Educator Materials

Teaching The Five C Theory in Sierra Leonean studies, civics and public administration

Start with one decision

Ask learners how a resident without an introduction can find out who approved a school repair. Give them a minute to write down what they know, what they infer and which record they would need. Return to their answers after the unit.

Learning outcomes

Learners should be able to explain two interacting domains, identify who had authority and realistic alternatives, and offer a counterexample. For their final task they turn a concern into a question an institution can answer and specify what would count as correction.

Choose a route

For one class, teach the water-service lesson on page 7. For a unit or semester, use pages 3-4. Pages 5-8 are lesson plans, page 9 is a reproducible student sheet, and page 10 gives the assessment and marking criteria.

Facilitation agreement

Offer a fictional case to anyone who prefers it. Allow a written response, a pass or a change of mind. Invite learners to use the language in which they can explain an idea most precisely and agree on a translation for shared notes. Nobody has to report a personal experience or speak for a community.

Source

Bhai-Dhawa Sesay, The Five C Theory: Culture, Corruption, Citizenship, Contentment, and Complacency in Sierra Leone. Revised 2026 EPUB, Leone Connect Publishing. The activities in this guide are companion teaching material.

Five domains of public life

Concept notes for the teacher / Introduction and chapters 1-20

Culture

Belonging, respect and family obligation can widen public care. Ask when helping someone understand a rule becomes changing the decision in their favour. A relative can support an official who refuses an improper request.

Corruption

Examine how entrusted authority is used. A shortlist quietly changed for a contact can distort a public decision without a payment. A delay alone leaves several explanations open. Ask who controlled the decision and who had a real choice.

Citizenship

Equal membership gives a resident a claim to fair procedure and an explanation. A supporter, client, subject or citizen can be the same person in different circumstances. Ask whether the office would answer a stranger on the same terms.

Contentment

Personal sufficiency concerns what a person considers enough. Resilience helps people continue under strain. Adaptation changes how they manage. Buying water can sustain a household while it continues to press a public claim.

Complacency

Look for evidence that an inadequate standard has come to seem acceptable. Fear, exhaustion, doubt about one campaign and a decision to withdraw can all explain nonparticipation. Ask what people still believe the institution owes.

Test the framework

Have students draw one supported relationship and one counterexample. Leave a domain open when evidence is missing. Strong analysis explains variation across offices or communities under similar pressures.

Educator Materials | Revised EPUB ISBN 979-8-9982321-5-2

Four or six weeks

Two teaching routes / Readings refer to chapters in the revised EPUB

Four weeks

1. Introduction and chapters 1-8. Compare giving advice with changing a shortlist. Submit a table of authority, alternatives and effects on other applicants.

2. Chapters 9-12 and 21. Walk through a service from the standpoint of an unknown citizen. Submit the rule and the explanation that any resident could request.

3. Chapters 13-20. Use the water-service lesson on page 7. Submit two explanations for a household's response and one fact that could distinguish them.

4. Chapters 22-24. Use the school-roof lesson on page 8. Submit a public question, a named responsible office and a test for closure.

Six weeks

1. Introduction. Build an evidence ledger for a decision. 2. Chapters 1-4. Apply the favour test and report a counterexample.

3. Chapters 5-8. Trace an official route and a private exception. 4. Chapters 9-12. Compare a patron's intervention with equal access to the ordinary procedure.

5. Chapters 13-20. Distinguish personal sufficiency, coping and public expectation. 6. Chapters 21-24. Present the case brief from page 10 and revise it after peer review.

Assessment rhythm

Collect one short written product per week. Carry the same case forward so learners can show which claim changed when new evidence arrived.

A twelve-week course

Weekly reading, seminar question and assessable product

Weeks 1 and 2

1. Introduction. What could the framework miss? Submit an initial claim and one rival explanation. 2. Chapters 1-2. When can respect make a necessary question easier to ask? Draft two versions of a respectful question.

Weeks 3 and 4

3. Chapters 3-4. Consider a relative requesting help. Draft a response a stranger could also receive. 4. Chapters 5-6. Map who controls a shortlist and identify the point where scrutiny would matter.

Weeks 5 and 6

5. Chapters 7-8. Compare the choices of an official and a family facing urgency. Submit a responsibility table. 6. Chapters 9-10. Use the unknown citizen test to assess a service counter.

Weeks 7 and 8

7. Chapters 11-12. Exchange the political identities in a hypothetical case. Record whether the standard changed. 8. Chapters 13-14. Identify the costs of continued coping and what responsible patience would require.

Weeks 9 and 10

9. Chapters 15-16. Write separate statements about personal sufficiency and public duty. 10. Chapters 17-20. Compare two explanations for silence and state what evidence could distinguish them.

Weeks 11 and 12

11. Chapters 21-22. Trace how a complaint could survive a change in officeholder. Design a record the next official can use. 12. Chapters 23-24. Present the school-roof case or another bounded issue, then defend a measure of verified closure.

Belonging and public authority

Lesson plan / 45 minutes / Chapters 1-8

Prepare

Write this fictional case on the board. A relative asks a recruitment officer for the selection criteria. Later the relative asks to be added to the shortlist after it has closed. Give pairs paper with three columns: request, power and effect on others.

Reason through the decisions - 15 min

Allow five minutes of individual annotation. In pairs, draft a reply to each request. Ask what information could be given to every applicant and which change would displace a published rule.

