the idea with the consultant who suggested that the following factors should be checked before any recommendations could be made:

- The number of pages in the combined textbooks for grades 1, 2 and 3
- The type of binding that could be used, bearing in mind that stab-stitching of a book with a large number of pages is not possible and that only thread-sewing the textbooks would be suitable, but that JEMC has only limited thread-sewing capacity
- How far re-formatting the textbooks to a larger format would reduce the number of pages in the combined textbook, bearing in mind that large format textbooks are not strong and will not last one school year and that the formats of JEMC’s printing equipment will determine the textbook format because of the need to minimise paper wastage
- The cost of using stronger text and cover paper which will be necessary because the combined textbook will be used three times more than the existing single-subject textbooks and the existing type of paper is too weak for the combined textbook to last one school year
- The capability of JEMC to print, accurately collate a large number of sections (so that the subjects do not get mixed up in the combined textbook) and bind a combined textbook

## **5 RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. When the MOES decides on its textbook provision system/s for the country, technical assistance should be offered to help with the detailed planning of the introduction in April 2002. Assistance with the first stage of countrywide training in the new system should also be available, both in the form of technical assistance and financial support.
2. EastConsult should urgently be given a copy of this report, with section 3 highlighted, so that their draft comparative evaluation report, due by 30 June, covers the various points made. It is EastConsult's wish that the draft report should be thorough so that the revisions needed for the final comparative evaluation report will be minor.
3. EastConsult should be requested to ensure that some schools in the Re-use districts are visited and that information on the number of years in use of the durable textbooks should be highlighted. In addition, EastConsult should investigate the situation on the distribution of the durable textbooks (where they have been stored since manufacture) and give information on the storage of durable textbooks in the RCs.
4. When the EastConsult draft evaluation report is received, reviewers should attempt to get their comments back to the Danida PAT Office, for onward transmission to EastConsult, within 10 days. The consultant will review the draft report in the UK and the Advisory and Monitoring Committee will also review it. Other reviewers are needed, however, and it is recommended that the PAT Office identifies and alerts other reviewers to the timetable for comments.
5. If possible, the DoE rapid study on the effects of the Reimbursement system should be made available to EastConsult before the final comparative evaluation report is written. Although EastConsult had not been asked to include it in the evaluation – this was the MOES's decision in 1999 – it is background information.

## ANNEX I

### BPEP II TEXTBOOK PROVISION EXPERIMENTS Report to Advisory and Monitoring Committee, 6 June 2002

1. The consultant has reviewed EastConsult's Year 2 Progress Report and given comments to EastConsult. The Advisory and Monitoring Committee is asked to review the Progress Report and to pass any comments to EastConsult within the next 7 days.
2. The next step in the evaluation of the Textbook Provision Experiments is the draft comparative evaluation report of EastConsult at the end of June 2002. The consultant and the Committee should review it and pass comments to EastConsult within 10 days of receipt. (The consultant will not visit Nepal at this time but will send feedback from the UK.) EastConsult will then revise it and produce the final comparative evaluation report in July 2002.
3. In August 2002, an MOES workshop (probably one day) will be organised to discuss the recommendations of the EastConsult comparative evaluation report. The objective of the workshop is to assist the MOES in deciding its textbook provision policy. According to the Mid Term Review Report, Joint Government-Donor, of March 2002, the textbook distribution policy should be available for the next Review Mission of November 2002. The MOES will therefore have 3 months for decision-making.
4. The MOES, with the DOE, decided on the experimental systems to test and the districts in which to test them in 1999. The Reimbursement system was not chosen because it had been thoroughly discredited. The BPEP Master Plan of 1997 confirms this. The JEMC Coupon system was introduced as an improvement on the Reimbursement system in 1999 and was therefore included in the experiments. It is reported that the Reimbursement system, re-introduced in 2000, seems to be costing the Government less than the JEMC Coupon system. However, this is not comparing like with like, because some parents are not being reimbursed and are therefore subsidising the Government. In addition, some parents are unable to buy the books in the first place as they do not have the cash and therefore they do not even request reimbursement. Both of these factors reduce the apparent bill for textbooks. But in the classrooms students do not have textbooks.
5. In order to assist the MOES in planning the implementation of its textbook provision system (or systems), the PAT Office/Danida would be willing to consider providing short-term technical assistance to draw up detailed plans and responsibilities (as for the implementation of the Textbook Provision Experiments), so that the new system/systems could start for school year 2003-04.
6. Because a new national textbook provision system/systems will be starting in April 2003, it is recommended that the *Textbook Protection and Maintenance Handbook* should be revised in the light of the forthcoming MOES policy decision. It is scheduled for printing 3000 copies in this financial year, but the 25,000 copies planned for the next financial year should await the revision.

