



## Learning at the bottom of the pyramid: Constraints, comparability and policy in developing countries

Daniel A. Wagner · Nathan M. Castillo

© UNESCO IBE 2014

**Abstract** United Nations development goals have consistently placed a high priority on the quality of education—and of learning. This has led to substantive increases in international development assistance to education, and also to broader attention, worldwide, to the importance of children’s learning. Yet, such goals are mainly normative: they tend to be averages across nations, with relatively limited attention to variations within countries. This review provides an analysis of the scientific tensions in understanding learning among poor and marginalized populations: those at the bottom of the pyramid. While international agencies, such as UNESCO and OECD, often invoke these populations as the “target” of their investments and assessments, serious debates continue around the empirical science involved in both research and policy. The present analysis concludes that the UN post-2015 development goals must take into account the critical need to focus on learning among the poor in order to adequately address social and economic inequalities.

**Keywords** Learning · Low- and middle-income countries · Poor and marginalized populations · Learning outcomes · Constraints · Comparability · Education policy

The World Conference on Education for All in Jomtien, Thailand, was a watershed moment in international education and development. Held in 1990, the conference embraced two key challenges: significantly increase access to education for children in poor countries, and promote the quality of learning in education. A decade later, at the 2000 Education for All (EFA) conference in Dakar, these same two challenges were expanded into a detailed list of six education targets in the Dakar EFA Framework for

D. A. Wagner (✉) · N. M. Castillo  
Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia,  
PA 19104-6216, USA  
e-mail: wagner@literacy.upenn.edu

N. M. Castillo  
e-mail: ncast@gse.upenn.edu



30 Action. The aims were to promote early childhood care, make primary school compulsory,  
31 address learning needs for all, promote adult literacy, reduce gender disparities, and  
32 develop quality measures of learning outcomes (UNESCO 2003, p. 28). They were rein-  
33 forced again in the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for 2015, where universal  
34 primary education was made the second of eight major goals (United Nations 2000). These  
35 global efforts led international development agencies to substantively increase their  
36 assistance to education; it also led the broader public to pay more attention to children's  
37 learning on a global scale.

38 There is a large and diverse empirical research base in the area of human learning.  
39 However, much of the available research is substantially limited by constraints of various  
40 kinds. Most prominent among these constraints is the limited ability to generalize from  
41 findings in one population context to other distinct population contexts. Similarly, research  
42 methods may vary greatly between one set of studies and another, making it difficult to  
43 discern whether the findings vary because of the methods or other factors. These are, of  
44 course, classic problems in the social sciences.

45 In this article, we analyse the scientific tensions in understanding learning among poor  
46 populations, those that Prahalad (2006) called the bottom of the pyramid (BOP). While  
47 international agencies often claim to target investments to populations most in need,  
48 serious debates continue about the empirical science needed to implement appropriate  
49 policies, with inevitable consequences for effective implementation in developing or low-  
50 and middle-income countries (LMICs).

## 51 Constraints

### 52 Learning in two South African classrooms

53 Shayandime Primary School, with buildings fashioned of adobe walls and zinc  
54 roofing, is located in a small rural village in the northern province of Limpopo, South  
55 Africa. Just a few dozen miles from the border of Zimbabwe, the area is dotted with  
56 traditional houses called *rondavels*, an adapted version of the southern Africa style  
57 hut. Baboons roam the school grounds freely and are known to slip through the space  
58 between the red-mud block and corrugated roofing and vandalize the classrooms at  
59 night. Despite the occasional broken window, the school is not without resources. It  
60 is one of many establishments in the region that received a donation of early-model  
61 desktop computers where upper primary learners spend time working on basic typing  
62 activities. However, disadvantaged learners with weak English proficiency have no  
63 access to the computers since no programmes have been written in their local lan-  
64 guage, Venda. In the classroom, learners spend most of their time copying sentences  
65 from the chalkboard, and are rarely stimulated to participate in activities that support  
66 creativity and critical thinking skills.

67 By contrast, 4 hours away in the provincial capital of Polokwane sits Central Ele-  
68 mentary School. With brick paths around the perimeter and a state-of-the-art com-  
69 puter lab, it has flat-screen monitors and a smart board with projector. The computer  
70 lab, which rivals that of the local university, was acquired in part through revenue  
71 earned by renting out the school's event hall to the community. There are no broken  
72 windows, the teachers present structured lesson plans, and the parents are an integral



73 part of the school culture. Given its appealing learning environment, the provincial  
74 officials proudly exhibit this urban school to visiting national and international  
75 education planners. Many students have mobile phones, and give the appearance of  
76 being motivated to learn and to be connected to South Africa's future. (Author's  
77 note: the school names have been changed, and these profiles combine details from  
78 several schools.)

