

COLLABORATION WITH A GROUP OF TEACHERS

INTRODUCTION

The system of hypothetical terminological elaboration of Luganda I propounded in Chapters IV and V was presented to a group of teachers in collaboration with Research and Development Network (REDENET) at three workshops conducted on the 2nd, 9th and 16th December 1995 at the Faculty of Education, Makerere University.

REDENET was founded in 1990 by a group of eight grassroot-based researchers, animators and trainers in Uganda. The main objective of the founders was to contribute to the survival and affirmation strategies of Ugandan communities by stimulating a spirit of commitment to, and start or strengthen processes of (re)valuation, (re)validation and building upon the indigenous knowledge base which nourishes farming, pastoral, healthcare, language, community, education and value systems.

Using various animative techniques, mostly those rooted in the Ugandan cultural heritage, REDENET promotes the collective investigation, analysis and action on problems and issues of importance in people's daily lives such as food, security, health, the identity crisis moral and emotional socialisation, intercultural learning, content, functions and goals of modern knowledge.

Since 1993 REDENET has worked under the aegis of a registered Non-Governmental Organisation YIGA NG'OKOLA RESOURCE CENTRE for the purpose of executing a collaborative programme of participatory research and formation of animators.

Seeking collaboration, I asked two questions. First, would the participants in the workshops appreciate

- (a) the PEGITOSCA Criterion
- (b) the Periodic System of Conceptual Elements
- (c) the Conceptual Calculus
- (d) the Principle of Concept Marking
- (e) concept marking in English and Luganda
- (f) the extrapolation of Luganda expression formation rules
- (g) the systems of terminological elaboration of Luganda in physics, chemistry, biology and mathematics?

Second, would the participants apply (a)-(g) above to exercises at the Primary, Secondary and Tertiary levels of formal education?

I hypothesised that the participants would accommodate the system of articulating scientific concepts in Luganda provided that they would have understood the system and its methodological implications.

I pursued, therefore, three objectives:

- (a) to administer a pre-workshop attitudinal questionnaire on the role of Luganda in the

scientific and technological development of Uganda (see Appendix C)

(b) to familiarise the participants with the system of terminological elaboration as set out in this study

(c) to invite the participants to criticise, improve on and possibly use the system.

The participants were to be drawn from current or former teachers of Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Luganda and Linguistics at Primary, Secondary and Tertiary levels of education. Three workshops were planned to be spread over three consecutive Saturdays and to involve about 20 participants per workshop.

Following discussions between the Project Co-ordinator (Mr Edward Mukasa) and the Project Director (K. B. Kiingi) it was decided to hold all three workshops in one venue, namely the Faculty of Education premises at Makerere University. This was intended to cut down on costs, time wastage and afford easy access to facilities for processing and reproducing working documents and learning materials. Another advantage would be to make the Project Director easily accessible for consultation by participants in between workshops as he would stay at a Guest House nearby.

The selection of participants took into account the following considerations: geographical coverage (five districts out of the nine found in the Buganda region), location (rural/urban), subject, special gender balance, level of education (primary/secondary/tertiary), nature of schools (government aided/private), denominational-based/independent, boarding/day and mixed/single gender). Resource persons were selected for their academic interest and practical efforts as linguists in the field of terminological elaboration. They were Dr. Kasalina Matovu (Institute of Languages) and Fred Masagazi (Department of Language Education) both from Makerere University. Lists of the participants are to be found in Appendix C.

Once funds for the project were secured the Project Co-ordinator decided not to rely on just sending out written invitations (see Appendix C) but to visit in person all the institutions concerned and talk *individually* to the invited participants. The choice of who to invite was facilitated by all sorts of formal and informal channels: from clan solidarities to religious fraternities, from old boy/girl net works to Parent-Teacher Associations. There was also the snowball effect whereby one participant approached another suggested who could be equally interested and committed to the process.

There were several reasons for going out in person to meet and speak to the participants. First, December is not a particularly ideal month for workshops because attendance can be seriously affected by the examination/marking season, end-of-school year festivities, or the sheer rush of weddings before Christmas, etc.

Second, some institutions observe a strict staff hierarchy which means that before any invitations are responded to, the inviting organisation has to explain in greater detail to the authorities concerned, the scope, value and relevance of the workshop. Then a decision is taken who to release/nominate or whether to attend at all. Fortunately, there was only one institution which declined our invitation.

Third, but perhaps most important of all, a personal visit to the participants was necessary to establish a pre-workshop rapport for explaining and negotiating the workshop agenda, get them to appreciate their role as people starting out on a process of becoming potential multipliers, and secure their understanding and agreement to fill in the questionnaire (see Appendix C) which was attached to the invitation.

On the basis of the pre-workshop feedback we changed slightly the workshops design including the agenda because it was too ambitious and would impose a heavy load on the participants. It was decided to divide the participants into two groups. One attended the first workshop on December 2nd (see Appendix C) and the other a second workshop on December 9th (see Appendix C). The groups then came together in a combined and final workshop on December 16th (see Appendix C). The agenda was also divided into a theoretical and a practical phase - the former being covered in the first and second workshops and the latter in the final workshop. Throughout both phases the working language was Luganda. There was no time to present and discuss the findings of the attitudinal questionnaire.