An Investigation into the Factors that Influence Students' Academic Performance in the Caribbean:

Home and School Factors

COUNTRY REPORT

St. Vincent & the Grenadines

Report #:
CERC_SAS1a:SVG

Caribbean Educational Research Centre

This page is intentionally blank.

An Investigation into the Factors that Influence Students' Academic Performance: Home and School Factors

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES COUNTRY REPORT

Caribbean Educational Research Centre

November 2024

Report # CERC_SAS 1a: SVG

This research was planned and executed by:

The Caribbean Educational Research Centre

The University of the West Indies

Cave Hill Campus, Barbados

- Professor S. Joel Warrican, Director
- Dr Coreen J. Leacock, Research Coordinator
- Dr Erin Mahon, Research Fellow
- Dr Laurette Bristol, Project Officer
- Ms Bethlene Ferdinand, Research Assistant
- Ms Jimelle Roberts, Research Assistant
- Ms Talyjah Hyatt, Research Assistant
- Ms Judy Ann Auld, Research Assistant
- Ms Crescentiana Alfred, Research Assistant
- Ms Jonielle Alleyne, Research Assistant
- Mrs Paula Alleyne, Research Assistant
- Ms Desiré Collins, Research Assistant
- Ms Rachel Frame, Research Assistant
- Mr Don Howell, Research Assistant
- Mrs Nitha Mauricette-Philip, Research Assistant
- Dr Allison DaSantos, Research Fellow
- Dr Chloe Walker, Research Fellow

Global Campus, Barbados

- Ms Melissa Alleyne, Planning Officer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

Educational practices that originated during the colonial era, when Caribbean nations were under European rule, persist today despite their misalignment with the modern Caribbean context. Recently, there has been a movement towards evidence-informed policymaking to address these outdated practices. An evidence-based approach is crucial for small island developing states with limited resources, such as St Vincent and the Grenadines. This study is a partial response to the growing demand for empirical data to support policymaking. It aims to provide insights into the home and school factors influencing students' academic progress in St Vincent and the Grenadines. Phase One of the study, conducted in 2017, received funding from the Board of Graduate Studies, The University of the West Indies, while Phase Two, carried out in 2024, was funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

Objectives

This report aims to describe and compare data collected in St Vincent and the Grenadines in 2017 and 2022 on:

1. Primary and secondary school students' home environment.
2. Primary and secondary school students' attitudes towards learning and perceptions of school climate.
3. Primary and secondary school teachers' classroom practices.
4. Primary and secondary teachers' and principals' perceptions of school leadership practices.
5. Primary and secondary school characteristics.
6. Primary and secondary teachers' and principals' views on common educational practices, including using the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment (CPEA) for secondary school placement, grade retention and ability-based streaming.
7. The impact of COVID-19 on primary and secondary school students' attitudes towards learning and teachers' attitudes towards teaching.

This report is Report 1a, the first in a two-part report on the home and school factors influencing student academic achievement. Report 1b will explore the potential of these factors to predict student achievement at the primary and secondary levels.

Methodology

Surveys were used to collect quantitative data from students, teachers, and principals in primary and secondary schools in St Vincent and the Grenadines. The study targeted key factors affecting academic achievement, including school, personal, and home influences. A representative sample of public and government-assisted schools was selected.

Profiles

Students

The overall study noted a difference in the number of primary students who participated, with more students taking part in 2017. More male students completed the survey in 2017 than in 2022, when more females participated. The children in the study ranged from nine to 11 years, with an average age of 10. The majority of the students in the study attended preschool before primary school. At the secondary level, the distribution of students by sex increased for female students and decreased for males. The average age remained consistent, with the dominant age group between 13-15 years.

Teachers

The primary teachers in the study were primarily females, with a general increase in participation in 2022. Primary teachers' experience within the profession ranged from three years to over four decades. The qualification that most primary teachers hold is an associate's degree. However, an increase in bachelor’s degrees was noted over the years, with no primary teachers holding a master's degree. The study's most significant cohort of teachers were trained non-graduate teachers, and this group steadily increased. A decrease in untrained graduate teachers was noted. Additionally, most teachers taught Language Arts and Science, with an increase in taught subjects right across the board. The dominant sex of teachers at the secondary level was female. Most secondary teachers were trained graduate teachers, with the majority having bachelor’s degrees. Most teachers taught at the upper secondary level, with the popular subjects being English, Mathematics, General Studies and Science.

Principals

The dominant sex for principals at the primary level was female. The maximum number of years in the teaching profession remained consistent at 39 years for principals who taught before their new role. The maximum number of years for a primary principal was 14, and the minimum was zero. The maximum number of years for principals at a particular school was 11, with the minimum number being zero. The highest qualification held for a principal was a doctorate (EdD), with the majority having a bachelor's degree. By 2022, all principals had qualifications in leadership and management, with the highest being a doctorate and the majority being an associate's degree. There was an increase in male and female principals at the secondary level. There was a wider variation in terms of years spent in the teaching profession in 2022 compared to 2017. There was also an increase in 2022 in the number of years as a secondary school principal and the number of years as principal at their current school. There was also an increase in the number and category of qualifications as principals in 2022. All principals in 2022 were trained in school leadership/management.

Factors Affecting Student Achievement

Student's Home Environment

Students at the primary level in both years lived primarily with their mothers, fathers and siblings, with a decrease in the presence of fathers in the household over the years noted. Employment for parents was primarily full-time, with a slight decline in part-time employment. According to the data, access to the internet increased significantly over the years, with more access to tablets in the household and a decrease in the use of smartphones. A decrease in the primary students' access to computers to work and a quiet place to study occurred, with increased access to their own rooms. The main means of transportation for primary students was public transportation, with decreased walking and increased use of private vehicles over the years. Watching television, listening to music and playing video games remain the social activities that children engage in in their spare time. While these remain at their average mark, there was a decrease in reading from 2017 to 2022, with genres being newspapers and non-fiction novels and no preference for paper or electronic format. With a decrease in reading, there was a decrease in the number of books in the household and persons reading to primary students at home. Additionally, primary students' participation in extracurricular activities saw a significant decrease from 2017 to 2022. The students listed a lack

of finances, confidence, motivation, and other responsibilities as reasons for not engaging in extracurricular activities. For the secondary level students, participation was evenly distributed, along with participation for students who did not participate in extracurricular activities. Students listed various activities, including sports, school clubs and groups. Secondary students gave reasons for non-participation, such as financial challenges, parental restrictions, lack of interest, bullying, and being overwhelmed with schoolwork.

Students' Attitude towards School and Learning

Primary school students had a generally positive attitude towards learning in both years. The students reported their thoughts on school and believed it would help them get a good job later in life and increase their knowledge. While the students believed school to be a fun place to learn new things, there was an increase in the perception over the years that school is boring, they wished they did not have to go to school and hated doing homework. However, the primary students enjoyed school and saw it as a place to aid their holistic development.

Students' Perception of the School Environment

Primary students had mixed emotions regarding how they felt about the school environment. The students felt proud to be part of their school. Students perceived the school to be friendly, allowing for persons to visit. However, this warm welcome was not extended to their parents. The students noted a decrease in broken and unfixed items. Where their teachers were concerned, the primary students felt they were part of a family, where the teachers were helpful and developed a sense of responsibility. However, the students did not feel safe trusting teachers and reported that there are approximately two teachers who they trust they can engage with at school. The primary students' main concern for the school environment was the interaction with each other (their peers), where students were unfriendly to each other. They appreciated that rules were in place, with their teachers helping them understand their consequences. Students at the secondary level perceived school to be a place that they enjoy and are proud to be a part of; however, with improvements. There has been a decrease in the friendliness of the school culture, where parents are not welcomed to the school. They believed that their teachers collaborate, and there has been an increase in teachers talking and teaching together often. Students reported feeling more involved in the decision-making process, a decrease in teachers making all the decisions, more classroom jobs were implemented, and more teamwork or group projects. They appreciated that the classroom

rules are more explicit and teachers show more respect to students than previously. Additionally, there has been a decrease in students not understanding why they receive the grades they receive. The secondary school students' perception of a safe school environment significantly decreased between 2017 and 2022. A high percentage also noted segregation in social class, where some students feel that they are better than others.

Teachers' Classroom Practices

Frequency of Use of Technology

Primary teachers from 2022 have increased their use of technology in the classroom to allow students to access lessons online. The internet is being utilised by teachers to assist with information for their classes and to aid students in engaging in more classroom chats and forums. Additionally, technology is being used to assist with tests, homework preparations and student grading. However, despite these changes, the use of software to teach concepts and the inclusion of cameras for learning remain low. The frequency of technology use for secondary teachers has increased generally. Secondary teachers use technology to create instructional materials, formulate tests for students, get information from the internet for lessons, and record student grades. However, engaging students in online discussions, posting homework assignments online, using digital cameras to enhance lessons, and using software to remediate basic skills are not being implemented during classroom time. Secondary teachers face challenges when using technology. These include insufficient computers, limited internet access, unreliable computers, inadequate instructional software, peripherals, and training opportunities. Overall, teachers selected several strategies for using technology.

School Leadership

Generally, primary teachers have reported improvements in school leadership. Teachers reported that school leaders clarified who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders). Additionally, they encouraged teachers to use the instructional time for teaching and practising new skills and concepts, ensured that the classroom priorities of teachers were consistent with the goals and direction of the school and complimented teachers privately for their efforts or performance. Teachers mentioned that

principals do not acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files. Most areas remained constant from 2017-2022.

School Characteristics

At the primary level, the number of female students participating in the study remained constant while the number of males decreased. The staff numbers showed that librarians continued to be present, with an increase in ancillary staff. There was an increase in principals' concern about absenteeism among students, while teachers' absenteeism ranged from no challenge to a moderate challenge. Facilities at the primary schools that were present and in use included libraries and canteens, which decreased over the years. However, there has been an increase in computer laboratories. Primary schools lack industrial arts rooms, home economics rooms, and music rooms. Students are more frequently assigned to classes based on ability compared to 2017, when mixed-ability classrooms were present. The maximum number of lessons per day remained the same at eight, with the minimum increasing from six to seven. The period of lessons decreased from 45 minutes to 40 minutes, with the shortest lesson lasting 25 minutes. Reading policies at the primary level have increased significantly along with time-tabled leisure reading. This was also reflected in extra-curricular activities, which saw an increase in policy and timetabled periods. At the secondary level, students were allowed to select their academic path, including arts, business, science and technical vocational areas. However, most students indicated that they chose their career, while others indicated that their teacher and/or parents influenced their decision. The most popular career choices were medicine, law, and business, with the least popular areas including technology, fashion design, science, beauty, and aesthetics.

Factors with Indirect Influences

Views on Common Educational Practices

Teachers

Primary teachers reported that they generally liked the teaching profession, with most enjoying teaching at their present school. Most of the primary teachers did not provide extra lessons after classes. According to the data, one reason may be that teachers believe they should be paid extra for such lessons. Additionally, parents are unwilling to pay for the extra lessons. The primary

teachers endorse that the Common Entrance Examination is a streaming tool for secondary school, that children should be streamed, and that grade retention practices should remain. At the secondary level, teachers indicated that they liked teaching in general but only to an extent at their current school. The teachers found it sometimes true that they provide extra lessons for students in their class outside of school hours. The data indicate that there was a decrease in parents' willingness to pay for lessons in school from sometimes to never. There was an overwhelming response from the secondary teachers that they should be paid for providing extra lessons to students in class outside of regular school time. The secondary teachers, like the primary teachers, supported using the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment for secondary school placement, saying that classes should be streamed according to ability and that grade retention should remain.

Principals

Like the teachers, primary school principals shared the view that teachers should be paid for extra lessons. There was a decrease in the principals' view that the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment should be used for secondary placement. Meanwhile, there was an increase in support for streaming students according to abilities, while opinions on grade retention saw no change in both years. Most secondary school principals indicated that teachers should be paid more for extra lessons, that the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment should be used for placement into secondary schools, that classes should be streamed according to ability and that grades should be retained.

The Impact of COVID-19 on Teaching and Learning

Students' Experiences of Schooling during the COVID-19 Pandemic

During COVID-19, most students had online classes, preferring face-to-face learning only. Many students mentioned that the shift to online learning was difficult, while others found it a smooth transition. Lessons were accessed through worksheets and television for some students, while others had no access at all. The primary students faced challenges during COVID-19, including finding a quiet space to work, difficulties in keeping up with their schoolwork, poor time management, no motivation to do work, and little help from their teachers. However, the students highlighted some benefits resulting from COVID-19, including additional time to complete assignments and having an appropriate device of their own. Additionally, the students enjoyed the extra time they spent with family and extra activities and the reduced worry of not travelling to

school. The students found the safety protocols challenging to follow. Generally, the students were very satisfied with the support received from school and at home.

For secondary school students, once more, most students attended classes online during COVID-19. They had access to their lessons through worksheets that their teachers sent. The majority of the students experienced challenges with online learning. This included trouble logging in to meeting spaces, devices not always working, and students not knowing how to use the learning platforms. Students also indicated difficulty keeping up with their schoolwork and organising their time. They did not feel like doing schoolwork, had difficulty finding a quiet place to work, and could not get extra help with schoolwork from teachers. However, despite the challenges that the students experienced, they indicated that they had had positive experiences attending school online. Some of these positive experiences included having more rest time, staying in bed longer in the morning before getting up for school, having more time with family, not having to travel to school and having more time for other activities.

The secondary school students preferred face-to-face lessons. They mentioned that they received extra support from their teachers during the pandemic by teachers providing additional time to complete classwork and assignments. Due to this, the students indicated they were moderately satisfied with the support they received from their schools during online schooling. The support they received from home was satisfactory, and they always had the necessary technology required, including their own devices. The students indicated that it was sometimes hard to follow the safety rules and that changing from face-to-face to online school was very hard for them. The COVID-19 pandemic did not affect how the students felt about school.

Teachers' Experiences of Schooling during the COVID-19 Pandemic

Despite the pandemic, primary teachers were still able to engage their students using the online platforms. They found the switch from face-to-face to online somewhat challenging. Teachers used worksheets the most to disperse information to students, with their preferred modality being face-to-face and some consideration of a blended approach. Like the students, the teachers experienced challenges with online learning. There were three significant challenges: dealing with parents in the online classroom, planning adequate assessments and the biggest challenge was identified as an unstable internet connection. For the primary teachers, the least challenging was not having a

device. Almost all teachers had access to a device: most used their personal computer, but others were sourced from the Ministry of Education.

The learning platforms that the teachers engaged with most were Microsoft Teams and WhatsApp, mainly used at home or school. Additional support offered to primary children by their teachers included extra time to complete assignments, directions provided to internet sources for extra resources and one-to-one support. Primary school teachers found online teaching to be very stressful. While their homes were conducive to teaching practices and they were competent in the skills necessary for online teaching, their motivation towards teaching was low, along with students' attendance and participation. Primary teachers found that the Ministry of Education was supportive during this time, even more so than parents.

Regarding the safety protocols, the teachers found it was sometimes hard for them to follow. Despite the pandemic and all related challenges, COVID-19 has had no effect on how teachers feel about teaching. Secondary school teachers engaged their students online during the lockdown and mainly sent worksheets for their students to complete. Most teachers reported experiencing challenges in online schooling. Challenges included dealing with unstable internet, creating appropriate assessment activities to gauge learning online, preparing lessons for online teaching, and dealing with parents online. Secondary school teachers preferred face-to-face and hybrid methods of engaging students during online teaching. The platform used most was Google Suite/Google Classroom. Teachers also used Microsoft Teams, WhatsApp Messaging and Zoom conferencing to engage their students during online teaching. Devices used by teachers for online teaching included a laptop computer, a tablet, and a smartphone, and most teachers used their own devices throughout the entire online schooling. Most teachers accessed the internet at home and school. For additional support, secondary school teachers directed students to online resources, while some teachers gave additional time for completing classwork and assignments. The support received from parents and the Ministry of Education was moderately supportive during this period. They indicated that teaching during COVID-19 was very stressful and that they were only able to moderately balance work and personal life while teaching online. However, their home environments were very conducive to teaching online. The teachers were comfortable using the technology in online teaching but felt that students' participation and attendance were average. Where following the safety protocols is concerned, they mentioned that they encountered difficulty in doing so. They also highlighted that the switch from face-to-face to online was somewhat

challenging. Generally, the COVID-19 pandemic did not affect how secondary school teachers felt about teaching.

What's Next…

In the pre-COVID-19 (2017) and post-COVID-19 (2022/2024) periods, data were collected from primary and secondary students, teachers and school principals from Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean to investigate certain home and school factors that are known to influence academic achievement, both at the individual level and school level. This report focused on the data collected in St Vincent and the Grenadines. It provides a descriptive summary of the responses from the various participant groups in this country that shed light on the home and school factors investigated and, in some cases, discusses implications.

A follow-up to this report is imminent. The follow-up report will examine the relationship between home and school factors summarised in this current report and academic achievement at the school level. Using primarily correlational analysis, we will explore, for example, the link between:

- school leadership and students' attitudes to school and learning
- school leadership and teachers' instructional practices
- students' home literacy behaviour and school achievement
- students' attitudes to school and learning and school achievement
- students' perceptions of their school and school achievement

Such issues will be explored for the pre- and post-COVID-19 periods.

INTRODUCTION

Over the years, education in the region has been a topic of extensive discussion and debate, with numerous contentious issues stemming from practices established during the colonial period. Debates have revolved around curriculum content and methods, transition practices from primary to secondary education, hierarchical arrangement of schools, and teacher recruitment processes, among others. These discussions, held in the media, parliamentary debates, and in various forums across the region, often lead to the formulation and implementation of policies. However, policymaking in the Caribbean frequently relies on "policymakers, who implement policies based on ideas, as well as ad hoc or outdated data" (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, 2012). Nevertheless, there have been recent calls for evidence-based policymaking and practices. Recognising the constraints of limited financial resources, stakeholders in the region understand the importance of basing decisions about education, which remains highly valued, on rigorously gathered and analysed empirical evidence.