79 Comparisons of rural and urban contexts in LMICs often consist of these types of  
80 observations of infrastructural and social characteristics. The South Africa Annual  
81 National Assessment (ANA), administered at the end of each school year, measures  
82 progress in learner achievement in grades 1–6 and 9 (DBE 2013). It tends to confirm the  
83 subjective account offered above. South African schools are categorized according to a  
84 poverty index based on the relative wealth or poverty of the community and are grouped  
85 into quintiles. Rural Shayandime Primary belongs to the lowest quintile. When the ANA  
86 was conducted there, only five learners in grade 3 scored above the national norm while the  
87 large majority scored in the bottom 10%, creating a bimodal distribution. By contrast,  
88 Central Elementary ranks in the middle (third) quintile with normally distributed scores;  
89 these are somewhat below the national urban norms for the Mathematics and Home  
90 Language reading competencies for grade 3 (DBE 2013).

91 The contrast in ANA test performance between these schools raises two related ques-  
92 tions: Why does Shayandime have a handful of high achievers, with the rest of its students  
93 clustered around the lower achievement continuum? And, within urban Central Element-  
94 ary, why are the scores more normally distributed, though below the national average?  
95 Studies often point to the role that social and family influences have on predicting learning  
96 outcomes, mainly in terms of what we call power, parents, and privilege. For example,  
97 various authors have studied the impact of social stratification on school results in terms of  
98 such factors (Benedict and Hoag 2004; Buchmann and Hannum 2001; Korinek and Pun-  
99 puing 2012; Lu and Treiman 2011). In many cases, the learners with the right combination  
100 of these influences are the ones who tend to sit closer to the front in large classrooms and  
101 have greater focus and motivation for learning.

102 These findings have serious implications. Our understanding of the psychological sci-  
103 ence of learning derives primarily from data from wealthy OECD countries, where edu-  
104 cational outcomes, including standardized test scores, are, by design, normally distributed.  
105 However, variation around the world, and especially in BOP contexts such as we noted in  
106 rural South Africa, may be bimodal: a few top scorers, and many low-scoring students.  
107 Where the contrast is so dramatic, and where the focus is on the bottom end of the normal  
108 curve, we are forced to reconsider notions of statistical normality, and with it, the idea that  
109 BOP contexts are simply an extension of the typical normal curve.

110 The idea that learning—in and out of school—may vary significantly across cultures is  
111 hardly new (Cole, Gay, Glick, and Sharp 1971; Wagner 1993, 2014). Nonetheless, the con-  
112 tinued increase in pressure to globalize data collection on education has pushed both researchers  
113 and policy makers to ignore, or minimize, such differences (Benavot and Tanner 2007). We  
114 believe that the failure to give serious consideration to learning at the bottom of the pyramid  
115 distorts reality and may also lead to ill-considered interventions on behalf of poor students.

116 Beyond South Africa, examples of distinctive learning styles abound in the research liter-  
117 ature. Some of this work originated decades ago in the United States with pioneering studies of  
118 individual differences in learning (Kagan, Moss, and Sigel 1963; Witkin, Moore, Goodenough,  
119 and Cox 1977). Today, learners in poor LMIC schools often struggle to understand the language  
120 of instruction and the language of reading. In such situations, teachers often emphasize rote



121 learning and memorization; though this remains a very common learning strategy around the  
122 globe, it is widely derided by modern (Western-trained) pedagogues (Wagner 1983). Another  
123 example of such contrasts is the way learning is constructed in various societies, such as those  
124 strongly influenced by Confucianism (Li 2003).

125 Learning is ubiquitous and takes many forms in everyday life. In education, learning is  
126 measured with instruments that can reliably estimate both processes and outcomes—or  
127 learning assessments. If it is necessary for an assessment to be representative of an entire  
128 population of a country, or valid across multiple countries in a comparative framework,  
129 then it will likely cost more in terms of both time and resources. Thus far, researchers have  
130 controlled time and resources by delimiting the range of *skills* to be assessed (the *skills*  
131 *sample*), and by constraining the *population* to be included (the *population sample*). It is  
132 important to understand these two forms of boundary constraints in terms of technical and  
133 statistical requirements, as well as policy requirements and outputs. Each of these issues  
134 poses empirical and statistical challenges.

### 135 Skill sampling and assessments

136 It is widely accepted that humans learn by sampling their environment, beginning by using  
137 their built-in senses from the moment of birth. Clearly, no infant, child or adult could  
138 possibly survive by taking in the totality of information available in the environment. In  
139 other words, human systems are designed to discriminate so they can sample for the  
140 information that will best help them handle learning challenges (Kahneman 2011). Indeed,  
141 parents typically prepare young children to adapt, learn and survive precisely by exposing  
142 them to the range of situations they will likely encounter in their lives. Of course, not all  
143 these learning environments may be similarly well adapted for a child's future in educa-  
144 tional settings.