Compare alternatives - 15 min

Give one group an applicant with an urgent income need and another the chair of the panel. Each group identifies what its person knew, controlled and could safely refuse. Ask which responsibilities follow from those differences.

Debrief and exit ticket - 15 min

Ask for a family response that makes fair recruitment easier. Each learner submits one way that belonging supports a public duty and one condition under which it could undermine it.

What to look for

A sound answer distinguishes explaining a rule from overriding it. Give credit for showing who would lose a fair opportunity and for naming the evidence needed before alleging wrongdoing.

Teaching notes

Would the office answer a stranger?

Lesson plan / 40 minutes / Chapters 9-12 and 21

Prepare

Offer a fictional service process: residents submit a paper request, receive a reference number and can ask for a reason if the request stalls. Tell half the pairs that the applicant knows a councillor. Give the others an applicant new to the area.

Trace the route - 12 min

Have pairs draw the steps from finding the requirements to receiving a decision. Circle each point where access depends on private knowledge. Indicate what the office could make available to everyone.

Exchange the identities - 13 min

Swap applicants. Ask whether the fee, required evidence, waiting time or right to an explanation changes. Have learners mark which differences follow from the rule and which arise from a relationship.

Debrief - 15 min

Ask groups to design one procedure the next unknown person could use. Invite a written response from anyone who prefers not to speak. An official may offer guidance while upholding equal standing.

Evidence of learning

Collect a two-sentence answer naming a duty that survives a resident's absence from a meeting and a concrete way to test whether that duty is met.

Teaching notes

Water, coping and public expectation

Lesson plan / 45 minutes / Chapters 13-21

Read

Use the illustrative water campaign in chapter 21. Residents buy water, document interruptions and ask the agency for an explanation. The chapter distinguishes improvement in the answer from restoration of the service. Present it as an illustration.

Sort the evidence - 15 min

Give groups three observations: a family buys water, a resident misses a meeting, and the agency names a repair date. For each, record what happened and two conclusions that the observation alone cannot establish.

Ask what is still owed - 15 min

Students separate personal ideas of enough from household adaptation. Have them compare fatigue, concern about retaliation, and loss of public expectation as explanations for absence. Which further evidence could distinguish them without exposing the resident?

Check the answer - 15 min

Ask what the promised date allows residents to check. A useful answer names the office, the service standard and a later observation, such as whether water returns to households beyond the campaign group.

Exit ticket

Write one sentence about household agency and one about institutional duty. Accept answers that show a workaround can preserve a claim or conceal its cost, depending on what follows.

Teaching notes

From a school roof to a remedy

Lesson plan / 50 minutes / Chapters 22-24

Case brief

Use chapter 23's school-roof example. Put six cards on the table: report, inspection, funding, authorisation, completed work and verified closure. A claim that the matter has been addressed can refer to different stages.

Sequence the evidence - 15 min

Give each group a fictional inspection note and a hypothetical budget entry. Ask which stages these documents support and what each leaves open. Keep the funding decision distinct from completed work.

Write a public question - 15 min

Students identify the office responsible for the next step and ask for one record or decision by a stated date. Exchange drafts and check that the question could be asked by a parent without a personal contact.

Test closure - 10 min

Ask whose observation could verify that the repair works, including for pupils whose families were absent from meetings. Ask what should remain on record if the repair stalls or the campaign must pause.

Review - 10 min

Each group submits a claim, a source and a limit. Award credit for identifying progress accurately even when the final outcome remains unresolved.

Teaching notes

Student case worksheet

Print one per learner or group / Use with any lesson

Decision and standard

Name one decision, the institution responsible and the public standard you can document. Use a fictional or anonymised example where appropriate.

Evidence and limits

Record one observation and its source. Identify an inference and one fact that would weaken it.

Relationships and responsibility

Choose the domains that matter here. Which relationship shaped the decision? Who controlled it, and who had limited alternatives?

Response and follow-up

Write one question the office can answer. Which record, date or observable change would show whether the remedy reached the next resident?

Assignments and assessment

Case brief, essay alternatives and a 100-point rubric

Institutional case brief

Submit a two-page account of a single decision. State the duty, attribute two pieces of evidence, compare a rival explanation and identify who could act differently. Finish with one attainable institutional response, a measure of progress and a limit of the framework.

Essay alternatives

Use two cases to examine when family obligation protects fair procedure. Or assess whether an improvement in complaint handling produces a remedy. In either essay, apply the same standard to allies and opponents and address one counterexample.

Conceptual understanding - 25

Accurately distinguish the relevant domains. In particular, give personal sufficiency, adaptation and public expectation separate meanings where they apply.

Evidence and precision - 20

Identify the source and limit of each consequential claim. Separate the book's illustrative scenes from documented events.

Analysis - 25

Explain a relationship, compare alternatives and show what evidence could change the conclusion. Identify the stage between a public claim and a verified remedy.

Consistency and fairness - 15

Apply one standard across identities. Weigh authority, knowledge, risk and realistic alternatives before assigning responsibility.

Structure and clarity - 10

Make the claim, reasoning and proposed test easy to follow. Use terms consistently.

Reflection and originality - 5

Name one assumption revised or one feasible improvement the analysis makes visible.

Further reading

Use the 28 questions in the book's Discussion Guide for seminar extensions. Find the current excerpt, guides and educator support at fivectheory.com/resources/ and fivectheory.com/educators/.