To this end, this study aligns with the current focus on seeking evidence to inform practice. It aims to contribute to our understanding of the factors that either promote or hinder students' academic progress in the region. This report, which is part of a more extensive study that investigates the home and school factors that influence student academic achievement in the Eastern Caribbean and Barbados, seeks to achieve the following objectives:

1. Develop demographic profiles of primary and secondary students, teachers and principals in St Vincent and the Grenadines.
2. Provide descriptions of several factors that influence students' academic achievement, including:
    a. Primary and secondary students' reported home environment.
    b. Primary and secondary students' perception of school and learning.
    c. Primary and secondary teachers' reported classroom practices.
    d. Primary and secondary teachers' and principals' perspectives on school leadership.
    e. Primary and secondary school characteristics.
    f. Indirect factors such as primary and secondary teachers' and principals' views on school and other education-related issues

The second phase of the study, conducted in 2022 in the OECS and 2024 in Barbados, aimed to achieve the same objectives as the first phase to enable pre- and post-COVID-19 comparisons. Additionally, the second phase aimed to:

3. Explore the experiences of students and teachers regarding schooling during the COVID-19 pandemic.

This report is Report 1a, the first in a two-part report on the home and school factors influencing student academic achievement. Report 1b will explore the potential of these factors to predict student achievement at the primary and secondary levels.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review examines various factors influencing student academic achievement, focusing on Caribbean and international perspectives. The discussion spans key areas such as the definition of academic achievement, the legacy of colonialism in Caribbean education, and evidence-based education reform. Additional sections explore specific influences on academic outcomes, including home environments, absenteeism, student attitudes, school climate, and leadership. The review also highlights the impact of post-colonial practices, such as academic tracking, and the role of technology in education, particularly in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic on student achievement.

Student Academic Achievement Defined

Steinmayr et al. (2014) define academic achievement as a representation of the outcomes that reflect how individuals have met specific educational goals within instructional settings, including schools, colleges and universities. These goals often centre on cognitive development, either spanning multiple disciplines (e.g., critical thinking) or focusing on the mastery of specific content areas such as literacy, numeracy, science or history. Steinmayr et al. (2014) state that it is a multifaceted construct that is context-dependent and shaped by the indicators used to measure it. These indicators range from general markers, such as procedural (knowledge of a process, skill, or procedure, e.g., conducting a science experiment) and declarative (knowledge of a concept or idea, e.g., knowing what a noun is) knowledge gained through education, to curriculum-based measures, such as grades and performance on achievement tests. Other indicators include cumulative outcomes such as degrees and certifications.

In modern societies, academic achievement is critical in determining a person's opportunities for further education and professional success. For example, performance measured by Grade Point Average (GPA) or other measures often dictates whether a student will succeed at college or university (Kobrin & Michel, 2006). This can be extended to the Caribbean, where admission to community colleges and universities relies on the results of the Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) and the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Exam (CAPE). Beyond individual implications, academic achievement has national significance, influencing a country's economic

prosperity and social well-being. International assessments, such as the Programme for International Assessment (PISA), assess academic achievement across nations, offering insight into the strengths and weaknesses of educational systems. The results of these studies are used to inform policy decisions aimed at improving educational outcomes (OECD, 2023).

Education in Post-Colonial Caribbean Contexts

The legacy of colonialism continues to shape education systems in the Caribbean, and inequities continue to be perpetuated by educational structures that are in place today (Brissett, 2021; Bristol, 2012; Thompson et al., 2011; Warrican, 2005, 2020; Williams, 2016). Brissett (2021) emphasises that these inequities are a direct result of colonial-era education systems that served a small elite, leaving marginalised populations, particularly those of African descent, with limited access to quality education. Similarly, Williams (2016) describes the persistence of hierarchical systems in Trinidad's education, where students from lower socio-economic backgrounds are marginalised through outdated curricula and disciplinary practices. When viewed through a postcolonial lens, we can thoroughly investigate the relationship between culture, education and research (Bristol, 2012).

While education reforms have aimed to address these inequities, Jules (2010) argues that global pressure to conform to Western educational norms often hinders truly localised efforts. The challenge, therefore, is not just one of access but of ensuring the relevance of education to local socio-economic contexts. Sappleton and Adams (2022) add an international perspective, comparing efforts to decolonise education in the Caribbean and South Africa with the ongoing challenges of racial inequalities in United States (U.S.) education. They point out that while diversity initiatives in the United States are gaining traction, they often fail to address the deep Eurocentrism embedded in the system, a challenge similarly faced in the Caribbean.

Warrican (2015) is aligned with these ideas, highlighting how the divide between home and school cultures affects literacy development in the Commonwealth Caribbean. He argues that many students, particularly those from working-class backgrounds, are disengaged from literacy instruction that prioritises Standard English (SE) and ignores the Creole languages spoken at home. The persistence of colonial education practices devaluing local languages and cultures results in poor literacy outcomes and broader educational disengagement. Warrican calls for reforms integrating students' home languages into the classroom, fostering a more inclusive learning

environment, and redefining literacy to include critical thinking and multiliteracies, which are necessary for success in modern society.

Progress has been made in certain realms, such as providing Universal Secondary Education throughout the Eastern Caribbean. Still, challenges remain in how children are placed into secondary school, with students who are more academically able being placed in prestigious schools that were historically grammar schools (Leacock, 2009; Thompson et al., 2011). Further, special and inclusive education in Barbados has transitioned from charity-based models to more inclusive practices; however, resource challenges and societal attitudes remain (Blackman, 2017).

This literature suggests that education in the Caribbean is at a crossroads. While efforts to decolonise and reform systems have made great strides, significant colonial legacies remain. Without addressing the inequities that persist in regional systems, especially those rooted in our shared colonial past, educational outcomes in the region will remain uneven, with marginalised groups continuing to face barriers to achievement.

Importance of Evidence-Based Education Reform

The impact of the Caribbean's colonial legacy on equitable access to quality education and increased globalisation necessitates ongoing educational reform in the Caribbean, and this reform is a focus of governments in the region (Jules & Williams, 2016). However, educational reform must be grounded in evidence-based research (Slavin, 2020). Further, evidence-based approaches can transform education systems by fostering continuous cycles of innovation, evaluation and improvement (Slavin et al., 2021).

The origins of evidence-based practice and policymaking trace back to the early 1990s in the medical field (Sackett & Rosenburg, 1995) and have since expanded to healthcare (Hoffmann et al., 2023), business (Luthans et al., 2021) and psychology (APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice, 2006). In education, it now plays a crucial role in areas such as higher education (Diery et al., 2020), remote (online) education (Greenhow & Galvin, 2020), and special and inclusive education (Mitchell & Sutherland, 2020).

Although evidence-based policymaking has gained global acceptance, many educational policies, both internationally (Gorard et al., 2020) and in the Caribbean, are often developed without sufficient evidence (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, 2012). The

United Nations (2024) highlights the unique challenges faced by small island developing states (SIDS) in implementing evidence-based policymaking, noting that:

> Small island developing states face significant challenges in data collection, analysis, technical and institutional capacity, which hinders evidence-informed policymaking, monitoring progress and accessing development financing; and we emphasise that capacity-building for stronger data governance and management will allow SIDS to support better data collection, protection, transparency and data sharing (pp. 4-5).

Shah and Kelman (2024) similarly emphasise the need for evidence-based policymaking in SIDS using both "big" data (e.g., extensive datasets) and "small" data (e.g., case studies) integrated with local expertise and extensive Indigenous datasets. Moreover, "small" data (e.g., case studies) should be integrated with local expertise and indigenous knowledge.

Researchers in the Caribbean face challenges related to the dominance of Western paradigms in educational research. Warrican (2020) critiques the imposition of Western research frameworks on Caribbean education, stating that this practice leads to the misinterpretation of local realities. For instance, educational behaviours, such as students' language use, are often misinterpreted when analysed through a Western lens. Warrican (2020) advocates for a shift towards more contextualised research methodologies that reflect the Caribbean region's socio-cultural history and educational needs.

The uncritical adoption of international education policies facilitates practices of policy transfer that overlook the unique social, cultural and economic realities of small island developing states, leading to ineffective reform (Crossley, 2019). Crossley emphasises the need for context-sensitive approaches to education reform, particularly in the Caribbean, where global benchmarks and policies, such as those from PISA, may not be appropriate. He further discusses the importance of equitable partnerships between global and local stakeholders to ensure policies are adapted to fit the local context rather than imposed without regard for local needs. Crossley advocates for a greater focus on qualitative research and Indigenous knowledge systems to support sustainable development goals, moving beyond the often quantitative-driven global governance models that dominate educational policymaking. This focus on Indigenous knowledge further contributes to the efforts to decolonise education by including the voices of those who both create and are impacted by policy.

Evidence-based education reform can transform governance and educational practices by enabling more effective resource allocation, fostering accountability, and ensuring policies address Caribbean education systems' unique sociocultural and historical context (Shah & Kelman, 2024; Slavin, 2020). Integrating "big" and "small" data with local expertise bridges gaps in equity and access while promoting sustainable development through continuous cycles of innovation, evaluation, and improvement (Crossley, 2019; Slavin et al., 2021). This approach empowers educators and institutions to enhance teaching practices, improve student outcomes, and align reforms with the region's developmental goals.

Academic Achievement Indicators in the Caribbean

The Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) and Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) are widely regarded as key achievement indicators in the region. They provide measurable benchmarks for assessing student performance and the effectiveness of secondary education systems (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2022). These standardised exams are often used by policymakers, educators, and researchers to evaluate trends in academic achievement, identify areas requiring intervention, and inform curriculum development.

To date, achievement indicators from the Caribbean region show significant improvement in specific curriculum areas. In contrast, other areas have stagnated or declined, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic remains to be fully understood. In 2019, just before the pandemic and subsequent lockdown, the overall CSEC pass rate was 75%, marking a 5% increase from the 70% pass rate in 2018 and up from 67% in 2017 (Press Release, 2019). Notably, there was a significant increase in performance in English A, with the pass rate rising from 67% in 2018 to 79% in 2019. However, in a more recent report from the Caribbean Examinations Council (2022), there has been a further decline in passing grades in most subjects since the first phase of this study was conducted in 2017, and this could be due to several factors, including the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The number of students obtaining passing grades in the core compulsory subjects of English A and Mathematics is of particular concern. In English A, the pass rate fell in 2022 to 71%, compared with 74% in 2021, 83% in 2020 and 79% in 2019. Similarly, a decline was noted in Mathematics, with a 37% pass rate in 2022, compared to 41% in 2021, 53% in 2020, and 46% in 2019.

Significant declines in passing grades since 2019 have been noted for most other subjects, including Social Studies (52% in 2022, 65% in 2019), Geography (62% in 2022, 75% in 2019), Spanish (55% in 2022, 70% in 2019), Information Technology (80% in 2022, 92% in 2019), Technical Drawing (75% in 2022, 87% in 2019), Textiles, Clothing and Fashion (71% in 2022, 83% in 2019), Religious Education (59% in 2022, 75% in 2019), Physics (64% in 2022, 73% in 2019), Chemistry (60% in 2022, 68% in 2019), Additional Mathematics (63% in 2022, 71% in 2019), Principles of Business (80% in 2022, 87% in 2019), Principles of Accounts (69% in 2022, 75% in 2019), Music (69% in 2022, 75% in 2019), Electronic Document Preparation and Management (EDPM) (88% in 2022, 94% in 2019), IT (Mechanical) (80% in 2022, 86% in 2019). Slight declines in passing grades between 1% and 5% were observed between 2019 and 2014 in Economics, Portuguese, French, Information Technology (Building and Electrical), Physical Education and Sport, Food and Nutrition, and Office Administration.

The most significant increases in passing grades since 2019 are in Human and Social Biology (67% in 2022, 52% in 2019) and English B (71% in 2022, 65% in 2019). Increases in passing grades between 1% and 5% are noted in Caribbean History, Integrated Science, Family and Resource Management, Biology and Theatre Arts. Agricultural Science and Visual Arts passing grades remain the same in 2022 as in 2019. These trends suggest a need to reconsider traditional measures of academic achievement, such as standardised exam pass rates, and explore alternative assessment methods that capture a broader range of student competencies.

This study aims to examine a range of factors that may influence students' academic achievement, including those that may be contributing to the decline in passing grades observed across most subjects at the CSEC level in secondary schools and the large percentage of children who do not achieve high marks on the Common Entrance Examination at the end of primary school (Leacock et al., 2007).

Factors Affecting Academic Achievement: International and Caribbean Perspectives

Academic achievement is influenced by many factors, many of which vary across educational and cultural contexts. International research provides valuable insights into these influences, while regional studies offer a more localised understanding of Caribbean education systems' unique challenges and opportunities. By examining international and Caribbean perspectives, we can better understand the complex interplay of psychological, social, and instructional factors that

shape student outcomes. This offers a comprehensive view of the variables affecting academic success in this region.

In a systematic review of 169 studies using meta-analysis, which included over 250 variables, Kocak et al. (2021) used effect sizes to determine the strength of each variable on academic performance across education levels. The study categorises these variables into nine domains: psychological characteristics, teaching and learning strategies, socio-economic and socio-demographic characteristics, family, teacher, school, educational technology, special education and violence-related factors. They found that psychological factors such as self-efficacy and academic emotions (feelings about learning and school) had the largest positive effect sizes, indicating that psychological traits such as motivation and emotional regulation play a significant role in academic success. Concerning teaching and learning strategies, creative drama, constructivist and collaborative learning, and learning strategy instruction had substantial positive impacts on academic achievement. Higher socioeconomic status was consistently associated with better academic performance. Family variables included parental expectations, attitudes and involvement as critical predictors of academic success, with large effect sizes, especially when parents were actively involved in their children's education. Teachers' judgement of students' abilities and academic performance had significant effects, as well as the quality of teacher-student relationships. In schools, the incorporation of physical activities also positively impacts student achievement. The presence of reading disabilities and behavioural disorders impacted academic achievement negatively. Finally, tools such as computer-aided instruction and one-to-one laptop programmes positively impacted academic outcomes.

These findings are echoed in research that has been conducted in developing nations. For example, Farooq et al. (2011) found that higher socioeconomic status and higher levels of parental education predicted higher levels of academic achievement in a sample of secondary school students in Pakistan. In the Caribbean, a study conducted with middle-school students in Jamaica found that behavioural engagement, specifically participation in class activities and homework completion, positively predicted academic achievement (Martin et al., 2016). Another study in Barbados and Trinidad found that secondary school students' academic achievement improved after teachers trained in and used relational group work in their classes (Layne et al., 2008). Further, in a study conducted with primary school children in St. Vincent and the Grenadines, difficulties with attention were linked to lower academic achievement (Jimerson, 2006), which may connect with

the findings on behavioural disorders in the "special education" domain in Kocak et al.'s (2021) review. Other Caribbean studies related to various factors contributing to student academic achievement are presented in the sections below.

Home Environment and Academic Achievement

Nursery-Enrolment and Early-Childhood Education

Research on early childhood education (ECE) consistently shows its significant role in improving long-term academic outcomes. For example, Haslip (2018) found that public Pre-K attendance in the U.S. significantly improved first-grade literacy, particularly for economically disadvantaged children. However, socio-economic status (SES) is not the sole determinant of early educational outcomes. Other factors, such as programme quality, teacher training, and culturally relevant curricula, also play critical roles in shaping the effectiveness of ECE programs (Escayg & Kinkead-Clarke, 2018; Hogrebe & Strietholt, 2016). Moreover, early development of skills such as attention regulation and social competence – identified by Rabiner et al. (2016) as critical predictors of academic success – can amplify the benefits of high-quality ECE programmes across all socio-economic groups.

On an international scale, Hogrebe and Strietholt (2016) used data from nine countries to explore preschool's effects on reading achievement and concluded that programme quality plays a crucial role in outcomes. Similarly, Eshetu (2015) in Ethiopia and Agirdag et al. (2015) in Turkey highlighted how socio-economic disparities affect access to preschool, with wealthier students benefiting more from early education. These studies highlight the importance of targeting intervention to close achievement gaps between SES groups and socio-economically disadvantaged populations by addressing variability in programme quality and access.

Escayg and Kinkead-Clarke (2018) call for integrating culturally relevant, decolonised curricula, shifting away from Eurocentric teaching models in the Caribbean. They argue that Caribbean ECE can foster positive racial identities and create more relatable and practical learning environments for children by incorporating local traditions such as storytelling and music.

These studies suggest that while SES is an important factor, it must be considered alongside programme quality, accessibility, and cultural relevance when designing and implementing ECE programmes. Moreover, fostering foundational skills like attention regulation and social

competence can enhance the effectiveness of these interventions. To close achievement gaps, a concerted effort must be made to target socio-economically disadvantaged children while ensuring that these programmes promote academic and social development to support local cultural identities.

Parental Involvement & Home Literacy Environment

Parental involvement is a widely recognised determinant of student academic achievement, with its effects varying based on the type of involvement, socioeconomic status and regional context. Research demonstrates that parental engagement, such as setting high academic expectations and providing home-based support, is associated with improved academic outcomes (Boonk et al., 2018; Wilder, 2014). However, direct involvement in homework can yield mixed results, especially as students advance through grade levels, highlighting the importance of the quality of engagement over its frequency (Boonk et al., 2018). Socioeconomic factors also significantly influence parental involvement, as families from higher socioeconomic backgrounds generally have greater access to resources that support their children's education. In contrast, parents in lower socioeconomic settings often face financial difficulties and work-related constraints that limit their ability to engage fully (Marshall et al., 2014).