145 When it comes to scientific research on learning, we humans do best when we take  
146 samples of our informational environment, whether in educational institutions or via word  
147 of mouth or, increasingly, via Internet search engines such as Google. This relatively  
148 simple observation is very relevant here: one of the most vexing problems researchers  
149 encounter in studying and evaluating learning is how to generalize from one sampling of  
150 skills to another. Thus, sampling a finite set of skills, and knowing about the contextual  
151 situations in which they are used, are key elements of all learning assessments.

152 In designing learning research and evaluation strategies, researchers make highly complex  
153 decisions: they choose contextual and demographic variables (e.g., child's age, year in  
154 school, gender, socio-economic status), and select the skills to be assessed and the type of  
155 research methodology to apply. Each option is tied to a set of assumptions and compromises,  
156 and the selections included in the final research design will influence the validity, reliability  
157 and practical feasibility of the chosen approach (Braun and Kanjee 2006; Wagner 2010,  
158 2011a). Furthermore, research must be designed so it can respond to dynamic changes over  
159 time. And, as expectations of literacy, numeracy and higher-order skills adapt to changes in  
160 social and economic environments, the measurement methods must also be adapted so they  
161 align with educational goals (Wagner, Murphy, and de Korne 2012).

### 162 Learning and population samples

163 Population sampling also matters. For example, about 5% of the world's population resides  
164 in the United States, but nearly 95% (Arnett 2008) of scientific publications on psycho-  
165 logical development are based on populations that are WEIRD (western, educated,



166 industrialized, rich, and democratic; Heinrich, Heine, and Norenzayan 2010), and living  
167 primarily in OECD countries. Moreover, of the research on psychological development  
168 conducted in the United States, about 80% is on “majority” ethnic groups (those of  
169 European origin), though these groups account for only about 50% of the current U.S.  
170 population (Arnett 2008). It seems obvious that researchers should explicitly address  
171 questions of representativeness and external validity, but often they do not. These critiques  
172 also apply to international research, as much of the available research on learning is  
173 constrained in important ways by scientific data sets and research studies drawn from  
174 population samples living mainly within middle- to high-income countries. Fortunately,  
175 this trend is now beginning to change (Wagner 2014).

176 In international large-scale educational assessments (LSEAs), key parts of BOP pop-  
177 ulations may be excluded from, or under-represented, in samples that are said to be  
178 national (Engel and Feuer 2014; Wagner 2011b). Gender has been a leading reason why  
179 children in LMICs do not attend school, although recent decades have seen significant  
180 progress. Still, in the poorest countries, fewer girls than boys are present in schools at the  
181 two points when achievement is often measured: the entry to primary and to post-primary  
182 school. The systematic exclusion of girls in low-income countries usually results in fewer  
183 adolescent girls attending school; those who do attend often earn lower scores on national  
184 assessments compared to boys. For example, in the SACMEQ regional assessment in 6th  
185 grade, undertaken in 2007, Saito (2011) found that, averaged over 15 African countries,  
186 boys generally outperformed girls in mathematics, while girls outperformed boys in  
187 reading. However, national differences in gender disparities varied widely in both reading  
188 and math. Similar trends arise in national assessments that oversample the easier-to-reach  
189 urban areas in low-income countries. Further, in some LMICs, the difficulty of literally  
190 tracking down nomadic children can make it onerous and expensive for education  
191 authorities to include them in schools (UNESCO 2010).

192 Another issue is the language variation across ethnic groups that exists in nearly every  
193 country. Many of these groups, sometimes termed ethno-linguistic minorities, are well  
194 integrated into a national mix, as in Switzerland; but in other situations this variation may  
195 contribute to civil strife. Latin America, with over 500 indigenous languages, is one region  
196 where intercultural bilingual education is expanding to promote social change; to date, 12  
197 governments have institutionalized multilingual pedagogy (Cortina 2014). Often, social  
198 and political forces try to help resolve differences, usually including policy decisions that  
199 result in a hierarchy of acceptable languages to be used in schools and governance  
200 structures. In such situations, whether in OECD countries or LMICs, it is not unusual for  
201 children who speak minority languages to be excluded from research and assessments of  
202 learning.