Carmelle Denning  
IBD, London

**ANNEX II**  
**SUGGESTED CONTENTS OF THE COMPARATIVE EVALUATION REPORT**

**Nepal Basic and Primary Education Programme II**  
**Textbook Provision Experiments**  
**COMPARATIVE EVALUATION REPORT**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1) Introduction
- A. CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION**
- 2) The problem of textbook availability in schools
- 3) Objectives of the comparative evaluation
- 4) The 4 textbook provision systems being compared
- 5) Implementation of the textbook provision experiments by the DOE
- 6) Methodology of the evaluation carried out by EastConsult
- 7) Description of evaluation indicators and their relevance to the objectives of the evaluation
- B. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION**
- 8) Main points in the individual evaluations of the four systems
- 9) Comparative evaluation of the four systems using the evaluation indicators
- C. ISSUES, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
- 10) Outstanding issues from the results of the evaluation
- 11) Conclusions from comparative evaluation
- 12) Recommendations on the system(s) to be introduced
- 13) Problems to be resolved in advance of nationwide implementation
- 14) Changes needed

ANNEXES

- I. Basic terms of reference for the comparative evaluation
- II. Literature consulted
- III. People consulted
- IV. Evaluation organisation and timetable
- V. Evaluations of the four systems
- VI. Textbook durability and availability
- VII. Summary data from fieldwork: questionnaires, interviews, Focus Group Discussions
- VIII. Documentation used in the textbook provision experiments

ETC

## ANNEX III

### BPEP II

#### Review of Report “Supplementary Books Distribution in 2057 B.S.” by EastConsult (15 January 2002)

##### 1. Distribution of supplementary reading books (SRBs) to schools

<u>Ecological belt</u>	<u>Districts</u>	<u>% of sample schools which received SRBs</u>
Mountain	Darchula	89%
	Jumla	63%
	Mustang	100%
	Taplejung	100%
Hill	Kathmandu	57%
	Surkhet	0%
	Lamjung	96%
	Kavre	48%
Terai	Kailali	75%
	Chitwan	100%
	Parsa	74%
	Jhapa	47%

The distribution system for the SRBs has therefore failed to a significant degree and it does not appear to be related to the difficulty of the terrain. The suspicion is that this is a failure of management which should be investigated and a feedback system of supervision and monitoring put in place. Where are the missing books?

##### 2. Number of SRBs received by schools

The average number of SRBs received per school is roughly 12 (36 60 copies received by 307 schools). Schools received between 0 and 3 copies of each of the 10 titles.

This is, of course, a small number of SRBs for a school and does not even cover the requirements of a complete class. This small number of copies may explain the way the SRBs were used in some schools.

##### 3. Use of the SRBs in schools which received them

<u>Districts</u>	<u>% of sample schools which let students use SRBs outside class</u>	<u>% of sample schools which used SRBs in class</u>	<u>% of sample schools which used SRBs for students to study in class</u>
Darchula	71%	100%	0%
Jumla	90%	90%	0%
Mustang	100%	100%	0%
Taplejung	84%	78%	22%
Kathmandu	62%	95%	5%
Lamjung	82%	87%	13%
Kavre	97%	100%	0%
Kailali	75%	89%	6%
Chitwan	100%	93%	7%
Parsa	96%	96%	0%
Jhapa	100%	95%	5%

As mentioned before, the small number of titles and copies received by the schools limited the use to which the SRBs could be put. Some teachers, however, regarded the SRBs as an adjunct to the textbooks rather than a tool for increasing student's study skills, language skills and also for providing information and values.

#### 4. Language level of the SRBs according to the schools which received them

Every one of the 10 SRB titles was criticised as having too high a language level by some districts. Other districts found the language level to be medium and none found it to be low. However, we do not know which classes were using the SRBs, nor do we know for which classes the SRBs were planned.

Clearly, in the publishing process:

- Skilled education editors must give prior information to authors of SRBs on language level and targeted class before they start writing;
- Manuscripts must be pilot-tested on a small scale in a few of the targeted classes by the publisher;
- Editors must ensure that the authors revise their manuscripts according to the feedback from the pilot testing;
- The editors must then edit the revised manuscripts thoroughly;
- The publisher must ensure that information to the school is given on the cover of the SRB as well as inside about the class for which the SRB is written.

#### 5. Teacher support in the use of SRBs

From the comments of the teachers who used the SRBs, it is clear that a number of them, while stating that the SRBs were useful, did not know how to use them or what the purpose of an SRB is. Teachers asked for "teacher guidelines" and for teacher training. Some teachers used the SRBs as ancillary textbooks – perhaps the SRBs were more attractive and the information they contained more accessible than the textbooks.

A nationwide orientation and training programme in the use of SRBs for teachers will be necessary if the SRBs are to be exploited thoroughly and give maximum benefit to students in improving their language skills, study skills and know-how, and to encourage them to enjoy reading.

#### 6. Conclusions and recommendations

The survey done has been very useful in pointing out the direction for further developments in the supply of SRBs to primary schools.

It is recommended that the following actions are taken:

- Improvement of SRB distribution management in the districts and design of feedback system for supervision and monitoring of distribution
- Increase in the number of titles and doubling of the number of copies of the titles given to schools
- Improved publishing of SRBs through proper targeting, pilot testing, and editing
- Teacher orientation and training programme in the purpose and use of SRBs