In the Caribbean, these socioeconomic disparities are pronounced, and strong school leadership and community support play a pivotal role in fostering parental involvement, particularly in under-resourced areas (Edgerton et al., 2023; Marshall & Jackman, 2015). School leaders act as intermediaries, bridging the gap between families and schools to enhance student outcomes. Furthermore, addressing the "secondary slump", or the decline in parental involvement as students progress through secondary education, is critical for sustaining academic motivation and performance (Marshall et al., 2014; Marshall & Jackman, 2015). Therefore, policies that provide resources and opportunities for sustained parental engagement, particularly in marginalised communities, are essential for improving student achievement in the Caribbean.

Research also consistently emphasises the importance of the home literacy environment (HLE) in shaping children's academic success. Schlee et al. (2009) found that parental resource capital – such as education level, income, and home literacy practices – strongly predicts early academic performance in reading and mathematics, highlighting the importance of a well-resourced home environment. This finding aligns with Heppt et al. (2022), who concluded that physical books,

especially children's books, are key predictors of academic success. Neuman and Moland (2016) introduced the concept of "book deserts", showing that income segregation limits book access in disadvantaged U.S. neighbourhoods, exacerbating literacy gaps. Neuman (2017) further demonstrated that access to books alone is insufficient; meaningful interaction between children and caregivers, such as reading together, is crucial for developing literacy skills.

Studies in other contexts reinforce these findings. In the UK, Hartas (2012) demonstrated that while socioeconomic status (SES) plays a significant role in literacy development, simple home learning activities like reading cannot entirely close the achievement gap for lower SES families. van Bergen et al. (2017) explored the interaction between genetic and environmental factors, concluding that while parental reading skills can be hereditary, environmental factors such as access to books independently improve literacy outcomes. Similarly, Lesemen and De Jong (1998) highlight the multifaceted nature of the HLE, where opportunities for reading, parent-child interactions and instructional quality collectively predict early reading success. This view is supported by Darling and Westberg (2004), who found that structured parental involvement – where parents are trained in reading activities – significantly impacts children's literacy outcomes. In the United States, Albee et al. (2019) tackled summer reading loss by distributing culturally relevant books and involving parents in literacy activities, reducing reading loss among disadvantaged students. Sammons et al. (2015) extended this to the long term, showing that early HLE strongly predicts later academic success, particularly for low-income students.

Similar patterns emerge regarding the influence of the HLE in the Caribbean. Martin et al. (2016) studied middle school students in Jamaica and found that parental engagement and motivation were critical for academic success, though socioeconomic limitations often hinder access to literacy resources. This reflects broader international findings, where socioeconomic factors limit the availability of literacy materials, contributing to persistent achievement gaps (Neuman & Moland, 2016; Schlee et al., 2009).

Student and Teacher Absenteeism

The literature consistently demonstrates that student absenteeism negatively impacts academic performance, with various causes producing different effects. Klein et al. (2023) found that truancy and sickness-related absences are particularly harmful; Jamil & Khalid (2016) found student delinquency to be a predictor of low academic achievement, while Keppens (2023) highlighted

that unexcused absences, especially during critical periods like exams, have the most detrimental effects. Allen et al. (2018) focused on health-related absenteeism, emphasising the role of chronic illness and mental health issues. The authors advocate for early interventions involving healthcare professionals, families and schools to prevent long-term academic decline due to absenteeism. These findings suggest the need for targeted interventions considering the reasons for and timing of absences.

Further, Hancock et al. (2016) investigated socioeconomic factors and absenteeism, finding that absenteeism negatively affects academic performance across all demographics. In the Caribbean, absenteeism is also tied to socioeconomic challenges. Cook and Ezenne (2010) found that factors such as financial difficulties, family responsibilities, and poor infrastructure contribute to absenteeism in Jamaica. Also, in Jamaica, Jennings et al. (2017) found financial difficulties experienced by parents as the leading cause of absenteeism. In Guyana, Bristol (2017) noted that teacher absenteeism contributes to student absenteeism, as students perceive little value in attending school when teachers are absent. Similarly, in Barbados, Lewis (2020) found negative correlations between teacher absences and student performance in core subjects such as science and math, though a positive effect was seen in English. This research in the Caribbean suggests that absenteeism is one of several factors influencing student outcomes and calls for solutions involving school, community and government intervention.

Students' Perceptions of Learning and School Climate

Student Attitudes Toward Learning and School

The influence of students' attitudes towards school and learning (ATSL) on motivation and achievement has long been acknowledged (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Recent research by Veresová & Malá (2016) demonstrates a strong correlation between ATSL and academic achievement. Slovak secondary school students who displayed positive attitudes toward learning achieved higher Grade Point Averages (GPAs), with a cognitive component (beliefs about their ability to succeed) being the strongest predictor. The study also uncovered gender differences, with girls having more positive attitudes than boys, though this did not translate into a significant GPA difference.

Similarly, a study in Nigeria, Kpolovie et al. (2014) found that both interest in learning and attitude towards school were significant predictors of academic performance in secondary school students. This study suggests that these factors collectively account for over 20% of the variance in academic achievement, with interest in learning being slightly more influential. This reinforces the importance of student engagement and a positive learning attitude in driving academic success. Knight and Obidah (2014) explored student perceptions of secondary education under the Universal Secondary Education (USE) policy in the Caribbean context. Students from low-performing schools expressed dissatisfaction with teaching methods and student-teacher relationships, negatively impacting their attitudes towards learning. This demonstrates that the relationship between attitudes toward learning and academic achievement is not unidirectional. Additionally, Bowe (2012) conducted research with Caribbean students in the UK and noted that negative attitudes towards school and risky behaviour were prevalent among boys and contributed to an academic achievement gap between boys and girls.

These findings suggest that fostering positive attitudes towards school and learning can significantly contribute to better academic outcomes. Gender differences in ATSL, particularly favouring girls, indicate a need for targeted interventions aimed at enhancing boys' attitudes where significant differences exist. Additionally, as highlighted by several studies, the importance of cognitive beliefs about academic success suggests that building students' confidence in their academics is crucial.

School Climate and Academic Achievement

Research consistently highlights the critical role of school climate in shaping student well-being and academic achievement across various international and Caribbean contexts. Akey (2006), in a study of U.S. urban high schools, found that supportive teacher-student relationships and clear behavioural expectations positively influenced student engagement and perceived competence, which enhanced academic achievement. Similarly, Steinmayr et al. (2018) emphasised that a positive school climate significantly predicted student well-being, although its direct effect on academic achievement was weaker. Instead, self-efficacy emerged as the strongest predictor of academic performance, indirectly supporting school climate through enhanced student well-being.

In Australia, Maxwell et al. (2017) demonstrated that student perceptions of a positive school climate, mainly through a sense of school identification, were associated with better performance

in literacy and numeracy. Staff perceptions of school climate also positively influenced academic outcomes, underscoring the importance of a supportive environment for students and teachers. In their meta-analysis, Dulay and Karadağ (2017) further reinforced the importance of school climate, showing a medium-level positive effect on student achievement across multiple countries, with the impact observed in subjects such as English and social sciences.

Leadership plays a critical role in shaping school climate. Allen et al. (2015) found that transformational leadership positively influenced teachers' perceptions of school climate, mainly through fostering collaboration and a sense of order. However, the impact of school climate on student achievement was more nuanced, with significant effects observed primarily in reading but not mathematics. Veletić et al. (2023) highlighted the importance of distributed leadership, where shared decision-making among staff contributes to a more positive perception of school climate, especially in Scandinavian countries. This aligns with Zysberg and Schwabsky (2020), who found that a positive school climate in Israel, characterised by strong interpersonal relationships and a sense of belonging, enhanced students' academic self-efficacy, improving academic outcomes in core subjects.

In the Caribbean, Bartley (2024) examined the role of school climate in fostering resilience and well-being among Jamaican secondary school students. The study emphasised that supportive relationships between students and teachers, coupled with clear expectations and a safe environment, were crucial for promoting student resilience, particularly in the context of challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. La Salle et al. (2021) also found that students in Jamaica reported higher levels of school connectedness, which was linked to better mental health outcomes, further reinforcing the importance of a positive school climate for overall student well-being.

In summary, positive interpersonal relationships, a sense of belonging, and strong leadership that fosters collaboration are critical elements of a healthy school climate. While school climate has a more indirect effect on academic performance, its role in supporting student engagement, self-efficacy, and resilience is vital across diverse educational contexts.

Democratic Classrooms and Student-Centred Instruction

The literature across international and Caribbean concepts underscores the importance of democratic classrooms and student-centred instruction in improving student outcomes, both academically and socially. Print et al. (2002) highlight how democratic participation in Danish schools fosters active citizenship and critical thinking. In Albania, Bara and Xhomara (2020) found that problem-based learning and student-centred methods led to significant improvements in science achievement, with problem-based learning showing a particularly strong effect. Similarly, Asoodeh et al. (2012), in their study of Iranian elementary students, demonstrated that student-centred learning significantly improved academic performance in subjects like mathematics, science, and reading. Additionally, they found that this approach had a lasting positive impact on students' social skills, such as communication and adaptive behaviour, with benefits persisting even months after the intervention. Further, a recent meta-analysis also demonstrated that student-centred approaches in mathematics improved academic performance and reduced anxiety, especially in middle school students (Emanet & Kezer, 2021). Finally, Yildirim (2023) similarly found that student-centred methods in life sciences significantly boosted achievement, reinforcing the broad applicability of these approaches across subjects.

Student-centred methods have also been found to be effective in developing nations. In Nigeria, Precious and Feyisetan (2020) showed that student-centred approaches, such as discussions and field trips, improved biology performance, outperforming traditional teacher-centred methods. These findings align with research from the Caribbean, where Warrican and Leacock (2011) explored democratic education in Caribbean classrooms. Leacock and Warrican's (2011) study of online learning environments illustrates both the potential and challenges of promoting democratic practices. Their findings show that while online platforms can foster greater student participation and recognition of individual needs, issues such as technological barriers and isolation hinder their effectiveness. The study highlights the cultural tensions between online learning and traditional oral communication in the Caribbean, calling for more interactive components to fully support student-centred approaches. Similarly, Layne et al. (2008) demonstrated that group work in Trinidad and Barbados significantly improved academic performance, particularly for low-achieving students. Further, Warrican (2019) highlighted that while Barbadian teachers expressed support for learner centred instruction, practical barriers such as lack of resources and mentorship limited its full implementation.

School Leadership

School leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping both student outcomes and the broader school environment. Internationally, transformational and distributed leadership styles have been identified as particularly effective in fostering positive school climates and supporting student achievement. Veletić et al. (2023) demonstrated that distributed leadership, where decision making is shared among staff, was associated with improved school climate perceptions across different regions, although its impact varied, with particularly strong results in Scandinavian countries. This leadership model, emphasizing collaboration and shared responsibilities, creates a more inclusive organizational structure that contributes to better school outcomes. Further to this, Leithwood (2021) highlighted the importance of equitable leadership, focusing on culturally responsive practices that engage diverse communities and address the needs of all students. These leadership practices are essential for promoting inclusivity and ensuring that schools serve as equitable learning environments for students from various socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds. The link between transformational leadership and improved school climate is further emphasized by Allen et al. (2015) and Tan et al. (2021), who found that leadership styles that inspire and motivate staff indirectly improve student outcomes through their positive effects on the school climate. However, the direct impact of leadership on student achievement remains modest, highlighting the importance of combining leadership with strong instructional practices.

In the Caribbean, Miller (2016) pointed out that effective school leadership in this region often blends formal training with experiential learning. Principals in the Caribbean face unique socioeconomic and cultural challenges, requiring them to adapt leadership strategies to their specific local contexts. This contextual adaptation is crucial for addressing the complex needs of Caribbean schools. Leacock (2009) echoed these findings, showing that in the Caribbean, transformational leadership is particularly effective in improving student outcomes, especially in core subjects like English and mathematics. Principals who motivate their staff create a collaborative school environment that enhances both teacher performance and student engagement. This leadership style is key to fostering positive academic outcomes in Caribbean schools. Further supporting this, Brown et al. (2014) in their study of primary schools in Trinidad and Tobago, demonstrated how professional networks among teachers, facilitated by strong leadership, positively impact academic performance. Schools where principals fostered collegial trust and encouraged teacher collaboration, particularly around the use of assessment data, had

higher student proficiency levels on national tests. However, the study noted that despite these gains, resource limitations and a lack of external professional support hindered the full implementation of collaborative teaching practices. These findings reinforce the idea that leadership, when focused on building collaborative school climates, directly influences teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

However, leadership alone may not be enough. Jennings et al. (2017) stressed that a combination of strong leadership and teacher quality is necessary for improving academic performance, particularly in schools serving low income communities. Leadership's role in supporting teacher effectiveness is critical to overcoming resource constraints and ensuring that all students have the opportunity to succeed. Finally, Heaven and Bourne (2016) in their study of Jamaican schools, found only a weak correlation between instructional leadership and student achievement, suggesting that broader contextual factors, such as socio-economic conditions, also play a crucial role in shaping educational outcomes. This highlights the complex interplay between leadership and external factors in influencing student success.

Post-Colonial Education Practices

Academic Tracking, Ability Labelling and the Use of the Common Entrance Exam for Secondary School Placement

Academic tracking, ability labelling and the Common Entrance Examination (CEE) for secondary school placement have profound effects on both student outcomes and educational equity. These practices often reinforce existing socioeconomic disparities, disproportionately impacting students from disadvantaged backgrounds. For example, research which drew on data from the UK Millennium Cohort Study demonstrated that early academic streaming tends to benefit students in higher streams while disadvantaging those in lower streams (Parsons & Hallam, 2014). Students in lower academic tracks, particularly in subjects like mathematics and English, often receive less challenging curricula, which diminishes their academic performance over time. Similarly, Boliver and Capsada-Munsech (2021) found that lower-tracked students in UK primary schools reported reduced enjoyment of key subjects, leading to decreased engagement and academic achievement.

The psychological effects of tracking and ability labelling are also significant. Research by Odongo et al. (2021) in Uganda revealed that students in lower ability streams had significantly

lower self-esteem than their peers in higher streams. This is further emphasized by Papachristou et al. (2022) who found students in lower ability groups were more likely to exhibit behavioural and emotional issues, such as hyperactivity and emotional challenges, reinforcing the socio emotional divide between high and low achievers. Tracking and labelling significantly affect students' self-concepts, particularly in subjects like mathematics. Campbell (2021) found that girls placed in lower math groups developed negative self-concepts, which were further reinforced by teacher judgments. This finding aligns with Bradbury (2021) who highlighted how teachers often adopt a fixed ability mindset limiting students' opportunities for growth. Once labelled as "low ability" students are less likely to be exposed to challenging material or higher achieving peers, creating a self-fulfilling cycle that further widens the academic gap between high and low performers.

These trends are mirrored in the context of the Caribbean. Warrican et al. (2019) found that in Trinidad and Tobago's bi-dialectal context, peer effects substantially shaped individual literary achievement, where group performance significantly impacted individual outcomes. Students surrounded by higher-achieving peers performed better, regardless of their socio-economic background or individual characteristics, underscoring the importance of peer dynamics in shaping academic success. However, students in lower academic tracks, who are often separated from higher-achieving peers, lose these beneficial peer effects, further entrenching the academic divide. From a psychological standpoint, Lipps et al. (2010) reported that students in lower academic tracks in Caribbean countries, like Jamaica and St Vincent, exhibited higher levels of depressive symptoms, highlighting the emotional toll of being labelled as having "low ability".

These disparities are further engrained in the context of high-stakes exams like the CEE in Barbados. Pilgrim and Hornby (2019) noted that students from wealthier backgrounds with access to better preparatory resources consistently outperformed their less affluent peers, securing places in top-tier schools. This dynamic exacerbates existing educational inequalities, as students placed in lower-ranked schools receive fewer resources and face more significant academic challenges. Additionally, students with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) are disproportionately placed in lower-ranked schools based on their CEE performance. This is due to a number of factors including low levels of psychoeducational assessment, weak referral systems and inadequate supplies of SEND teachers and classes, further removing them from many educational opportunities.

Despite the persistence of tracking and ability labelling, several studies call for reform. Pilgrim and Hornby (2019) advocate for abolishing the CEE in Barbados in favour of a zoning system that allows students to attend schools within their communities, thus reducing socioeconomic segregation. Similarly, Bradbury (2021) and Boliver and Capsada-Munsech (2021) proposed mixed-ability teaching to mitigate the adverse effects of tracking and ability labelling, and must be supported by resources, training and strong student support systems, providing students with more equitable educational experiences.

Overall, the literature highlights the significant academic, emotional, and social inequalities perpetuated by academic tracking, ability labelling, and high-stakes exams like the CEE. These practices, while intended to tailor education to student ability, often exacerbate socioeconomic disparities and psychological distress, particularly among students in lower academic tracks. Reform efforts and the allocation of resources to these efforts must promote inclusivity, reduce reliance on tracking, and ensure that all students, regardless of background, have access to the resources and support they need to succeed.

Grade Retention

The literature consistently shows that grade retention negatively affects students' academic performance and motivation. Rodriguez-Rodriguez (2022) found that retained students did not see significant academic improvement and experienced decreased motivation, often focusing more on avoiding failure than achieving success. Similarly, Valbuena et al. (2020) observed that any short-term academic benefits of retention tend to diminish over time, with retained students facing a higher risk of dropping out and poorer labour market outcomes compared to their peers.

The long-term consequences of retention are not limited to academic performance. A study from the Netherlands found that while retained students eventually achieved similar educational qualifications as their peers, they entered the workforce later, resulting in lower lifetime earnings due to delayed labour market entry (ter Mullen, 2023). Further, Mariano et al. (2018) studied retention in New York City schools. They found that retained students were less likely to graduate on time, accumulated fewer credits, and were more likely to be placed in special education programmes, further contributing to their higher dropout rates. Retention policies can exacerbate these issues, especially when they disproportionately affect younger students. Jerrim et al. (2022) highlighted how rigid school entry laws in Spain, which require children to start school based on

calendar year rather than readiness, increased retention rates among younger children born later in the year.