203 This process of exclusion also occurs in regions where civil conflict or economic  
204 distress leads to substantial cross-border migration, where immigrant groups (and their  
205 children) are treated as transients, and where children are provided with little or no  
206 schooling (Pigozzi, Carrol, Hayden, and Ndaruhutse 2014). The 2010 Global Monitoring  
207 Report describes how marginalization can threaten educational attainment as these children  
208 face many challenges. The world’s most marginalized learners are generally faced with  
209 “inequalities, stigmatization, and discrimination linked to wealth, gender, ethnicity, lan-  
210 guage, location and disability” (UNESCO 2010, p. 5). The degree to which groups are, or  
211 are not, included in population samples has serious implications as researchers develop  
212 norms for learning outcomes. The majority of those in the population of interest may treat  
213 “others” as an inferior group that “cannot learn”. Ironically, in South Africa, where the  
214 poor are in the numerical majority, it is the poor rural students who feel the most



215 marginalized and powerless (Babson 2010). In sum, both skills and population samples  
216 vary, as do the learning processes that individuals deploy and the contexts in which they  
217 take place.

218 Finally, we must consider the stakeholders who *do* the sampling. Whether they are  
219 policymakers, psychometricians, or local teachers, they all come to the task of sampling  
220 skills and populations with their own experiences and points of view. Choices about which  
221 skills to sample, among which populations, and in which languages and contexts, also add  
222 potential bias to an already complex set of sampling issues. In order to address such biases,  
223 researchers can use a range of methods including tailored sampling and subsample designs,  
224 matching samples, oversampling marginalized populations, and mixed methods designs.  
225 The consequences of these various constraints can have an important impact on educa-  
226 tional policy and practice, and on global educational governance (Meyer and Benavot  
227 2013).

## 228 **Methodological credibility**

229 Research that can be converted into policy depends on its credibility—which means that  
230 well-trained specialists must achieve a consensus on the merits of a particular objective set  
231 of findings, even if they might disagree with the interpretation of such findings. The two  
232 most often-cited dimensions of credibility in learning research are validity and reliability.

233 The validity of any learning measurement tool can be determined in several ways. First,  
234 internal validity is determined by the degree to which findings can be credibly linked to the  
235 conceptual rationale for the intervention by minimizing systematic error, or bias. For  
236 example, do questions on a multiple-choice test really relate to a child's ability to read, or to  
237 the ability to remember what he or she has read earlier? Validity can vary significantly by  
238 context and by population, since a test that might be valid in London may have little validity  
239 in Lahore. Similarly, a reading test used effectively for one language group of mother-tongue  
240 speakers may be quite inappropriate for children who are second-language speakers of the  
241 same language. This second type of validity is appropriately referred to as external: the  
242 concern is whether findings are replicable across contexts. If data continues to be aggregated  
243 without regard to local context, assessments may misrepresent learners in BOP contexts.

244 A third type of validity concern has been raised with respect to international LSEAs:  
245 how valid are the choices of test items and how appropriate is their content, when they are  
246 applied to local cultures and local school systems? While much learning research takes the  
247 form of quantitative testing, qualitative and ethnographic methods can also contribute,  
248 particularly with respect to cultural variation in learning processes in diverse contexts.

249 Reliability is often measured in two quantitative ways. In general, reliability means the  
250 degree to which an individual's results on a test are consistently related to additional times  
251 that the individual takes the same (or equivalent) test. High reliability usually means that  
252 the rank ordering of individuals taking a given test would be very similar on a second  
253 occasion. A second, and easier, way to measure reliability is to look at the internal function  
254 of the test items: Do the items in each part of an assessment have a strong association with  
255 one another? This is inter-item reliability, measured by Cronbach's *alpha* statistic. Of  
256 course, reliability implies little about the validity of the instrument: the researchers'  
257 consensus that the instrument is relevant to educational outcomes.

258 Seen in a qualitative perspective, reliability would be achieved when context-sensitive  
259 ethnographers, for example, agree on a set of observations of learning processes that they  
260 have gathered independently in a particular context. This is an example of "team



ethnography”, which is increasingly being used in education research in the United States and Europe (Bartlett and Garcia 2011; Blackledge and Creese 2010). Further, the use of randomized control trials (RCT) is seen as an important way to increase the credibility of research findings, by comparing interventions with control groups. Recent reviews by Kremer and Holla (2009), Banerjee and Duflo (2011) and Bruns, Filmer, and Patrinos (2011) support the use of RCTs for improving research credibility in international development work, while others (e.g., Castillo and Wagner 2014) suggest some serious limitations of the use of RCTs for the design of educational policy.

The diversity of learning outcomes is most often summarized in terms of an average or normal range that can be mapped along the predictable dimensions of a bell-shaped curve (Gurn 2010). As many have observed, the notion that human behavior falls along some normal curve, with the majority of observations concentrated around a discernable average, oversimplifies the range and diversity of human experiences (Dudley-Marling and Gurn 2010). Society and culture influence almost every aspect of the human condition, from intelligence to height and weight, in many non-random ways. In the domain of learning and international development, the overreliance on interpreting findings through a prism of normally distributed data contains inherent biases.

Why does that matter? It is potentially misleading to base claims about human learning, and make predictions about it, in an assumption of normal distributions. We have argued that, for learners at the BOP, learning science may be substantially different than for those in more favored populations. One useful approach would be to focus on what BOP learners bring to learning rather than what they are missing. For example, Harper (2012) frames anti-deficit research in U.S. education contexts and Moll, Amanti, Neff, and Gonzalez (1992) describe an orientation that looks at “funds of knowledge” or assets. Each of these approaches supports the notion that there needs to be greater focus on what and how learning takes place at the bottom of the pyramid.

## Comparability of learning outcomes across contexts

Comparability is central to global education databases, such as the large-scale data collection carried out by the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) and OECD. Nonetheless, if the primary goal is comparability, less attention may be paid to the local and cultural validity of the definitions and classifications of learning. Further, the data may become less meaningful and potentially less applicable at the local level. This is a natural and essential tension between universalistic *etic* and context-sensitive *emic* approaches to measurement, and it is particularly relevant to the study of BOP populations. In one well-known example, emic approaches are those that are consciously focused on local cultural relevance, such as local words or descriptors for an “intelligent” person. Etic approaches are those that might define “intelligence” as a universal concept, and try to measure individuals across cultures on that single concept or definition.

Can both comparability and sensitivity to context be appropriately balanced in learning research? Should countries with below average scores be tested on the same scales with countries that have much higher average scores? If some countries, or groups of students, are located at the “floor” of a scale, some would say that the solution is to drop the scale to a lower level of difficulty. Others might say that the scale itself is flawed, and that there are different types of skills that could be better assessed, especially if the variations are evidently caused by cultural, ethnic, linguistic and related variables that lead one to question the test as much as or more than the group that is tested. Yet some say that having different scales for different groups or nations is an unacceptable compromise of the



307 benchmarks that are sought by international policy makers, such as the Learning Metrics  
308 Task Force (Brookings Institution 2013) or the UN Global Education First Initiative (GEFI  
309 2014). If the most important goal is to improve learning at the BOP, how credible are the  
310 findings at the tail of the distribution from international (or even national) assessments?

311 To the extent that comparability can be achieved (and no learning assessment claims  
312 perfect comparability), the results allow policymakers to consider their own national or  
313 regional situation relative to others. This seems to have most merit when the choices to be  
314 made apply to proximal situations, rather than distal ones. For example, consider an African  
315 country that has adopted a particular bilingual education program that appears to work well  
316 in primary school. If the education minister in a neighboring country believes that the case is  
317 similar enough to his or her own national situation, then it makes good sense to compare the  
318 scores on, say, primary school reading tests. A more distal comparison might be to observe  
319 that a certain kind of bilingual education program in Canada seems to be effective, but to  
320 doubt the prospects for applying it in a quite different context in Africa. But proximity is not  
321 always the most pertinent feature; for example, in the United States and Japan rivalries  
322 between educational outcomes and economic systems have been a matter of serious dis-  
323 cussion and debate over many years (Stevenson and Stigler 1982). In a more recent example,  
324 senior officials in Botswana were interested in knowing how Singapore came to score first in  
325 mathematics on several LSEAs (Gilmore 2005; see also Sjoberg 2007).

326 The key issue here is the degree to which it is necessary to have full comparability in  
327 learning outcomes, with all individuals and all groups on the same measurement scale. Or  
328 if a choice is made not to “force” the compromises needed for a single unified scale, what  
329 are the gains and losses in terms of comparability? Can international goals and com-  
330 mensurate statistics be maintained as stable and reliable if localized approaches are chosen  
331 over international comparability? The responses to these questions have led to situations  
332 where some LMICs may be tempted to participate in international learning assessments,  
333 but hesitate because their results may appear to be very low. Or, they may feel that the cost  
334 to participate does not add sufficient value to decision-making at the national level  
335 (Greaney and Kellaghan 1996). Others may participate because they do not want to be  
336 viewed as having benchmarks that are inferior to those used in OECD countries; for a  
337 recent discussion of some of these issues, see OECD (2014) and Bloem (2013).

338 In the end, international research on learning requires some form of comparability, but  
339 perhaps in more varied ways than usually considered today. For example, international and  
340 regional assessments are aimed specifically at cross-national comparability, while hybrid  
341 assessments (Wagner 2011b) are more focused on local contexts and increased validity.  
342 The latter try to combine aspects of large-scale and small-scale assessments, and may be  
343 thought of as smaller, quicker and cheaper. An early hybrid assessment was UNESCO’s  
344 Literacy Assessment Project (ILI 2002); later versions may be seen in the early grade  
345 reading assessments that have grown in popularity (Gove and Wetterberg 2011). Hybrid  
346 assessments offer localized comparability that large-scale assessments do not, and can  
347 offer more focused results for improving learning and interventions among poor and  
348 disadvantaged populations. Which types of comparability are most important depends on  
349 the policy goals desired, as well as timing and resource considerations.