Goos et al.'s (2021) meta-analysis of 84 studies on retention across various countries found that while about 24% of the studies reviewed found some positive short-term academic and psychosocial benefits for retained students, the majority (76%) reported negative outcomes or at least no benefits. Their review highlights that retention can slightly improve psychosocial functioning, such as motivation and academic self-concept, but these are often short-lived. Long-term retention generally leads to higher dropout rates, increased placement in special education, and diminished job prospects. Moreover, retention is notably less effective in countries with separation systems like Belgium and Germany, where it is paired with ability grouping and tracking. In contrast, countries like the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand that use this approach as a last resort with additional support see better outcomes.

Given these findings, Goos et al. (2021) emphasise that educational policymakers should shift away from retention as a solution for underperformance and focus instead on early interventions and targeted support. Valbuena et al. (2020) similarly suggest that interventions, such as remedial programmes and personalised academic support, can help struggling students catch up without the adverse long-term effects of retention.

Overall, the evidence points to grade retention's detrimental impacts on educational attainment and future economic prospects. Rather than relying on retention, which disproportionately affects vulnerable students, educational systems would benefit from flexible policies and support mechanisms that address students' academic needs early on, providing them with the resources to succeed without repeating a grade.

Technology in Education and the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic

Before the pandemic, technology and education were increasingly integrated into learning environments, but their use varied widely across contexts. For instance, George (2015) found that while some Caribbean countries had introduced technology-enabled learning, rural and low-income communities faced significant barriers to accessing these tools.

The COVID-19 pandemic radically transformed the role of technology in education. The sudden closure of schools worldwide led to an unprecedented reliance on online learning platforms.

Pokhrel and Chhetri (2021) reported that the pandemic disrupted the education of over 1.6 billion students globally, forcing students to shift to emergency remote education. However, this shift exposed significant technological access disparities, particularly in rural and underprivileged areas. Winter et al. (2021) documented how teachers in Ireland struggled to engage students online, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds, due to a lack of adequate infrastructure and digital training.

In developing nations, such as those studied by Tadesse and Muluye (2020), the lack of digital infrastructure, particularly in rural areas, makes it difficult for students to continue their education. Parents in these regions often lacked the resources to support their children's online learning, worsening educational inequalities. The digital divide between urban and rural populations was also highlighted in Fikuree et al. (2021), who studied the Maldives education system during the pandemic.

Post-pandemic, blended learning models that combine online and in-person instruction are increasingly being adopted. Bubb and Jones (2020) suggested that the creative use of technology during home-schooling should be maintained to enhance student engagement. However, the pandemic also underscored the need for more equitable access to technology and infrastructure. Leacock and Warrican (2020) reported that in the Eastern Caribbean, many teachers were not adequately trained for online instruction, and students in rural areas struggled to access the necessary technology for effective learning.

In countries like Barbados and Jamaica, the pandemic exposed deep-rooted inequities and access to education. Blackman (2022) found that although the government distributed devices and set up online learning platforms, many students, particularly those from low-income households, remained disconnected. Further, Pokhrel and Chhetri (2021) noted that while online learning presented opportunities for innovation, the shift to digital platforms highlighted the need for better teacher training and infrastructure to ensure continuity and learning.

Despite these challenges, studies conducted before the pandemic have shown that technology can improve student outcomes when effectively implemented. Fraser (2018) demonstrated that computer-aided instruction in Caribbean Studies led to significant academic improvements among students. Further, Viera et al. (2014) demonstrated in an action research project in St Vincent and the Grenadines that while students were initially hesitant to use more formal platforms such as

Google Groups and a school website, they embraced familiar social media tools, showing that technology use can bridge formal and informal learning environments. However, as Abdullah et al. (2015) pointed out, the relationship between technology and academic achievement is complex, and effective outcomes depend on how well the technology is integrated into the teaching process.

While the COVID-19 pandemic has accelerated the use of technology in education, it has also exposed significant disparities in access and readiness, particularly in developing regions like the Caribbean. Increased use of technology offers the potential for improving academic outcomes. However, its success depends on equitable access, teacher preparedness, and infrastructure development. Investments in digital infrastructure, ongoing teacher training, and blended learning models will be essential for creating resilient and inclusive education systems.

Conclusion

This review highlights the multifaceted nature of student academic achievement, demonstrating how factors ranging from socioeconomic conditions and home environments to school climate and leadership influence outcomes. Both international and Caribbean perspectives emphasise the importance of addressing inequities that stem from colonial legacies, socioeconomic disparities, and access to quality education. While the COVID-19 pandemic has exposed gaps in educational infrastructure, it has also accelerated the use of technology, presenting opportunities for reform. The studies reviewed underscore the need for evidence-based, inclusive strategies that promote equitable access to education and support students' academic success across diverse contexts.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Whether viewed from a psychological, sociological, or economic perspective, it is widely recognised that numerous factors influence children's academic performance and achievements. In larger countries with more substantial resources for research, extensive data is analysed to assess the impact of multiple factors on student academic achievement. However, in the Caribbean, which factors are most influential, how they interact to produce the observed outcomes, and the best strategies for maximising positive influences while minimising negative factors are often unclear. As a result, educational policy and education planning in the region are frequently based on incomplete information. This may lead to the inefficient use of resources and funds, devastatingly affecting small Caribbean countries with limited resources. Therefore, it is crucial to identify the factors affecting academic achievement in the region, keeping in mind that solutions from other countries may not be applicable in this context.

In countries such as the United States, the term 'achievement gap' typically highlights performance disparities between white students and students of colour. Opportunity gaps have been identified as crucial in explaining these differences in achievement among students from diverse backgrounds. Richard Milner (2012) introduced the opportunity gap explanatory framework to analyse these disparities in highly diverse and urban contexts in the United States. A vital component of this framework is the myth of meritocracy. Alongside other constructs such as colour blindness, cultural conflicts, low expectations, deficit mindsets, and context-neutral mindsets, this framework helps to "explain both positive and negative aspects and realities of people, places, and policies in educational practice." It serves as a basis for researchers to "explain and systematically name what they observe and come to know inductively" (Milner, 2012, p. 699). Although the educational context in the Caribbean differs significantly from that of the United States, the myth of meritocracy remains relevant for understanding how opportunities may be obstructed for students in the Caribbean.

The myth of meritocracy posits that educators may tend to believe that "their own, their parents, and their students' success and status have all been earned" and any individual failure regarding educational outcomes "is solely a result of making bad choices and decisions" (Milner, 2012, p. 704). While acknowledging achievement gaps, educators may overlook how socioeconomics intersect with education, even though they "appear to be more at ease, confident, and comfortable

reflecting about, reading, and discussing how socioeconomics, particularly resources related to wealth and poverty, influence educational disparities, inequities, outcomes, and opportunities" (Milner, 2012, p. 704). For example, those subscribing to the myth may overlook the role of economic privilege in their success, whether earned or unearned and may assume that all have equal or equitable opportunities for success. This myth can serve as a mechanism for understanding how teacher quality, teacher training, curriculum, the digital divide, wealth and income, healthcare, nutrition, and quality childcare affect achievement (Irvine, 2010).

In our examination of academic achievement within the current initiative, we recognise the potential for the myth of meritocracy to operate in Caribbean contexts, potentially obscuring and overlooking opportunities that impact the academic outcomes of young people. Smith (2020) has demonstrated the presence of Eurocentric mechanisms within the Caribbean educational landscape, which implicitly influence literacy and its role in student performance. Consequently, our investigations consider numerous opportunities such as school resources, technology, teacher and principal characteristics, and curriculum to understand better and uncover underlying patterns in achievement within Caribbean contexts. Through this exploration, we aim to develop frameworks that elucidate achievement and opportunity within the unique educational experience of the Caribbean region.

METHODOLOGY

In this section, a summary of the research methodology employed is provided.

Research Design

This study followed a survey design, and the larger project included data collection in four Eastern Caribbean countries (Antigua, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Vincent and the Grenadines) and Barbados in 2017. The second data collection phase occurred in 2022 across five Eastern Caribbean countries (Dominica, Grenada, St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadines) and in 2024 in Barbados.

Sampling Strategy

Given the number of schools in St. Vincent and the Grenadines and resource constraints, including all schools in the study was impractical. Therefore, a sampling guide was developed to select a representative sample of schools. A general sampling guide, outlined in Table 1, was established to guide the process. Additionally, recognising the difficulty in accessing private schools, the decision was made to limit the selection to public schools or government-assisted schools.

Table 1: General Sampling Guide

PRIMARY SCHOOLS	SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Four schools will be selected from each district. If schools are small, additional selections may be made. The sample should include single-sex schools, including at least one girls' and one boys' school, where feasible. Efforts will be made to ensure the representation of different groups in cases of significant diversity (e.g. language, ethnicity) within the selected schools. Only students in the grade level preceding the level at which primary exit examinations are typically taken will be included. This guide is provisional and subject to adjustment upon obtaining information on the number of students in each school.	Two schools will be selected from each district. The sample should encompass former grammar school(s) The sample should include single-sex schools, including at least one girls' and one boys' school, where feasible. Only students in the second and fourth form levels will be included. Efforts will be made to ensure the representation of different groups in cases of significant diversity (e.g. language, ethnicity) within the selected schools. This guide is provisional and subject to adjustment upon obtaining information on the number of students in each school.

Information was obtained from the Ministry of Education to facilitate the selection of schools. A list of schools categorised by district was acquired. Additionally, data regarding the enrolment numbers of students in the required grades and the count of teachers at the selected schools were acquired to ensure an adequate supply of questionnaires. Although all attempts were made to follow the general sampling guide, alterations had to be made in some cases for practical reasons. Table 2 shows a breakdown of the number of schools from each district included in the sample.

Table 2: St. Vincent and the Grenadines' School Sample

DISTRICT	2017		2022	
	Number of Primary Schools	Number of Secondary Schools	Number of Primary Schools	Number of Secondary Schools
1	2	1	0	1
2	2	1	1	1
3	2	1	1	1
4	2	1	1	1
5	2	1	1	1
6	2	1	2	1
7	2	3	0	4
8	2	1	0	1
9	2	0	1	0
10	2	1	1	1
11	1	0	0	0
12	0	1	0	1
TOTAL	**21**	**12**	**8**	**13**

Procedure

Hard-copy surveys were distributed to each participating school's principal and all teachers. In many instances, the questionnaires had to be left at the schools and collected at a later arranged time due to the busy schedules of teachers and principals. For primary schools, surveys were administered to Grade Five students and for secondary schools, to Form Two and Four students. Where class sizes were small, classes were combined to collect the maximum number of responses, and where classes were streamed according to ability, the "middle" group of students was surveyed.

Surveying was conducted using the traditional face-to-face method. Trained researchers administered all questionnaires directly to students in their classrooms. This approach was chosen to ensure the highest quality of data. Two researchers visited each classroom whenever possible: one read the questionnaire aloud and the other to aid students with reading difficulties. Student

questionnaires were administered and collected on the same day to streamline the data collection process.

All participants were instructed not to write their names or other identifying information on the surveys.

Data Analysis

Questionnaires were coded with unique identifiers, and responses were entered into six separate databases: one each for primary students, teachers and principals, and one each for secondary students, teachers and principals. Quantitative data analysis techniques using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were employed to analyse the collected data. Descriptive statistics were utilised to compute frequencies, means, standard deviations and ranges for individual questions and scales within the questionnaire. Where open-ended response options were provided, responses were compiled and coded where necessary (e.g. secondary students' planned career choices). Finally, the statistics were tabulated to compare data gathered in 2017 with data collected in 2022.

COUNTRY PROFILE: STUDENTS

Primary School Students

Data were collected from 370 primary school students from 22 schools in 2017 and 154 primary school students in 2022 from 9 primary schools, and the results of the primary student survey are presented in the following sections.

Profile of Students in the Primary Schools Sample

The data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the students in the primary school sample. All students in the sample were in Grade Five, and the distribution of sex, age and nursery enrolment before primary school can be found in Tables 3 to 5.

Primary Students' Sex

Table 3: Distribution of Primary Students by Sex

Sex of Student	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Female	181	48.9	85	55.2
Male	188	50.8	69	44.8
No Response	1	.3	0	0
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

In 2017, data were collected from 370 primary students. There were 181 females (48.9 %) and 188 males (50.8%). There was no response from one student. Compared to data collected in 2022, data were collected from 154 students, 85 females and 69 males. It should be noted, however, that there is a 216-student difference between 2017 and 2022. In 2017, there was a higher percentage of male participants (50.8%), while in 2022, there was a higher percentage of female participants (55.2%).

Primary Students' Age

From the data collected in 2017, students ranged from 8 to 11 years old. Most of the primary students were 10 years old. One 8-year-old (.3%) participated. Other primary students included 125 9 years (55.1%), 204.10 years (55.1%) and 39 11-year-olds (99.7%). There was a notable 216 student decrease in the number of students who participated in the survey in 2022. The most

significant number of respondents were 10 years old (82.5%), followed by 11 years old (13.6%) and nine years old (2.6%). There were not any students in the eight years old category in 2022.

Table 4: Distribution of Primary Students by Age

Age of Student	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
8	1	.3	0	0
9	125	33.8	4	2.6
10	204	55.1	127	82.5
11	39	99.7	21	13.6
No Response			0	0
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

Enrolment in Nursery Before Primary School

Table 5: Distribution of Primary Students by Prior Nursery Enrolment

Prior Nursery Enrolment	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	359	97.0	149	96.8
No	9	2.4	5	3.2
No Response	2	.5	0	0
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

Students were asked whether they attended preschool or not. 359 (97.0%) of the students from the 2017 sample selected yes, while 9 (2.4%) said no. There were two missing students. In 2022, 96.8% of students indicated that they attended a pre-school, while 3.2% indicated that they did not.

Summary

First, there was a 216 difference in the number of students who participated in the study in 2017 and those who participated in 2022. This difference may have had implications for the comparison between both years of data collection. More male students (50.8%) completed the survey in 2017, while more female students (55.2%) completed the survey in 2022. There was also a difference in the age of students in 2017 and 2022. In 2017, the highest percentage of respondents were 11 years old (99.7%), while in 2022, they were 10 years old (82.5%). In both years of data collection, the majority of students attended pre-school. 97% attended pre-school in 2017, while 96.8% attended pre-school in 2022.

Secondary School Students

Data were collected from 535 secondary school students in 2017 across 12 schools and 311 secondary students in 2022 across 11 schools involved in the research, and the results of the secondary student survey are presented in the following sections.

Profile of Students in the Secondary Schools Sample

The data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the students in the Secondary school sample. All students in the sample were in either Form 2 or Form 4. The distribution of students by sex, form level and age can be found in Tables 6 to 8.

Secondary Students' Sex

Table 6: Distribution of Secondary Students by Sex

Sex of Student	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Female	265	49.5	197	63.3
Male	268	50.1	114	36.7
No Response	2	.4	0	0
TOTAL	**535**	**100**	**311**	**100**

Concerning the sex of the sample in 2017, data were collected from 535 secondary students. There were 265 females (48.5 %) and 268 males (50.1%). There was no response from two students. Compared to data collected in 2022, data were collected from 311 secondary students, a notable decrease from 2017. 265 (63.3%) were females and 114 (36.7%) were males. There was a higher percentage of males (50.1%) participating in 2017 than 2017 with females leading with the higher percentage (63.3%) in 2022.

Secondary Students' Form Level

Table 7: Distribution of Secondary Students by Form Level

Age of Student	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Form 2	291	54.4	162	52.1
Form 4	244	45.6	149	47.9
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

Concerning the students' form level of the sample in 2017, data were collected from 535 secondary students. There were 291 form 2 students (54.4 %) and 244 form 4 students (45.6%). When compared to data collected in 2022, data were collected from 311 secondary school students. 162 (52.1%) were Form 2 students, while 149 (47.9%) were Form 4 students. Form 2 students were the higher number of participants in 2017 (54.4%) and 2022 (52.1%).

Table 8: Distribution of Secondary Students by Age

Age of Student	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
12	85	15.9	8	2.6
13	150	28.0	126	40.5
14	90	16.8	24	7.7
15	133	24.9	95	30.5
16	43	8.0	45	14.5
18	6	1.1	9	2.9
No Response	6	1.1	1	0.3
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100**

Concerning the distribution of secondary students by age of the sample in 2017, data were collected from 535 secondary students. The students' ages ranged from 12 to 19 years old. It must be noted, however, that the largest age groups who participated in this study were 13- and 15-year-olds. One hundred fifty students were 13 (28%), while 133 (24.9%) students were 15 years old. The lowest number of participants was the 18- and 19-year-old age group; 6 (1.1%) were 18, and 2 students (1.1%) were 19. This data demonstrated that the dominant ages were 13 and 15, respectively. Compared to data collected in 2022, the most significant sample came from 13-year-olds (40.5%), followed by 15-year-olds (30.5%). The lowest percentages were from 12-year-olds (2.6%), 14-year-olds (7.7%) and 18-year-olds (2.9%). There are some similarities between the 12 and 18 age groups for the least number of participants in 2017 and 2022. While the 13- and 15-year-olds share the same similarities for 2017 and 2022.

Summary

The distribution of secondary students by sex increased in 2022 for the female students and decreased in 2022 for the male students. The age of the students remained consistent throughout the years of 2017 and 2022. The dominant age group in 2017 and 2022 were ages 13 and 15.

COUNTRY PROFILE: TEACHERS

Primary School Teachers

Data were collected from 55 primary school teachers across the 22 primary schools involved in the research in 2017 and 98 primary school teachers across the nine primary schools involved in the study in 2022.

Profile of Teachers in the Primary Schools Sample

The data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the teachers in the primary school sample. The distribution of sex, number of years teaching overall and at the current school, qualifications, professional status and subjects taught can be found in Tables 9 to 15.

Primary Teachers' Sex

Table 9: Distribution of Primary Teachers by Sex

Sex of Teacher	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Female	45	81.8	87	88.8
Male	4	7.3	11	11.2
No Response	6	10.9	0	0
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

In 2017, 55 teachers participated in the study. From this cohort, there were more females than males. 45 (81.8%) were female teachers, while 4 (7.3%) were male teachers. For 2022, there were 98 teachers, 87 (88.8%) of whom were female and 11 (11.2%) were male.

Primary Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience

Teachers reported their years in the teaching service; the results can be found in Table 10.

Table 10: Number of Years Teaching for Primary Teachers

	2017 (N=55)					2022 (N=98)				
	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
No. Years in Teaching Profession	49	0	30	9.69	10.5	88	0	43	10.10	9.52

In 2017, the maximum number of teaching years for primary teachers was 30. The minimum during this period was 0. The average number of years was 9.6, approximately 10 years. In 2022, the maximum number of teaching years was 43, while the minimum was 0. The average number of years was 10.10, approximately 11 years.

Primary Teachers' Years at the Current School

Teachers responded to the question about how many years they had been teaching at their current school, and the results are shown in Table 11

Table 11: Number of Years Teaching at Current School for Primary Teachers

	2017 (N=55)					2022 (N=98)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years at Current School	49	0	30	5.22	5.8	88	0	32	6.3	6.49

Qualifications Held by Primary Teachers

Teachers were asked to indicate the qualifications that they held at the time of data collection. They could select all the qualifications held. The results are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Qualifications of Primary Teachers

Qualification	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**
Associate Degree	28	50.4	27	27.6
Bachelor's Degree	14	25.2	27	27.6
Master's Degree	2	3.6	3	3.1
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0.0	0	0.0
Doctorate (PhD)	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other Qual (e.g. CSEC)	13	23.4	10	10.2

In 2017, 28 teachers held an associate's degree (50.4%). Fourteen had a bachelor's degree (25.2%), 2(3.6%) had a master's degree, and 13 (23.4%) had other qualifications. The study showed that most teachers from that year had an associate's degree, with the least coming from a master's degree. In 2022, 27 (27.6%) teachers held associate degrees. Twenty-seven teachers had a bachelor's degree, showing a 2.4% increase; three teachers held a master's and 10 with other qualifications. Once again, most primary teachers had an associate's degree, and the least had a Master's. Neither year saw any primary teachers with qualifications higher than a master's.

Education-Related Qualifications Held by Primary Teachers

Not only were the teachers asked to indicate the qualifications they held, but they were also asked to indicate the areas of qualification. These areas were categorised as being education-related and not. Education-related areas include primary education, primary education core areas English, Mathematics, Science and Social Sciences. The percentages of respondents holding their education-related qualifications are shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Proportion of Primary Teachers with Qualifications in Education-Related Areas

Education-Related Qualification	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate Degree	10	18.2	n/a	n/a
Bachelor's Degree	0	0	n/a	n/a
Master's Degree	0	0	n/a	n/a
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0	n/a	n/a
Doctorate (PhD)	0	0	n/a	n/a
Other Qual	0	0	n/a	n/a

Just under one-fifth of primary teachers in 2017 had qualifications in education-related areas and none of the teachers in 2022 specified the areas in which they were qualified.

Professional Status of Primary Teachers

The teachers indicated their status as to whether they were teacher-trained or held at least a first degree. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14: Professional Status of Primary Teachers

Professional Status	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Trained Graduate	12	21.8	21	21.4
Trained Non-Graduate	23	41.8	44	44.9
Untrained Graduate	2	3.6	2	2.0
Untrained Non-Graduate	11	20.0	15	15.3
Other Professional Status	1	1.8	3	3.1
No Response	6	10.9	13	13.3
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

In the 2017 study, there were 12 (21.8%) trained graduate teachers, compared to the untrained graduate teachers, who were 2 (3.6%). For the non-graduate teachers, 23 (41.8%) completed the

study, with 11 (20%) being untrained graduate teachers. Most teachers were trained non-graduate, with the least being untrained graduate teachers. One person had another professional status, and six persons did not respond. From the 2022 study, 21 (21.4%) trained graduate teachers showed an increase from 2017. There were two untrained graduate teachers in this year's study. For the non-graduate teachers, 44 (44.9%) were trained, and 12 (15.3) were untrained. Most primary teachers in 2022 were trained non-graduate teachers, and the least were untrained graduates.

Subject Areas Taught by Primary Teachers

The teachers were asked to indicate the subject areas they typically taught at their particular grade level. The results are shown in Table 15.

Table 15: Subject Areas Taught by Primary Teachers

Subject Area	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Language Arts	41	74.5	69	70.4
Mathematics	35	63.6	67	68.4
Science	38	69.1	68	69.4
Social Studies	39	70.9	62	63.3
Other Subject	23	41.8	38	38.8

In 2017, the subject taught the most by primary teachers was Language Arts (74.5%). The least taught subject was Mathematics (35-63.6%). Teachers reported teaching other subjects, including Health Education, Arts and Crafts, Religious Education, Music and Physical Education. In 2022, the primary teachers taught the subject Language Arts the most. The least taught subject was Social Studies.

Summary

The 2017 and 2022 studies revealed that most professional teachers were female. There was a general increase in participation in 2022. The primary teachers had a range of experience, whereas, in 2017, teachers had over three decades and four decades in 2022. The range of years at the current school was about the same average for both years, with a slight increase in 2022. Most teachers held an associate's degree for both 2017 and 2022, with increases in bachelor's and master's degrees in 2022. Along with the associate's degree, most teachers were trained non-graduate teachers, with an increase in this area in 2022. There was a decrease in 2022 with untrained graduate teachers.

None of the primary teachers had qualifications above a master's degree. Additionally, most teachers taught Language Arts and Science, with an increase in taught subjects right across the border.

Secondary School Teachers

Data were collected from 93 secondary school teachers across the 11 schools involved in the research in 2017 and from 105 teachers across the eight schools involved in the study in 2022.

Profile of Teachers in the Secondary Schools Sample

The data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the teachers in the secondary school sample. Tables 16 to 23 show the distribution of sex, the number of years teaching overall and at the current school, qualifications, professional status, and the subjects and levels taught.

Secondary Teachers' Sex

Table 16: Distribution of Secondary Teachers by Sex

Sex of Teacher	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Female	57	61.3	67	63.8
Male	24	25.8	38	36.2
No Response	12	12.9	0	0
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

Data collected for the sex of teachers was consistent for 2017 and 2022. Two-thirds of the secondary school teachers were females, while one-third were males.

Secondary Teachers' Years of Teaching Experience

Teachers reported their years in the teaching service.

Table 17: Number of Years Teaching for Secondary Teachers

	2017 (N=93)					2022 (N=105)				
	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD	n	Min	Max	Mean	SD
No. Years in Teaching Profession	81	0	40	12.1	8.4	102	0	38	12.16	9.6

The average age of secondary teachers was consistent between data collected in 2017 and 2022.

Secondary Teachers' Years at the Current School

Teachers responded to the question about how many years they had been teaching at their current school.

Table 18: Number of Years Teaching at Current School for Secondary Teachers

	2017 (N=93)					2022 (N=105)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years at Current School	81	0	30	7.9	5.7	101	0	28	7.8	6.4

The average number of years secondary teachers spent at their current school remained consistent from 2017 to 2022, with both years showing similar ranges and variations.

Qualifications Held by Secondary Teachers

Teachers were asked to indicate the qualifications that they held at the time of data collection. They could select all the qualifications held.

Table 19: Qualifications of Secondary Teachers

Qualification	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**
Associate's degree	30	32.2	0	0
Bachelor's Degree	56	60.2	62	59
Master's Degree	19	20.4	13	12.4
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0	0	0
Doctorate (PhD)	1	1	0	0
Other	23	24.7	39	37.1

The qualifications of secondary teachers remained consistent from 2017 to 2022, with most teachers indicating they have a bachelor's degree.

Education-Related Qualifications Held by Secondary Teachers

Not only were the teachers asked to indicate the qualifications they held, but they were also asked to indicate the areas of qualification. These areas were categorised as being education-related and not. Education-related areas include secondary education, secondary education core areas English,

Mathematics, Science and Social Sciences. The percentages of respondents holding their education-related qualifications are shown below.

Table 20: Proportion of Secondary Teachers with Qualifications in Education-Related Areas

Education-Related Qualification	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate Degree	29	31.1	n/a	n/a
Bachelor's Degree	50	53.7	n/a	n/a
Master's Degree	14	15.0	n/a	n/a
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0	n/a	n/a
Doctorate (PhD)	1	1.1	n/a	n/a
Other Qual	0	0	n/a	n/a

Teachers with qualifications in non-education-related areas held degrees in areas such as Cultural Studies, Economics, Management, Fine Arts, History, Human Resources and Computer Science.

Professional Status of Secondary Teachers

The teachers indicated their status as to whether they were teacher-trained or held at least a first degree.

Table 21: Professional Status of Secondary Teachers

Professional Status	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Trained Graduate	31	33.3	40	38.1
Trained Non-Graduate	12	12.9	26	24.8
Untrained Graduate	24	25.8	20	19.0
Untrained Non-Graduate	11	11.8	14	13.3
Other Professional Status	3	3.2	0	0
No Response	12	12.9	5	4.8
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

The professional status of trained graduate teachers increased by nine in 2022 compared to 2017. There were twice the number of trained non-graduate teachers in 2022 compared to 2017. The professional status of untrained graduates and untrained non-graduates stayed consistent through 2017 and 2022.

Subject Areas Taught by Secondary Teachers

The teachers were asked to indicate the subject areas they typically taught at their particular grade level.

Table 22: Subject Areas Taught by Secondary Teachers

Subject Area	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
English	16	17.2	22	21.0
Mathematics	13	13.9	18	17.1
General Studies	15	16.1	18	17.1
Science	6	6.4	31	29.5
Business	14	15.0	11	10.5
Industrial Arts	2	2.1	3	2.9
Art & Craft	1	1.0	0	0
Physical Education	2	2.1	5	4.8
Other Subject	9	9.6	11	10.5

The dominant subject areas for 2017 and 2022 include Mathematics, English, General Studies, and Business. Science increased by 24% in 2022, and Arts and Crafts Were not taught in 2022.

Level Taught by Secondary Teachers

The teachers were asked to indicate what grade level they typically teach. Between 2017 and 2022, the percentage of teachers who taught Science increased. The subject areas of English, General Studies, and Industrial Arts remained consistent throughout 2017 and 2022. However, there was a slight increase in Mathematics and Business in 2022.

Table 23: Subject Areas Taught by Secondary Teachers

Subject Area	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Lower Secondary (Forms 1-3)	32	15.1	61	58.1
Upper Secondary (Forms 4-5)	42	45.2	69	65.7
Post-Secondary (Lower 6-U6)	0	0	1	1.0
Other Level (Across Levels)	7	7.5	2	2.9

The number of teachers who taught at the lower secondary level increased by 100% in 2022. There was a moderate increase in the number of teachers who taught at the upper secondary level in 2022 compared to 2017, with an increase of one teacher for the post-secondary level in 2022.

Summary

Throughout 2017 and 2022, the dominant sex of secondary teachers was females. Most teachers had a bachelor's degree as their qualification, with most teachers indicating that they were trained graduate teachers in 2017 and 2022. The most popular subject areas taught by secondary teachers were English, Mathematics, General Studies and Science. Most teachers taught upper secondary school in 2017 and 2022.

COUNTRY PROFILE: PRINCIPALS

Primary School Principals

Data were collected from 9 primary school principals across the 55 primary schools involved in the research in 2017 and from 8 primary school principals across the nine primary schools involved in the study in 2022.

Profile of Principals in the Primary Schools Sample

The data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the principals in the primary school sample. The distribution of principals by sex can be found in Table 24.

Primary Principals' Sex

Table 24: Distribution of Primary Principals by Sex

Sex of Principal	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Female	8	88.9	7	87.5
Male	1	11.1	1	12.5
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

There were nine principals in the 2017 study: 8 females and one male. In 2022, there were eight principals, seven females and one male.

Primary Principals' Years of Teaching Experience

Principals reported their years in the teaching service, and the distribution of responses is shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Number of Years Teaching for Primary Principals

	2017 (N=9)					2022 (N=8)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years in Teaching Profession	9	24	39	29.2	4.7	8	16	39	32.0	7.5

In 2017, the minimum number of years teaching for primary principals was 24. The maximum was 39 years, with an average of 29 years. In 2022, the maximum was 39 years, the minimum was 16 years, and there was an average of 32 years.

Primary Principals' Years in Principal Position

Principals reported their years as principals, and the distribution of responses is shown in Table 26.

Table 26: Number of Years as a Principal for Primary Principals

	2017 (N=9)					2022 (N=8)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years as Principal	9	2	12	5.8	3.7	8	0	14	5.0	4.3

The 2017 data shows that the minimum number of years as principal for primary schools was 2, with the maximum being 12 years. There was an average of 5 years. In 2022, the maximum number of years as principal for primary schools was 14, and the minimum was 0. There was an average of 5 years.

Primary Principals' Years as Principal at the Current School

Principals responded to the question about how many years they had been serving as principals at their current school, and their responses are summarised in Table 27.

Table 27: Number of Years as Principal at Current School for Primary Principals

	2017 (N=9)					2022 (N=8)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years as Principal at Current School	9	1	11	5.1	3.7	8	0	6	3.5	2.2

In 2017, the minimum number of years in the role of principal held at that particular school was 1. The maximum number of years was 11, and the average number of years was 5. In 2022, the maximum number of years was 6, the minimum number of years was 0, and the average was 3.5 years.

Highest Qualification Held by Primary Principals

During data collection, principals were asked to indicate their highest qualification. Their responses are shown in Table 28.

Table 28: Qualifications of Primary Teachers

Qualification	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Bachelor's Degree	6	66.7	4	50.0
Master's Degree	3	33.3	3	37.5
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0.0	1	12.5
Doctorate (PhD)	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

The highest qualification for principals in 2017 was a master's degree. However, ¾ of the participants held a bachelor's degree as their highest qualification. In 2022, one principal with a doctorate (EdD) was the highest qualification for that year. Four principals had their bachelor's, and 2 had their Master's.

Education-Related Qualifications Held by Primary Principals

Not only were principals asked to indicate their qualifications, but they were also asked to indicate their areas of qualification. These areas were categorised as being education-related and not. Education-related areas include primary education, primary education core areas English, Mathematics, Science and Social Sciences. The percentages of respondents holding their education-related qualifications are shown in Table 29.

Principals in 2017 and 2022 did not specify the areas in which they were qualified, and so this data is unavailable.

Table 29: Proportion of Primary Principals with Qualifications in Education-Related Areas

Education-Related Qualification	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate Degree	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Bachelor's Degree	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Master's Degree	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Doctorate (EdD)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Doctorate (PhD)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Qual	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Primary Principals' Training in School Leadership/Management

Principals were asked to indicate whether or not they had qualifications or training in school leadership and/or management, and if so, to report at what level and in which area. Their responses are shown in Tables 30 and 31.

Table 30: Primary Principals' Training in School Leadership/Management

Qualifications/training in school leadership/management?	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	6	66.7	8	100
No	3	33.3	0	0.0
No Response	0	0.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

The 2017 data shows six principals had school leadership or management training, while three did not. In 2022, all principals had training or qualifications in school management.

Table 31: Highest Level of Training in School Leadership/Management for Primary Principals

Education-Related Qualification	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate Degree	0	0.0	3	37.5
Bachelor's Degree	1	11.1	2	25.0
Master's Degree	1	11.1	1	0.0
Doctorate (EdD)	0.0	0.0	1	12.5
Doctorate (PhD)	0.0	0.0	0	0.0
Other Qual	6	66.7	1	12.5

In 2017, one principal had a bachelor's and one a master's in school leadership. Other principals had other qualifications. In 2022, the highest qualification in school leadership was a doctorate (EdD). One principal had a master's, two had a bachelor's, and 3 had an associate's degree.

Summary

The data revealed more female than male principals in both years. Generally, the maximum number of years remained the same in 2017 and 2022, with a decrease in the minimum number of years for principals who taught previously. The average number of years for principals at a primary school was constant, with a maximum remaining around the same. The minimum number of years decreased to 0 in 2022, suggesting that a new principal was appointed at the school. This was reflected once more regarding the years a principal held that role at a particular school. There was an increase in qualifications for principals, with one having a Doctorate (EdD) in 2022; however, there was a decrease in the number of principals with a bachelor's degree. From 2017 to 2022, all principals were trained or held qualifications in leadership and management. The highest qualification in 2017 was a bachelor's, with an increase to a doctorate in 2022. However, most principals in 2022 had an associate's degree.

Secondary School Principals

Data were collected from 5 secondary school principals across five secondary schools involved in the research in 2017 and 8 secondary school principals across the eight secondary schools in the study in 2022.

Profile of Principals in the Secondary Schools Sample

The data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the principals in the Secondary school sample. The distribution of principals by sex can be found in Table 32.

Secondary Principals' Sex

Table 32: Distribution of Secondary Principals by Sex

Sex of Principal	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Female	3	60.0	5	62.5
Male	2	40.0	3	37.5
No Response	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

There was a slight increase in 2022 in the number of principals who participated in the survey. There was a 3% increase in females in 2022 and a 3% decrease in males in 2022.

Secondary Principals' Years of Teaching Experience

Principals reported their years in the teaching service. The distribution of principal responses can be found in Table 33.

Table 33: Number of Years Teaching for Secondary Principals

	2017 (N=5)					2022 (N=8)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years in Teaching Profession	5	25	36	31.8	4.6	8	15	39	32.06	8.2

There was an increase in the number of participants in 2022, along with an increase in the maximum number of years in the teaching profession and a decrease in the minimum years in the teaching profession.

Secondary Principals' Years in Principal Position

Principals reported their years as principals. The distribution of principal responses can be found in Table 34.