## 350 What roles do stakeholders play?

351 Many stakeholders—including policymakers, ministers of education, community leaders in  
352 rural villages, teachers, parents and education specialists—should be held to account for





353 what and how children learn. Journal editors and universities can play a role by requiring  
354 that researchers offer more intentional explanations of the representation and inherent  
355 implications of the samples they include in published studies. Yet, even today, educational  
356 specialists and statisticians in most countries have been the primary “guardians” of  
357 learning processes and their importance for school and economic success. One major  
358 reason for this restricted access to knowledge about learning is the complexities of the  
359 empirical science of learning, as described above.

360 A second reason is insufficient knowledge—and at times erroneous beliefs—among  
361 both parents and children about how important learning and schooling are for their life  
362 chances. Much evidence, from many societies, suggests that people in poor communities  
363 underestimate the value of learning and schooling; for example, Stevenson and Stigler  
364 (1982) compared parental beliefs in the United States, China and Japan. Today, it is more  
365 important than ever before to involve multiple stakeholders in educational decision-  
366 making. In many countries, the public has become more interested in children’s learning  
367 and school achievement in comparative perspective, probably due to increasing global-  
368 ization, the influence of international agencies, the efforts of NGOs, greater community  
369 activism and parental interest. Some field studies have involved strong community  
370 engagement that has led to governments incorporating findings for policy change; see  
371 Bhattacharjea, Wadhwa, and Banerji (2011) in India, and Piper and Korda (2010) in  
372 Liberia.

373 This type of multilevel information exchange is another way of linking science to  
374 accountability and expectation. Whose problem is it if a child, teacher, school, district or  
375 nation is not performing at a given level of learning? Indeed, how are such expectations  
376 even built? Whose expectations should be taken into account? Knowledge about the  
377 importance of learning—and how it can be achieved in formal and non-formal settings, and  
378 in structured and informal ways—has the potential to break new ground in research, policy  
379 development, community and family participation and local ownership. This is nowhere  
380 more apparent than at the bottom of the pyramid, where parents and communities are only  
381 now becoming more aware of the role learning can play in their children’s lives.

## 382 Policy conclusions

383 Research on how to improve learning in low-income countries and in poor and margin-  
384 alized communities—BOP populations—is, in principle, no more difficult to conduct than  
385 similar research in wealthier communities. However, given where most of the scientific  
386 (human and fiscal) resources are located (i.e., largely in OECD countries), it can be much  
387 less convenient for those with the advanced training needed to do the work. That fact,  
388 among others, is why so much remains to be known about learning in BOP contexts.

389 The way that learning is studied in LMICs, and specifically in BOP populations, could  
390 have great scientific significance, for both researchers and education planners. As we move  
391 forward from Jomtien, Dakar, and the United Nations MDGs towards the post-2015  
392 development goals, it is clear that social and economic inequalities will persist unless we  
393 maintain a serious focus on learning among the poor. In his seminal book on new  
394 approaches for reaching BOP consumer markets, Prahalad (2006) challenged corporations  
395 to adopt a new philosophy of service delivery for this historically overlooked population.  
396 By transforming the way learning is understood in contexts at the bottom of the pyramid,  
397 we can begin to understand how to better promote policies that will enhance educational  
398 quality and increase the learning consequences among those hardest to reach.