Table 34: Number of Years as a Principal for Secondary Principals

	2017 (N=5)					2022 (N=8)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years as Principal	5	2	13	6.2	4.6	7	1	20	32.0	8.2

There was an increase in the number of principals participating in the survey in 2022. There was a decrease in the minimum number of years teaching in 2022 and the maximum number of years a secondary school principal.

Secondary Principals' Years as Principal at the Current School

Principals responded to the question about how many years they had been principals at their current school. The distribution of principal responses can be found in Table 35.

There was an increase in the number of principals who participated in this survey in 2022. There was a decrease in the minimum number of years as principal at the current school in 2022 and an increase in the maximum number of years as principal at the current school in 2022.

Table 35: Number of Years as Principal at Current School for Secondary Principals

	2017 (N=5)					2022 (N=8)				
	n	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**	**n**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**SD**
No. Years as Principal at Current School	5	2	13	5.0	4.71	7	1	20	8.8	7.2

Highest Qualification Held by Secondary Principals

Principals were asked to indicate the highest qualification held at the time of data collection. Their responses are shown in Table 36.

Table 36: Qualifications of Secondary Principals

Qualification	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	**%**	**n**	**%**
Bachelor's Degree	1	20	3	37.5
Master's Degree	4	80.0	5	62.5
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0	0	0
Doctorate (PhD)	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

There was an increase in the number of principals who held a bachelor's degree in 2022. 2022 also saw a rise in the number of principals who held a master's degree and an increase in principals who had a Doctoral degree.

Education-Related Qualifications Held by Secondary Principals

Not only were principals asked to indicate their qualifications, but they were also asked to indicate their areas of qualification. These areas were categorised as being education-related and not. Education-related areas include secondary education, secondary education core areas of English, mathematics, science, and social sciences. The percentages of respondents holding their education-related qualifications are shown in Table 37.

In 2022, two principals indicated bachelor's degrees in education-related fields, while three indicated they had master's degrees in education-related fields.

Table 37: Proportion of Secondary Principals with Qualifications in Education-Related Areas

Education-Related Qualification	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate Degree	n/a	n/a	0	0
Bachelor's Degree	n/a	n/a	2	25.0
Master's Degree	n/a	n/a	3	37.5
Doctorate (EdD)	n/a	n/a	0	0
Doctorate (PhD)	n/a	n/a	0	0
Other Qual	n/a	n/a	0	0

Secondary Principals' Training in School Leadership/Management

Principals were asked to indicate whether or not they had qualifications or training in school leadership and/or management, and if so, to report at what level and in which area. Their responses are shown in Tables 38 and 39.

Table 38: Secondary Principals' Training in School Leadership/Management

Qualifications/training in school leadership/management?	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	3	60.0	8	100.0
No	2	40.0	0	0
No Response	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

100% of the principals in 2022 had school leadership/management training, while only 60% had training in 2017.

Table 39: Highest Level of Training in School Leadership/Management for Secondary Principals

Education-Related Qualification	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Associate Degree	0	0	0	0
Bachelor's Degree	0	0	2	25.0
Master's Degree	2	40.0	1	12.5
Doctorate (EdD)	0	0	1	12.5
Doctorate (PhD)	0	0	0	0
Other Qual	0	0	4	50.0
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

In 2017, principals reported training in educational management, administration, and leadership and learning. In 2017, two principals attained master's degrees in an education-related field, one more principal than in 2022. In 2022, two principals indicated that they had bachelor's degrees in an education-related field, and one indicated that they had a doctorate in an education-related field.

Summary

There was an increase in male and female principals in 2022. There was also an increase in the maximum number of years principals had as teachers in 2022 and a decrease in the minimum number of teaching years in 2022. There was also an increase in 2022 in the number of years as a secondary school principal and the number of years as principal at their current school. There was also an increase in the number and category of qualifications as principals in 2022. All principals in 2022 were trained in school leadership/management.

FACTORS AFFECTING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Several factors affect student achievement, and the study's findings are reported below. Findings are divided into the categories:

- Students' Home Environment
- Students' Perception of School and Learning
- Teachers' Classroom Practices
- School Leadership
- School Characteristics
- Teacher and Principal Views on Common Educational Practices
- The Impact of COVID-19 on Teaching and Learning

This report presents students' perspectives first in the primary and secondary school sections. Traditionally, educational research has focused on writing **about** students; however, there is a new focus on having "students fill the pages with their voices not to 'prove', or support researcher claims but rather to make claims of their own" (Cook-Sather, 2020, p. 9). From this perspective, we conducted this study to capture Vincentian students' voices accurately.

Students' Home Environment

Primary and secondary students were asked about various factors influencing their home environments. These factors include which family members live with them at home, items found in the households, access to devices and the internet, and types of leisure activities engaged in. Students were also asked several questions that can serve as indicators of the home literacy environment, including the number of books in the home and whether someone reads or reads to them at home.

Primary Students' Home Environment

Family Members Living with Primary Students

Students were asked who usually lives with them at home and their parents' employment status. Their responses can be found in Tables 40 to 42.

Table 40: Family Members Living with Primary Students

Family Member	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Mother (including stepmother or foster mother	320	86.5	124	80.5
Father (including stepfather or foster father)	210	56.8	69	44.8
Brother(s) (including stepbrothers)	191	51.6	64	41.6
Sister(s) (including stepsisters)	187	50.5	60	39.0
Grandparent(s)	136	36.8	60	39.0
Others (e.g. cousin)	86	23.2	52	33.8

Other relatives included aunts, uncles and cousins.

Table 41: Primary Students' Mothers' Employment Status

Mother employment status	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
She is working full-time for pay	177	47.8	71	46.1
She is working part-time for pay	68	18.4	35	22.7
She is not working but looking for a job	62	16.8	27	17.5
Other (e.g. home duties; retired)	42	11.4	15	9.7
No Response	21	5.7	6	3.9
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

Table 42: Primary Students' Fathers' Employment Status

Father employment status	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
He is working full-time for pay	245	66.2	95	61.7
He is working part-time for pay	68	18.4	24	15.6
He is not working, but looking for a job	18	4.9	7	4.5
Other (e.g. home duties; retired)	12	3.2	21	13.6
No Response	27	7.3	7	4.5
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

Primary Students Access to Devices, Internet and Other Resources at Home

Students were asked if they had access to the internet and to indicate the electronic devices they had access to at home. They were also asked to indicate access to other resources in their households. Their responses showing the percentage of students with regular access to these resources at home can be found in Tables 43 to 45.

Table 43: Primary Students' Access to the Internet at Home

Regular internet access at home	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	277	74.9	145	94.2
No	87	23.5	5	3.2
No Response	6	1.6	4	2.6
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

Table 44: Primary Students' Access to Electronic Devices at Home

Regular access to a device at home	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Smartphone	261	70.5	74	48.1
Electronic tablet	226	61.1	127	82.5
Laptop computer	181	48.9	50	32.5
Desktop computer	78	21.1	19	12.3
Smart TV	247	68.8	97	63
Other	8	2.2	6	3.9

Other devices listed include PS4 and Nintendo

Table 45: Primary Students' Access to Other Resources at Home

Regular access to	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
A computer you can use for schoolwork	193	52.2	65	42.2
A desk to study at	158	42.7	76	49.4
A dictionary	317	85.7	122	79.2
A dishwasher (or washing machine)	176	47.6	91	59.1
A DVD player	236	63.8	50	32.5
A guest room	88	23.8	46	29.9
Internet access	251	67.8	134	87.0
Microwave oven	200	54.1	90	58.4
A musical instrument	147	39.7	73	47.4
A quiet place to study	204	55.1	82	53.2
A room of your own	197	53.2	97	63.0
Books of poetry	142	38.4	68	44.2
Books to help with your schoolwork	284	76.8	132	85.7
Classic literature (e.g. Roald Dahl; Dr Seuss)	64	17.3	36	23.4
Educational software	142	38.4	72	46.8
Puzzles and Educational toys	252	68.1	89	57.8
Technical reference books or manuals	99	26.8	56	36.4
Works of art (e.g., paintings)	240	64.9	91	59.1

Primary Students' Transportation to School

Students were asked how they usually travel to school every day. Table 46 shows the percentage of students who use various modes of transportation to school.

Table 46: Primary Students' Mode of Travel to School

Mode of travel	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Walking	208	56.2	79	51.3
By public transport (e.g. bus, minibus, route taxi)	64	17.3	27	17.5
By private vehicle (e.g. parent's car; with a friend)	70	18.9	31	20.1
Cycling (e.g. bicycle)	0	0	2	1.3
Other	3	.8	14	9.2
No Response	25	6.8	0	0
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100**

Primary Students' Leisure Activities

Primary students were asked to report on the leisure activities they engage in at home. The distribution of students engaging in each leisure activity can be found in Table 47.

Table 47: Primary Students' Leisure Activities at Home

Leisure activity	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Watching TV	310	83.8	117	76.0
Creative writing (e.g. stories, poetry, cartoons)	96	25.9	46	29.9
Watching movies/videos on a device	281	75.9	92	59.7
Listening to music	285	77.0	99	64.3
Playing sports	237	64.1	78	50.6
Reading	236	63.8	87	56.5
Hanging out with friends	258	69.7	83	53.9
Using social media (e.g. Snapchat; Facebook; Twitter; Instagram)	164	44.3	58	37.7
Playing video games	244	65.9	112	72.7
Surfing the Internet	179	48.4	45	29.2
Other	12	3.2	6	3.9

Other reported leisure activities include playing games, e.g. dominoes and cards, swimming, fishing and afternoon drives.

Primary Students' Home Literacy Environment

Students' home literacy environment was ascertained by asking about several factors. Students were asked to report on leisure time reading materials and whether they were accessed in paper or electronic formats, the number of books in the home, who, if anyone, reads to them at home and their perception of reading as a gender-specific activity. Primary student responses can be found in Tables 48 to 52.

Table 48: Primary Students' Reading Material and Format

Reading material and format	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Novels (Fiction): Paper format ONLY	73	19.7	44	28.6
Novels (Fiction): Electronic format ONLY	34	9.2	32	20.8
Novels (Fiction): BOTH Paper & Electronic	21	5.7	8	5.2
Other books (e.g. Non-fiction): Paper format ONLY	139	37.6	66	42.9
Other books (e.g. Non-fiction): Electronic format ONLY	22	5.9	20	13.0
Other books (e.g. Non-fiction): BOTH Paper & Electronic	27	7.3	6	3.9
Magazines: Paper format ONLY	60	16.2	30	19.5
Magazines: Electronic format ONLY	21	5.7	25	16.2
Magazines: BOTH Paper & Electronic	14	3.8	2	1.3
Comics: Paper format ONLY	69	18.6	44	28.6
Comics: Electronic format ONLY	30	8.1	20	13.0

Comics: BOTH Paper & Electronic	20	5.4	3	1.9
Newspapers: Paper format ONLY	123	57.6	41	26.6
Newspapers: Electronic format ONLY	17	4.6	5	3.2
Newspapers: BOTH Paper & Electronic	16	4.3	4	2.6
Other	-	-	15	9.7

Other reported reading materials included in 2017 and 2022 include scary books and poems.

Table 49: Number of Books in Primary Students' Homes

No. of books	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
0 – 10	79	21.4	29	18.8
11 – 25	94	25.4	31	20.1
26 – 100	90	24.3	36	23.4
101 – 200	44	11.9	29	18.8
201 – 500	26	7.0	9	5.8
More than 500	26	7.0	19	12.3
No Response	10	2.7	1	.6
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100.0**

Table 50: Primary Students' Who Are Read to at Home

Does someone read to you at home?	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	239	64.6	73	47.4
No	126	34.1	78	50.6
No Response	4	1.1	3	1.9
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100.0**

Table 51: Person Who Reads to Primary Students at Home

The person who reads to the student	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Father (including stepfather or foster father)	90	24.3	38	24.7
Mother (including stepmother or foster mother)	191	51.6	75	48.7
Brother(s) (including stepbrother)	65	17.6	15	9.7
Sister(s) (including stepsister)	93	25.1	29	18.8
Other relatives (e.g. grandparents; cousins; aunts, uncles)	115	31.1	38	24.7
Other(s) (e.g. friends)	7	1.9	8	5.1

Other individuals who read to primary students in 2017 and 2022 include best friends.

Table 52: Primary Students' Perception of Reading as a Gender-Specific Activity

Reading is an activity that is for	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Girls only	11	3.0	6	3.9
Boys only	6	1.6	4	2.6
Both girls and boys	350	94.6	144	93.5
No Response	3	.8	0	0
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100.0**

Primary Students' Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities

Students were asked if they participated in extra-curricular activities. Primary student responses to this item can be found in Table 53. Students who responded yes to this question were asked to indicate the extracurricular activity they most often engage in. Students who answered no were asked why they do not participate in extracurricular activities.

Table 53: Primary Students' Participating in Extra-Curricular Activities

Participate in extra-curricular activities	2017 (N=370)		2022 (N=154)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	317	85.7	102	66.2
No	49	13.2	50	32.5
No Response	3	.8	2	1.3
TOTAL	**370**	**100**	**154**	**100.0**

In the 2017 study, primary students reported engaging in numerous activities, including sports, music, and mentorship programmes. Students who did not participate gave reasons that included illnesses, lack of interest, parents not giving permission, not getting accepted into groups and overload of schoolwork. Primary students reported in 2022 engaging in various activities, including: sports, Brownies, dancing, choir and drumming. Students who reported not participating in extracurricular activities in 2022 gave multiple reasons, including being too nervous, shy, not being able to do sports, not wanting to do any extracurricular, having other responsibilities, parents not being financially able, parents not wanting them to do any activities, because of Covid-19, and being lazy.

Summary

In the 2017 and 2022 studies, students lived with their mothers, fathers and siblings. It was noted that there was a decrease in fathers in the household in the 2022 study. Mothers continued to work

full-time, with a slight increase in part-time employment in 2022. Fathers saw a slight decrease in both full-time and part-time employment over the years. Internet access increased significantly in 2022, with almost all students accessing this utility. The 2022 study saw a significant decrease in access to a smartphone at home compared to the 2017 study. However, there was a substantial increase in access to tablets utilised most by the students. Where resources are concerned, there was a slight decrease in students having access to a computer for work and likewise a quiet place to study. However, an increase in privacy was seen with more students having access to their own rooms. In 2017, more students reported walking as their primary means of transportation. This decreased in 2022, and more students travelling to school via private access were observed. However, public transport remained constant as the average mode of transportation for students. Watching television, listening to music and playing video games remain the social activities that children engage in in their spare time. While these remain at their average mark, there was a decline in reading from 2017 to 2022. The students' preference for reading was newspapers and non-fiction books. For both years, there was an increase in both electronic and paper formats. There has been a slight decline in the number of books within the students' household, as well as in person's reading to the students at home. Students' participation in extracurricular activities saw a significant decrease from 2017 to 2022. Reasons for not participating included lack of finances from parents, parents not granting permission, having other responsibilities, lack of motivation, and not being selected by teams.

Secondary Students' Home Environment

Family Members Living with Secondary Students

Students were asked who usually lives with them at home and their parents' employment status. Their responses can be found in Tables 54 to 56.

For 2017 and 2022, mothers were the most significant percentage of family members living at home with students. In 2017, 73.1% lived with their mother; in 2022, 71.7% lived with their mother. Other relatives, including the father, were marginally behind in 2017 at 38.3% and in 2022 at 37.9%.

Table 54: Family Members Living with Secondary Students

Family Member	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Mother (including stepmother or foster mother)	391	73.1	223	71.7
Father (including stepfather or foster father)	205	38.3	118	37.9
Brother(s) (including stepbrothers)	203	37.9	107	34.4
Sister(s) (including stepsisters)	187	35.0	103	33.1
Grandparent(s)	149	27.9	84	27
Others (e.g. cousin)	131	24.5	99	31.8

Table 55: Secondary Students' Mothers' Employment Status

Mother employment status	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
She is working full-time for pay	264	49.3	162	52.1
She is working part-time for pay	54	10.1	34	10.9
She is not working, but looking for a job	106	19.8	52	16.7
Other (e.g. home duties; retired)	0	0	38	12.2
No Response	111	20.7	25	8.0
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

In 2017 and 2022, most secondary students indicated that their mothers' employment status was working for full-time pay, followed by their mothers not working but looking for a job. The least recorded response was that the mothers are working part-time for pay for 2017 and 2022.

Table 56: Secondary Students' Fathers' Employment Status

Father employment status	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
He is working full-time for pay	350	65.4	206	66.2
He is working part-time for pay	67	12.5	33	10.6
He is not working, but looking for a job	33	6.2	14	14.5
Other (e.g. home duties; retired)	0	0	13	4.2
No Response	85	15.9	45	14.5
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

In 2017 and 2022, secondary students indicated that their fathers worked for full-time pay. In 2017, 12.5% indicated that fathers worked for part-time pay, while 10.6% indicated the same for 2022. In 2022, 14.5% of secondary students indicated that their fathers were not working but that they were looking for a job, an 8.3% increase from 2017.

Secondary Students Access to Devices, Internet and Other Resources at Home

Students were asked if they have access to the internet and to indicate the electronic devices they have access to at home. They were also asked to indicate access to other resources in their households. Their responses showing the percentage of students with regular access to these resources at home can be found in Tables 57 to 59.

Table 57: Secondary Students' Access to the Internet at Home

Regular internet access at home	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	453	84.7	293	94.2
No	74	13.8	15	4.8
No Response	8	1.5	3	1.0
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

Most secondary students indicated that they had regular access to internet at home in 2017 and 2022

Table 58: Secondary Students' Access to Electronic Devices at Home

Regular access to a device at home	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Smartphone	456	85.2	216	69.5
Electronic tablet	284	53.1	230	74.0
Laptop computer	320	59.8	149	47.9
Desktop computer	111	20.7	43	13.8
Smart TV	278	52.0	192	61.7
Other	19	3.5	14	4.5

In 2017, most secondary students indicated regular access to a smartphone; in 2022, most secondary students indicated regular access to an electronic tablet. In 2017, 59.8% of students indicated regular access to a laptop computer, while 53.1% indicated regular access to an electronic tablet. In 2022, 69.5% indicated regular access to a smartphone, while 47.9% indicated regular access to a laptop computer. Other devices listed include DVDs, gaming consoles, MP3 players, music sets, normal TV, PlayStation, PS Vita, PS4, Xbox, PSP, DSI, radio, kitchen utensils, smartwatches, stereo sets, tablets, Xbox 360, and Xbox One.

Table 59: Secondary Students' Access to Other Resources at Home

Regular access to	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
A computer you can use for schoolwork	354	66.2	162	52.1
A desk to study at	217	40.6	138	44.4
A dictionary	463	86.5	251	80.7
A dishwasher (or washing machine)	261	48.8	160	51.4
A DVD player	312	58.3	76	24.4
A guest room	137	25.6	74	23.8
Internet access	430	80.4	281	90.4
Microwave oven	298	55.7	188	60.5
A musical instrument	250	46.7	119	38.3
A quiet place to study	240	44.9	149	47.9
A room of your own	374	69.9	200	64.3
Books of poetry	227	42.4	119	38.3
Books to help with your schoolwork	418	78.1	237	76.2
Classic literature (e.g. Roald Dahl; Dr Seuss)	160	29.9	71	22.8
Educational software	215	40.2	128	41.2
Technical reference books or manuals	137	25.6	82	26.4
Works of art (e.g., paintings)	232	43.4	123	39.5

In 2017, most students indicated that they had regular access to a dictionary, internet access, books to help with schoolwork and a room of their own. In 2022, secondary students indicated they had internet access, a dictionary and books to help with schoolwork.

Secondary Students' Transportation to School

Students were asked how they usually travel to school every day. Table 60 shows the percentage of students who use various transportation modalities to school.

Table 60: Secondary Students' Mode of Travel to School

Mode of travel	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Walking	104	19.4	62	19.9
By public transport (e.g. bus, minibus, route taxi)	320	59.8	155	49.8
By private vehicle (e.g. parent's car; with a friend)	77	14.9	70	22.5
Cycling (e.g. bicycle)	0	0	0	0
Other	5	0.9	7	2.3
No Response	29	5.4	9	2.9
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

In 2017 and 2022, most secondary students indicated they travelled to school by public transport.

Secondary Students' Leisure Activities

Secondary students were asked to report on the leisure activities they engage in at home. The distribution of students engaging in each leisure activity can be found in Table 61.

Table 61: Secondary Students' Leisure Activities at Home

Leisure activity	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Watching TV	424	79.3	325	75.6
Creative writing (e.g. stories, poetry, cartoons)	119	22.2	56	18.0
Watching movies/videos on a device	399	74.6	247	79.4
Listening to music	457	85.4	272	97.5
Playing sports	255	47.7	114	36.7
Reading	308	57.6	172	55.3
Hanging out with friends	318	59.4	173	55.6
Using social media (e.g. Snapchat; Facebook; Twitter; Instagram)	356	66.5	242	77.8
Playing video games	273	51.0	174	55.9
Surfing the Internet	317	59.3	148	47.6
Other	32	5.9	40	12.9

In 2017, secondary students indicated that they mostly listened to music, watched TV, watched movies or videos on a device, and used social media. In 2022, most secondary students indicated that they mainly listened to music, watched movies or videos on a device, and used social media.

Other reported leisure activities include art, drawing, solitude, chores, family gatherings, church, cleaning, cooking, baking, dancing, DJ-ing, homework and study, exercising, sleeping, eating, selling snacks, fixing bikes, gardening, beach, graphic designing, relaxing, making craft, making videos, music, sports, part-time job, research, riding bikes, singing, gardening and watching YouTube.

Secondary Students' Home Literacy Environment

Students' home literacy environment was ascertained by asking about several factors. Students were asked to report on leisure time reading materials, whether they were accessed in paper or electronic formats, the number of books in the home, and their perception of reading as a gender-

specific activity. The students were also asked who, if anyone, read to them at home when they were in primary school. Secondary student responses can be found in Tables 62 to 66.

Table 62: Secondary Students' Reading Material and Format

Reading material and format	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Novels (Fiction): Paper format ONLY	123	23.0	44	14.1
Novels (Fiction): Electronic format ONLY	56	10.5	64	20.6
Novels (Fiction): BOTH Paper & Electronic	46	8.6	26	8.4
Other books (e.g. Non-fiction): Paper format ONLY	130	24.3	64	20.6
Other books (e.g. Non-fiction): Electronic format ONLY	56	10.5	56	18.0
Other books (e.g. Non-fiction): BOTH Paper & Electronic	44	8.2	19	6.1
Magazines: Paper format ONLY	99	18.5	23	7.4
Magazines: Electronic format ONLY	29	5.4	26	8.4
Magazines: BOTH Paper & Electronic	15	2.8	2	0.6
Comics: Paper format ONLY	82	15.3	29	9.3
Comics: Electronic format ONLY	45	8.4	46	14.8
Comics: BOTH Paper & Electronic	28	5.2	14	4.5
Newspapers: Paper format ONLY	162	30.3	34	10.9
Newspapers: Electronic format ONLY	23	4.3	25	8.0
Newspapers: BOTH Paper & Electronic	21	3.9	5	1.6
Other	10	1.8	20	6.4

In 2017, secondary students indicated that they mostly read newspapers in paper format, non-fiction books in electronic format only, and fiction novels in paper format only. In 2022, students mainly read fiction novels in electronic format only, non-fiction books in paper format only and other books in electronic format only. Other reported reading materials included the Bible, Bible stories, blogs, English Literature stories, fables, New Testament, notebooks, notes phone, schoolbooks, stories, storybooks and textbooks.

Table 63: Number of Books in Secondary Students' Homes

No. of books	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
0 – 10	106	19.8	88	28.3
11 – 25	105	19.6	69	22.2
26 – 100	137	25.6	90	28.9
101 – 200	66	12.3	34	10.9
201 – 500	45	8.4	12	3.9
More than 500	40	7.5	5	1.6
No Response	33	6.2	13	4.2
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

In 2017 and 2022, most secondary students had between 26 to 100 books in their homes.

Table 64: Secondary Students' Read to at Home When in Primary School

Did someone read to you at home when you were in primary school?	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	374	69.9	210	67.5
No	140	26.2	93	29.9
No Response	21	3.9	8	2.6
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

Most secondary students in 2017 and 2022 had someone read to them at home in primary school.

Table 65: Person Who Read to Secondary Students at Home when in Primary School

The person who read to the student	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Father (including stepfather or foster father)	112	20.9	60	19.3
Mother (including stepmother or foster mother)	304	56.8	166	53.4
Brother(s) (including stepbrother)	62	11.6	21	6.8
Sister(s) (including stepsister)	117	21.9	48	15.4
Other relatives (e.g. grandparents; cousins; aunts, uncles)	172	32.1	93	29.9
Other(s) (e.g. friends)	21	3.9	25	8.0

In 2017 and 2022, mothers of secondary students read to them at home when they were in primary school. Other individuals who read to secondary students included cousins.

Table 66: Secondary Students' Perception of Reading as a Gender-Specific Activity

Reading is an activity that is for	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Girls only	28	5.2	6	1.9
Boys only	4	.7	2	0.6
Both girls and boys	482	90.1	298	95.8
No Response	21	3.9	5	1.6
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

Secondary Students' Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities

Students were asked if they participated in extra-curricular activities. Secondary student responses to this item can be found in Table 67. Students who responded yes to this question were asked to indicate the extracurricular activity they most often engage in. Students who answered no were asked why they do not participate in extracurricular activities.

Table 67: Secondary Students' Participating in Extra-Curricular Activities

Participate in extra-curricular activities	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	311	58.1	149	47.9
No	215	40.2	155	49.8
No Response	9	1.7	7	2.3
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

Students reported engaging in a range of activities, including art classes, the art club, athletics, table tennis, music band, basketball, business club, cadets, chess club, choir, steel pan band, Christian fellowship, class competition, cricket, audio technician, football, dance club, dancing, drama club, environmental club, youth empowerment club, first aid, volleyball, girl guides, heritage club, modern language club, student council, piano lessons, swimming, theatre arts and watching Netflix.

Students who reported not participating in extracurricular activities gave various reasons, including: Not participating in the school band because of the secular music that the band plays, it is hard to get home after activities, because of illness, didn't make the football team and not interested in anymore clubs, do not feel like taking part in any extracurricular activities, do not know why, lots of school work, hardly any time to do anything extra, never got the chance to join, I am afraid, I am asthmatic, I am diagnosed with sickle cell, focusing on school work, I am going to, laziness, not fit enough, not good at any activities and playing sports, not interested, not ready yet, not sure why, can't afford the uniform, chose to stop, don't have a lot of time, don't like sporting activities, didn't find any nice groups to join as yet, do not want to go and do not have money, do not find that it is entertaining, do not like any of the activities, like to be by myself, hate outside activities, has asthma, shy and is afraid to get on stage, not made up mind on what to do as yet, after school classes, used to but am no longer interested, parents won't let me join, afraid to be judged, other students make fun and laugh at you, it is a waste of time, the football coach is biased, the sport that I like (basketball) is not offered.

Summary

It was found that participation in extracurricular activities was almost split evenly among those who participated and those who did not. Students participated in various sporting activities and school clubs and groups. Students also gave reasons for not participating in extracurricular

activities including financial challenges, parental restrictions, being overwhelmed with schoolwork, not being interested and feeling intimidated or bullied by others.

Students' Perception of School and Learning

Primary and secondary students were asked about their feelings about learning and school in general. They were also asked about their feelings about several aspects of their school's climate.

Primary Students' Attitudes Towards School and Learning

Students were presented with a list of statements about school and learning and were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with each statement. They were also allowed to indicate that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed. The frequency of primary student responses to each statement is presented in Table 68.

Summary

The students were asked to rate statements investigating their attitudes towards learning and school. In both 2017 and 2022, students showed a positive attitude towards school, highlighting that it will help them get a good job later in life, help to increase their knowledge and is good for the brain. Additionally, the students reported that learning new things in school is fun. However, compared to 2017, the 2022 study saw an increase in students reporting school as boring, wishing that they did not have to go to school at all and hated doing homework. Nonetheless, students enjoyed school and saw it as a place that would help their development and growth.

Table 68: Primary Students' Attitudes Towards School and Learning

Statement	2017 (N=370)					2022 (N=154)				
	Responses (%)					Responses (%)				
	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	No Response	Total	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	No Response	Total
Going to school will help me get a good job when I am older.	94.1	.5	3.8	1.6	100	92.9	1.3	4.5	1.3	100.0
School is fun.	80.0	7.8	6.6	5.9	100	74.0	13.0	10.4	2.6	100.0
I wish we didn't have to go to school at all.	8.8	82.4	8.4	4.9	100	14.9	69.5	11.7	3.9	100.0
I would rather stay at home than go to school.	10.2	81.9	7.9	4.6	100	15.6	64.3	15.6	4.5	100.0
I would rather go to the doctor or dentist than go to school.	12.2	74.3	8.4	94.9	100	11.7	73.4	11.7	3.2	100.0
Learning new things at school is fun.	86.8	3.8	2.4	93.0	100	84.4	5.2	7.8	2.6	100.0
In school all we ever do is work, work, work.	38.7	54.9	6.4	3.5	100	49.4	38.3	9.1	3.2	100.0
School will help me know many things.	94.6	1.6	.8	3.0	100	90.3	3.9	4.5	1.3	100.0
School will help me think better.	89.7	2.4	2.4	5.4	100	87.7	2.6	7.1	2.6	100.0
School will get me prepared for the future.	82.2	6.5	5.1	6.2	100	81.8	4.5	10.4	3.2	100.0
School is boring.	8.9	76.5	7.3	7.3	100	15.6	68.2	12.3	3.9	100.0
I don't like school.	10.5	77.0	6.2	6.2	100	11.7	70.1	11.7	6.5	100.0
I like to do schoolwork.	69.2	19.5	5.7	5.7	100	64.3	22.1	9.7	3.9	100.0
I will never use what I learn at school.	14.6	68.9	7.6	8.9	100	10.4	75.3	7.8	6.5	100.0
School is like a prison.	19.7	68.4	10.4	6.8	100	20.1	62.3	11.0	6.5	100.0
I would rather be at school than playing video games	64.1	26.4	9.5	5,9	100	53.2	27.3	16.2	3.2	100.0
I hate to do schoolwork.	10.8	74.1	5.7	9.5	100	15.6	69.5	10.4	4.5	100.0
I would rather be at school than at home watching TV.	62.7	23.2	8.1	59	100	58.4	26.6	10.4	4.5	100.0
I don't need school to get a job.	12.4	73.8	6.8	7.0	100	18.2	70.1	8.4	3.2	100.0
I like all the different things we do at school.	86.2	5.7	3.8	4.3	100	77.3	12.3	6.5	3.9	100.0
What I learn at school is good for my brain.	92.4	3.0	1.1	3.5	100	89.6	5.2	4.5	.6	100.0
School is important for everyone.	86.2	5.7	1.1	7.0	100	87.7	6.5	5.2	.6	100.0
I would rather be at home alone than at school.	7.0	80.0	9.2	3.8	100	19.5	68.2	9.7	2.6	100.00

Primary Students' Perception of the School Environment

One of the research objectives is to understand students' perceptions of their school environment. To achieve this, primary school students were administered a 29-item School Climate Survey-Student Version ESAI-E-S3. This instrument comprises stems for 29 statements, each offering three options for completion. Students read each stem and select the option that best reflects their perception of the school. Typically, student responses within a school are aggregated, providing a measure of the school climate from the student's viewpoint. The presented findings summarise the percentage of students selecting each option for each item in Table 69, offering an overview of the proportions of primary school students' responses. Some students circled more than one response, and these are shown as option "d" in the table below.

Table 69: Primary Students' Responses on School Climate Survey

Statement	2017 (N=370)	2022 (N=154)
	Responses (%)	Responses (%)
1) From what I can tell, this school is		
a) A great place for people to visit.	72.4	72.1
b) An okay place for people to visit.	22.4	23.4
c) Not a place people want to visit.	3.8	4.5
2) In my experience, at this school		
a) Everything works, or gets fixed quickly.	38.4	42.2
b) A few things are broken, but mostly things here work.	52.8	48.1
c) A lot of things are broken.	7.0	9.1
3) When I look around at this school I see		
a) Lots of colour and kids' work is up everywhere.	51.6	50.0
b) Some colour and kids' work is up in some places.	32.7	37.0
c) Mostly blank walls.	13.2	13.0
4) Most of the students at this school		
a) Help the teachers and other kids make the school clean and nice to look at.	49.7	42.2
b) Keep the school clean because we would get in trouble if we did not.	34.1	31.2
c) Don't keep the school pretty and clean even when teachers tell us to.	14.3	26.0
d) Ambivalent (multiple responses chosen)	0	.6
5) My teacher spends time with other teachers		
a) Planning, talking and teaching together often.	57.3	51.9
b) Talking mostly at recess or school events.	24.9	26.6
c) Only at lunch or not at all.	15.7	21.4
6) When I am at school, I feel like		
a) The teachers, classmates, and I are like a family.	61.4	63.6
b) I am part of a good school, but not really a family.	28.6	27.9
c) No one cares about me at this school.	8.1	8.4