## References

- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602–614.
- Babson, A. (2010). *The place of English in expanding repertoires of linguistic code, identification and aspiration among recent high school graduates in Limpopo Province, South Africa*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2011). *Poor economics: A radical rethinking of the way to fight poverty*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Bartlett, L., & Garcia, O. (2011). *Additive schooling in subtractive times: Bilingual education and Dominican immigrant youth in the Heights*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Benavot, A., & Tanner, E. (2007). *The growth of national learning assessments in the world, 1995–2006*. Background paper prepared for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2008. Paris: UNESCO.
- Benedict, M., & Hoag, J. (2004). Seating location in large lectures: Are seating preferences or location related to course performance? *The Journal of Economic Education*, 35(3), 215–239.
- Bhattacharjea, S., Wadhwa, W., & R. Banerji, R. (2011). *Inside primary schools: A study of teaching and learning in rural India*. New Delhi: ASER. [http://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/Inside\\_Primary\\_School/Report/tl\\_study\\_print\\_ready\\_version\\_oct\\_7\\_2011.pdf](http://img.asercentre.org/docs/Publications/Inside_Primary_School/Report/tl_study_print_ready_version_oct_7_2011.pdf).
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A critical perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Bloem, S. (2013). *PISA in low and middle income countries*. OECD education working papers, no. 93. Paris: OECD.
- Braun, H., & Kanjee, A. (2006). Using assessment to improve education in developing nations. In J. E. Cohen, D. E. Bloom, & M. B. Malin (Eds.), *Educating all children: A global agenda* (pp. 303–353). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Brookings Institution (2013). *Toward universal learning: Recommendations from the Learning Metrics Task Force*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Center for Universal Education. <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Research/Files/Reports/2013/09/learning%20metrics%20task%20force%20universal%20learning/LTMF%20RecommendationsReportfinalweb.pdf>.
- Bruns, B., Filmer, D., & Patrinos, H. A. (2011). *Making schools work: New evidence on accountability reforms*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Buchmann, C., & Hannum, E. (2001). Education and stratification in developing countries: A review of theories and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 77–102.
- Castillo, N. M., & Wagner, D. A. (2014). Gold standard? The use of randomized controlled trials for international educational policy. *Comparative Education Review*, 58(1), 166–173.
- Cole, M., Gay, J., Glick, J., & Sharp, D. (1971). *The cultural context of learning and thinking*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cortina, R. (Ed.) (2014). *The education of indigenous citizens in Latin America*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- DBE [Department of Basic Education], South Africa (2013). *Report on the Annual National Assessment of 2013: Grades 1 to 6 & 9*. Pretoria: DBE. <http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=Aiw7HW8ccic%3D&tabid=36>.
- Dudley-Marling, C., & Gurn, A. (Eds.) (2010). *The myth of the normal curve*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Engel, L. C., & Feuer, M. J. (2014). Five myths about international large-scale assessments. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 22, 18–21.
- GEFI [Global Education First Initiative] (2014). *Global education first initiative: An initiative of the United Nations Secretary-General*. [http://www.globaleducationfirst.org/files/GEFI\\_Brochure\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.globaleducationfirst.org/files/GEFI_Brochure_ENG.pdf).
- Gilmore, A. (2005). *The impact of PIRLS (2001) and TIMSS (2003) in low- and middle-income countries: An evaluation of the value of World Bank support for international surveys of reading literacy (PIRLS) and mathematics and science (TIMSS)*. New Zealand: IEA.
- Gove, A., & Wetterberg, A. (2011). *The early grade reading assessment: Applications and interventions to improve basic literacy*. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI.
- Greaney, V., & Kellaghan, T. (1996). *Monitoring the learning outcomes of education systems*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Gurn, A. (2010). Conclusion: Re/visiting the ideological imagination in (special) education. In C. Dudley-Marling & A. Gurn (Eds.), *The myth of the normal curve* (pp. 241–256). New York: Peter Lang.
- Harper, S. R. (2012). *Black male student success in higher education: A report from the National Black Male College Achievement Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education.



- 458 Heinrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral Brain*  
459 *Science*, 33(2–3), 85–135.
- 460 ILI [International Literacy Institute] (2002). *Towards guidelines for the improvement of literacy assessment*  
461 *in developing countries: Conceptual dimensions based on the LAP project*. Philadelphia: ILI/  
462 UNESCO.
- 463 Kagan, J., Moss, H. A., & Sigel, I. E. (1963). Psychological significance of styles of conceptualization.  
464 *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 28(4), 73–112.
- 465 Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York: Macmillan.
- 466 Korinek, K., & Punpuing, S. (2012). The effect of household and community on school attrition: An analysis  
467 of Thai youth. *Comparative Education Review*, 56(3), 474–510.
- 468 Kremer, M., & Holla, A. (2009). Improving education in the developing world: What have we learned from  
469 randomized evaluations? *Annual Review of Economics*, 1, 513–542.
- 470 Li, J. (2003). U.S. and Chinese cultural beliefs about learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95,  
471 258–267.
- 472 Lu, Y., & Treiman, D. J. (2011). Migration, remittances and educational stratification among Blacks in  
473 Apartheid and Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Social Forces*, 89(4), 1119–1143.
- 474 Meyer, H.-D., & Benavot, A. (Eds.) (2013). *PISA, power and policy: The emergence of global educational*  
475 *governance*. Oxford: Symposium Books.
- 476 Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a  
477 qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 132–141.
- 478 OECD (2014). *PISA for development*. Paris: OECD. [http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisafordevelop](http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisafordevelopment.htm)  
479 [ment.htm](http://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/pisafordevelopment.htm).
- 480 Pigozzi, M. J., Carrol, B., Hayden, J., & Ndaruhutse, S. (2014). Fragile and conflict-affected situations. In D.  
481 A. Wagner (Ed.), *Learning and education in developing countries: Research and policy for the post-*  
482 *2015 UN development goals* (pp. 58–73). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 483 Piper, B., & Korda, M. (2010). *Early grade reading assessment (EGRA) plus: Liberia*. Program evaluation  
484 report: Prepared for USAID/Liberia. Research Triangle Park, NC: RTI International.
- 485 Prahalad, C. K. (2006). *The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid: Eradicating poverty through profits*. Upper  
486 Saddle River, NJ: Wharton School Publishing.
- 487 Saito, M. (2011). *Gender equality in education: Looking beyond parity*. Paris: UNESCO IIEP. [http://www.](http://www.sacmeq.org/sites/default/files/sacmeq/publications/7_1_1_5_mioko_saito_eng_version_2012_02_15.pdf)  
488 [sacmeq.org/sites/default/files/sacmeq/publications/7\\_1\\_1\\_5\\_mioko\\_saito\\_eng\\_version\\_2012\\_02\\_15.](http://www.sacmeq.org/sites/default/files/sacmeq/publications/7_1_1_5_mioko_saito_eng_version_2012_02_15.pdf)  
489 [pdf](http://www.sacmeq.org/sites/default/files/sacmeq/publications/7_1_1_5_mioko_saito_eng_version_2012_02_15.pdf).
- 490 Sjoberg, S. (2007). PISA and ‘real life challenges’: Mission impossible? In S. T. Hopmann, G. Brinek, & M.  
491 Retzl (Eds.), *PISA according to PISA: Does PISA keep what it promises?* (pp. 203–224). Vienna: LIT  
492 Verlag. <http://folk.uio.no/sveinsj/Sjoberg-PISA-book-2007.pdf>.
- 493 Stevenson, H. W., & Stigler, J. W. (1982). *The learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we can*  
494 *learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. New York: Summit.
- 495 UNESCO (2003). *Education for all global monitoring report: Gender and education for all—The leap to*  
496 *equality*. Paris: UNESCO.
- 497 UNESCO (2010). *Education for all global monitoring report: Reaching the marginalized*. Paris: UNESCO.
- 498 United Nations (2000). *United Nations millennium declaration*. Resolution adopted by the General  
499 Assembly. United Nations A/RES/55/2. <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>.
- 500 Wagner, D. A. (1983). Rediscovering ‘rote’: Some cognitive and pedagogical preliminaries. In S. Irvine & J.  
501 W. Berry (Eds.), *Human assessment and cultural factors* (pp. 179–190). New York: Plenum.
- 502 Wagner, D. A. (1993). *Literacy, culture and development: Becoming literate in Morocco*. New York:  
503 Cambridge University Press.
- 504 Wagner, D. A. (2010). Quality of education, comparability, and assessment choice in developing countries.  
505 *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 40(6), 741–760.
- 506 Wagner, D. A. (2011a). What happened to literacy? Historical and conceptual perspectives on literacy in  
507 UNESCO. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31, 319–323.
- 508 Wagner, D. A. (2011b). *Smaller, quicker, cheaper: Improving learning assessments in developing countries*.  
509 Paris, Washington: UNESCO IIEP and EFA Fast Track Initiative of Global Partnership for Education.
- 510 Wagner, D. A. (Ed.) (2014). *Learning and education in developing countries: Research and policy for the*  
511 *post-2015 UN Development Goals*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 512 Wagner, D. A., Murphy, K. M., & de Korne, H. (2012). *Learning first: A research agenda for improving*  
513 *learning in low-income countries*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- 514 Witkin, H. A., Moore, C. A., Goodenough, D. R., & Cox, P. W. (1977). Field-dependent and field-  
515 independent cognitive styles and their educational implications. *Review of Educational Research*, 47,  
516 1–64.
- 517



518 **Daniel A. Wagner (United States)** is UNESCO Chair, professor of education, and director of the  
519 International Literacy Institute and International Educational Development Program at the University of  
520 Pennsylvania. He has extensive experience in national and international educational issues, and has served  
521 as an advisor to UNESCO, UNICEF, the World Bank, USAID, DFID, and other agencies on international  
522 development issues. He is a fellow of the American Psychological Association, the American  
523 Anthropological Association, and the American Educational Research Association.

524 **Nathan M. Castillo (United States)** is in the Ph.D. program at the Graduate School of Education and a  
525 research associate for the International Literacy Institute at the University of Pennsylvania. Before coming  
526 to Penn, he was based at Education Development Center's International Development Division in  
527 Washington, DC. From 2006 to 2008, he was a health education coordinator, while serving with the United  
528 States Peace Corps in Guatemala. He holds a master's degree in International Education Policy from  
529 Harvard University.

530

REVISED PROOF