7) At this school		
a) Students all get along no matter what they look like or where they are from.	40.8	31.8
b) Students who are alike or friends get along.	29.7	31.8
c) A lot of students don't get along.	27.8	36.4
8) The popular students at this school		
a) Are nice to the other students.	42.4	28.6
b) Are nice to the other popular students.	15.7	16.2
c) Think they are better and are often mean to others.	39.5	53.9
9) In my class		
a) We make a lot of the decisions along with the teacher.	28.4	31.8
b) The teacher lets us choose sometimes.	48.1	40.3
c) The teacher makes all the decisions.	20.3	26.6
10) In my class		
a) There are lots of classroom jobs, and we all take turns doing them.	44.6	32.5
b) There are a few jobs for students in the class.	36.5	44.8
c) Students only do classroom jobs because they have to, or have gotten in trouble.	16.8	22.1
11) School events such as games, plays, performances, meetings, or conferences are attended by		
a) Lots of people.	46.5	53.2
b) Some people who care about that event.	38.4	33.8
c) Not many people.	12.4	13.0
12) At this school, I feel safe		
a) Everywhere in the school.	54.1	47.4
b) Only in my classroom.	25.4	25.3
c) Some days and not other days.	18.9	26.6
13) At this school		
a) Many students are in leadership roles in and out of class.	34.6	24.0
b) A few students are picked by the teachers to be leaders.	43.5	46.1
c) There are few or no students in leadership roles.	19.7	29.2
14) At this school		
a) The students and teachers from different classrooms work together on many projects.	34.1	28.6
b) The students work together on projects in their class.	51.4	56.5
c) Students do not work together on projects.	12.7	14.3
15) In my class, the rules		
a) Are clear and help the kids get along.	34.1	34.4
b) Are clear and keep the kids from misbehaving.	51.4	33.8
c) Are not clear and the kids are afraid of doing something to make the teacher angry.	12.7	31.2
d) Ambivalent (multiple responses chosen)	0	.6
16) When students break rules		
a) The teacher gives them a fair consequence and helps them understand why.	43.5	53.9
b) The teacher gives consequences sometimes.	42.2	22.1
c) The teacher gets upset at the students publicly.	13.0	24.0
17) In my judgment, I would say that		
a) I am learning to be more responsible every day because of my teacher.	38.9	59.7

b) I am learning to do what the teacher wants.	27.3	21.4
c) I feel like if I did what I wanted to do, I would get in trouble.	32.2	18.2
18) I would say that		
a) I can see clear evidence that my teacher respects and cares about me.	59.5	40.9
b) When I show my teacher respect, he/she shows me respect.	26.2	35.1
c) I try to respect my teacher, but sometimes I feel like I am not respected.	11.9	24.0
d) Ambivalent (multiple responses chosen)	0	0
e) No response	0	0
19) In my class		
a) Things run smoothly because the teacher makes things very clear.	40.3	40.9
b) Things run pretty well because the teacher has a lot of control.	40.0	26.0
c) A lot of the time things do not run smoothly.	17.8	32.5
20) When it comes to grades and assignments		
a) What it takes to get a good grade is very clear to me.	46.2	48.1
b) Most of the time I understand what is expected.	28.1	27.9
c) Often, I am confused as to why I get the grades I do.	23.0	24.0
21) What is important in my class is		
a) How much we try and the effort we put into our work.	57.6	56.5
b) Getting right answers and good grades.	28.6	25.3
c) Doing what makes the teacher happy.	11.6	18.2
22) I would describe the work in my class as		
a) Active, hands-on and interesting.	46.8	48.7
b) Interesting but mostly out of the book.	29.7	29.9
c) Mostly worksheets and the teacher talking.	21.4	21.4
23) The work in my class		
a) Makes me think and challenges me.	47.8	61.0
b) Is mostly about remembering what the teacher or textbook says	32.2	26.6
c) Is mostly about keeping us all busy	17.0	11.0
d) Ambivalent (multiple responses chosen)	0	.6
24) At this school when a student uses mean language		
a) Other students point out to them that it is not right.	51.6	43.5
b) Sometimes they get in trouble from an adult.	34.9	44.2
c) Usually nothing happens to them, so they keep doing it.	10.5	12.3
25) At this school		
a) I trust and can talk to most of the adults.	44.6	43.5
b) There are one or two adults that I can trust to talk to, but not many.	42.2	44.8
c) I do not feel like I can be honest with the adults at the school.	10.5	11.7
26) On the playground		
a) We have peer mediators and/or "Peacemakers" that help the students solve their own problems.	49.2	37.7
b) We have peer mediators and/or "Peacemakers," but they mostly just get kids in trouble.	35.4	17.5
c) There are only adults to supervise.	13.2	42.2
27) The best way to describe how I feel about this school is		
a) I am very proud to be a student here.	44.9	51.9
b) I like this school.	20.0	29.2

c) This school is okay, but I would rather be at another school.	31.6	18.2
28) My parents		
a) Feel welcome to come to the school.	50.0	44.8
b) Mostly just come to school for events that are expected such as parent-teacher conferences.	34.6	37.7
c) Don't come to the school very often.	12.7	17.5
29) At this school		
a) We have lots of guests, visitors, and volunteers.	48.4	41.6
b) We have a few guests, visitors and volunteers.	28.9	40.3
c) There are not many guests, visitors or volunteers.	20.3	18.2.

Summary

Students' perceptions on school varied. From both years the students highlighted that the school culture is friendly allowing for visitors and guests. However, a decline is noted in parents feeling welcomed at schools. There has been a decrease in the number of broken or unfixed items around the school, and students are seeing more of their work displayed around the school. The students reported that teachers are helpful, and an increase is noted in students feeling as though they are part of a family. The results show that the students are learning to be more responsible because of their teachers. Despite this, more students in 2022 report that there are only one or two adults they trust and can talk to at school.

There has been a decline in the friendliness of the students towards each other, where a significant drop from 2017 –2022 was noted in students being nice despite their backgrounds and being nice generally. The students appreciate that there are rules in class, with an increase in teachers helping them understand why there are consequences for their actions. The consensus from students is that the majority like school, with an increase in the students feeling a sense of pride in being a part of the school.

Secondary Students' Attitudes Towards School and Learning

Secondary students were also presented with statements about school and learning and were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with each statement. They were allowed to indicate that they did not know if they agreed or disagreed. The frequency of secondary student responses to each statement is presented in Table 70.

Table 70: Secondary Students' Attitudes Towards School and Learning

Statement	2017 (N=535)					2022 (N=311)				
	Responses (%)					Responses (%)				
	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	No Response	Total	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	No Response	Total
Going to school will help me get a good job when I am older.	**92.7**	1.3	3.9	2.1	100.0	85.5	3.9	6.8	3.9	100.0
School is fun.	**62.1**	21.3	13.8	2.3	100	47.3	29.3	19.9	3.5	100.0
I wish we didn't have to go to school at all.	19.8	**66.5**	11.0	2.6	100.0	19.6	59.8	17.4	3.2	100.0
I would rather stay at home than go to school.	16.8	**66.9**	12.1	4.1	100.0	23.5	57.9	14.8	3.9	100.0
I would rather go to the doctor or dentist than go to school.	9.3	**78.1**	8.8	3.7	100.0	14.8	67.8	13.5	3.9	100.0
Learning new things at school is fun.	**84.9**	3.2	8.8	3.2	100.0	77.8	6.4	11.9	3.9	100.0
In school all we ever do is work, work, work.	**60.2**	32.9	4.1	2.8	100.0	59.8	30.9	5.5	3.9	100.0
School will help me know many things.	**90.8**	3.4	3.6	2.2	100.0	87.1	4.2	6.1	2.6	100.0
School will help me think better.	**78.9**	7.9	10.1	3.2	100.0	71.1	10.0	16.4	2.6	100.0
School will get me prepared for the future.	**92.0**	2.6	3.6	1.9	100.0	82.0	6.4	8.7	2.9	100.0
School is boring.	**25.6**	51.2	19.6	3.6	100.0	31.8	39.2	25.1	3.9	100.0
I don't like school.	16.6	**65.6**	13.6	4.1	100.0	22.2	53.7	20.6	3.5	100.0
I like to do schoolwork.	52.5	**28.6**	15.9	3.0	100.0	37.6	34.7	23.5	4.2	100.0
I will never use what I learn at school.	7.9	**78.9**	9.7	3.6	100.0	11.3	72.0	13.5	3.2	100.0
School is like a prison.	**45.8**	36.3	13.8	4.1	100.0	43.7	38.6	13.2	4.5	100.0
I would rather be at school than playing video games	53.8	**32.9**	10.8	4.3	100.0	42.4	37.9	16.4	3.2	100.0
I hate to do schoolwork.	17.8	**64.1**	13.8	4.3	100.0	27.3	48.9	19.6	4.2	100.0
I would rather be at school than at home watching TV.	53.8	**32.9**	10.8	2.4	100.0	41.8	38.9	15.1	4.2	100.0
I don't need school to get a job.	10.7	**78.1**	8.4	2.8	100.0	18.0	65.6	12.2	4.2	100.0
I like all the different things we do at school.	**75.3**	11.2	10.7	2.8	100.0	65.3	13.8	17.4	3.5	100.0
What I learn at school is good for my brain.	**88.4**	3.2	6.5	1.9	100.0	79.7	7.4	9.0	3.9	100.0
School is important for everyone.	**86.2**	4.5	6.7	2.6	100.0	79.1	9.0	8.7	3.2	100.0
I would rather be at home alone than at school.	18.5	**68.4**	10.5	2.6	100.0	29.6	50.2	17.0	3.2	100.0

Secondary Students' Perception of the School Environment

One of the research objectives is to understand students' perceptions of their school environment. Secondary school students were administered a 29-item School Climate Survey-Student Version ESAI-E-S3 to achieve this. This instrument comprises stems for 29 statements, each offering three options for completion. Students read each stem and select the option that best reflects their perception of the school. Typically, student responses within a school are aggregated, providing a measure of the school climate from the student's viewpoint. In the presented findings, the percentage of students selecting each option for each item is summarised in Table 71, offering an overview of the proportions of Secondary school students' responses. Some students circled more than one response, and these are shown as option "d" in the table below.

Table 71: Secondary Students' Responses on School Climate Survey

Statement	2017 (N=535) Responses (%)	2022 (N=311) Responses (%)
1) From what I can tell, this school is		
a) A great place for people to visit.	35.1	26.7
b) An okay place for people to visit.	43.4	53.7
c) Not a place people want to visit.	17.9	13.2
2) In my experience, at this school		
a) Everything works or gets fixed quickly.	16.6	17.4
b) A few things are broken, but mostly things here work.	55.5	59.8
c) A lot of things are broken.	23.6	16.4
3) When I look around at this school I see		
a) Lots of colour and kids' work is up everywhere.	30.8	23.5
b) Some colour and kids' work is up in some places.	35.1	35.0
c) Mostly blank walls.	28.8	35.0
4) Most of the students at this school		
a) Help the teachers and other kids make the school clean and nice to look at.	19.8	14.1
b) Keep the school clean because we would get in trouble if we did not.	25.6	26.0
c) Don't keep the school pretty and clean even when teachers tell us to.	49.7	52.1
d) Ambivalent (multiple responses chosen)	0	0.6
5) My teacher spends time with other teachers		
a) Planning, talking and teaching together often.	36.6	46.0
b) Talking mostly at recess or school events.	40.0	32.2
c) Only at lunch or not at all.	15.9	13.2
6) When I am at school, I feel like		
a) The teachers, classmates, and I are like a family.	32.5	30.9
b) I am part of a good school, but not really a family.	49.9	46.0
c) No one cares about me at this school.	13.1	15.4

7) At this school		
a) Students all get along no matter what they look like or where they are from.	16.4	15.8
b) Students who are alike or friends get along.	33.5	35.0
c) A lot of students don't get along.	46.0	42.8
8) The popular students at this school		
a) Are nice to the other students.	20.2	20.6
b) Are nice to the other popular students.	16.4	15.4
c) Think they are better and are often mean to others.	60.2	55.9
9) In my class		
a) We make a lot of the decisions along with the teacher.	29.9	34.1
b) The teacher lets us choose sometimes.	47.3	46.6
c) The teacher makes all the decisions.	19.4	12.2
10) In my class		
a) There are lots of classroom jobs and we all take turns doing them.	18.9	16.1
b) There are a few jobs for students in the class.	26.5	38.3
c) Students only do classroom jobs because they have to or have gotten in trouble.	50.7	36.7
11) School events such as games, plays, performances, meetings, or conferences are attended by		
a) Lots of people.	35.9	39.5
b) Some people who care about that event.	50.3	40.8
c) Not many people.	11.0	12.2
12) At this school, I feel safe		
a) Everywhere in the school.	39.4	31.5
b) Only in my classroom.	21.9	23.2
c) Some days and not other days.	35.5	37.3
13) At this school		
a) Many students are in leadership roles in and out of class.	25.8	17.7
b) A few students are picked by the teachers to be leaders.	51.8	54.7
c) There are few or no students in leadership roles.	19.6	20.3
14) At this school		
a) The students and teachers from different classrooms work together on many projects.	20.2	18.3
b) The students work together on projects in their class.	60.0	64.3
c) Students do not work together on projects.	16.1	9.0
15) In my class, the rules		
a) Are clear and help the kids get along.	26.5	24.4
b) Are clear and keep the kids from misbehaving.	41.1	44.7
c) Are not clear and the kids are afraid of doing something to make the teacher angry.	27.5	19.9
16) When students break rules		
a) The teacher gives them a fair consequence and helps them understand why.	39.4	42.8
b) The teacher gives consequences sometimes.	34.0	29.9
c) The teacher gets upset at the students publicly.	22.1	15.8
17) In my judgment, I would say that		
a) I am learning to be more responsible every day because of my teacher.	52.7	49.5
b) I am learning to do what the teacher wants.	16.6	15.4

c) I feel like if I did what I wanted to do, I would get in trouble.	22.1	23.2
18) I would say that		
a) I can see clear evidence that my teacher respects and cares about me.	32.5	34.7
b) When I show my teacher respect, he/she shows me respect.	42.4	35.0
c) I try to respect my teacher, but sometimes I feel like I am not respected.	19.3	19.3
19) In my class		
a) Things run smoothly because the teacher makes things very clear.	26.0	24.8
b) Things run pretty well because the teacher has a lot of control.	29.9	29.9
c) A lot of the time things do not run smoothly.	38.9	34.1
20) When it comes to grades and assignments		
a) What it takes to get a good grade is very clear to me.	43.4	41.2
b) Most of the time I understand what is expected.	29.9	34.4
c) Often, I am confused as to why I get the grades I do.	21.7	13.8
21) What is important in my class is		
a) How much we try and the effort we put into our work.	46.0	47.9
b) Getting right answers and good grades.	40.7	34.4
c) Doing what makes the teacher happy.	8.6	7.1
22) I would describe the work in my class as		
a) Active, hands-on and interesting.	37.6	31.8
b) Interesting but mostly out of the book.	33.8	35.0
c) Mostly worksheets and the teacher talking.	23.0	22.5
23) The work in my class		
a) Makes me think and challenges me.	51.8	42.8
b) Is mostly about remembering what the teacher or textbook says	30.3	35.7
c) Is mostly about keeping us all busy	13.1	11.3
24) At this school when a student uses mean language		
a) Other students point out to them that it is not right.	22.6	22.5
b) Sometimes they get in trouble from an adult.	41.5	41.2
c) Usually nothing happens to them, so they keep doing it.	30.1	26.0
25) At this school		
a) I trust and can talk to most of the adults.	25.2	19.3
b) There are one or two adults that I can trust to talk to, but not many.	41.5	43.1
c) I do not feel like I can be honest with the adults at the school.	27.7	25.7
26) On the playground		
a) We have peer mediators and/or “Peacemakers” that help the students solve their own problems.	37.9	27.7
b) We have peer mediators and/or “Peacemakers,” but they mostly just get kids in trouble.	20.7	19.0
c) There are only adults to supervise.	31.6	34.7
27) The best way to describe how I feel about this school is		
a) I am very proud to be a student here.	46.7	28.0
b) I like this school.	25.6	33.1
c) This school is okay, but I would rather be at another school.	22.2	28.0
28) My parents		
a) Feel welcome to come to the school.	32.1	21.5

b) Mostly just come to school for events that are expected such as parent-teacher conferences.	39.1	44.4
c) Don't come to the school very often.	23.4	23.5
29) At this school		
a) We have lots of guests, visitors, and volunteers.	31.0	23.8
b) We have a few guests, visitors and volunteers.	38.9	41.2
c) There are not many guests, visitors or volunteers.	24.3	24.8

Summary

These responses were based on students' perceptions of their school environment. This survey recorded consistencies for 2017 and 2022. There was a notable difference between 2017 and 2022 for the aspect of 'My teacher spends time with other teachers Planning, talking and teaching together often'; in 2017, 36.6% of students indicated that teachers spend more time with teachers, but in 2022, 46% indicated the same which shows an increase from 2017. Additionally, in 2017, 40% of students stated that teachers spend time with other teachers talking mostly at recess and school events, while in 2022, there was a decrease, with 32% of students indicating such. Also, there was a consistent percentage in 2017 and 2022 regarding the popular students at the school. In 2017, 60.2% of students thought they were better and were often mean to others; in 2022, 55.9% recorded the same.

In 2017, 19.4% of students indicated that the teacher makes all the decisions, while in 2022, 12.2% indicated that the teacher makes all the decisions—a notable decrease from 2017. Additionally, in 2017, 26.5% of the students indicated that there are a few jobs for students in the class, while in 2022, 38.3% indicated the same. In 2017, 50.7% of the students indicated that they only do classroom jobs because they have to or have gotten into trouble; in 2022, 36.7% indicated the same. In 2017, 50.3% of students indicated that only some people care about school events; in 2022, 40.8% indicated such. In 2017, 39.4% of students indicated that they felt safe at school, while in 2022, 31.5% indicated such.

In 2017, 16.1% of students indicated that they do not work on projects together, while in 2022, 9% indicated that students do not work on projects together. In 2017, 27.5% of students indicated that the rules were unclear in their class, and the students were afraid of doing something to anger the teacher. While in 2022, 19.9% of students indicated such. In 2017, 22.1% of the students indicated that when students break the rules, the teacher gets upset at the students publicly, while in 2022,

15.8% indicated the same. In 2017, 42.4% of students indicated that when the student shows respect to the teacher, the teacher shows the student respect. While in 2022, 35% indicated this.

In 2017, 21.7% of students indicated that when it comes to grades and assignments, they are confused as to why they get the grades they do, while in 2022, 13.8% indicated such. In 2017, 40.7% of students indicated that getting correct answers and good grades is important in their class. While in 2022, 34.4% stated the same. In 2017, 51.8% of students indicated that the work makes them think and challenges them; in 2022, 42.8% indicated such.

In 2017, 37.9% of students indicated that they have peer mediators and/or "Peacemakers" that help the students solve their own problems. While in 2022, 27.7% of students indicated such. In 2017, 46.7% of students indicated they were very proud to be a student at their school, while in 2022, 28% indicated the same. In 2017, 25.6% of students liked their school, while 33.1% indicated this in 2022. In 2017, 32.1% of students indicated that their parents felt welcome to come to the school, while in 2022, 21.5% of students stated this.

Teachers' Classroom Practices

One section of the questionnaire focused on teachers' classroom practices, particularly technology integration. Additionally, given the current emphasis on student-sensitive practices that foster engagement and embody democratic principles, teachers were also asked about their student's involvement in activities that align with these ideals and their use of democratic teaching practices.

Primary Teachers' Classroom Practices

Primary Teachers' Frequency of Using Technology for Various Purposes

The questionnaire included a list of activities where technology might be utilised in teaching and learning. Teachers were asked to reflect on their practices over the past academic year and indicate how often they use technology for these purposes. The percentages of the teachers in the sample reporting the frequency of use of technology for each activity are presented in Table 72.

There has been a general increase in 2022 from 2017 regarding the use of technology by teachers. Some of the ways that teachers have utilised this medium more include helping to plan lessons, assisting with grading and dispersing information to students.

Teachers were provided with a list of factors that impact the frequency of technology use in teaching and learning. They were asked to specify how each factor influenced their use of technology in their practice. Table 73 presents the percentages of teachers in the sample who reported various levels of influence for each factor.

There is a general increase from 2017-2022 regarding factors affecting the use of technology in the classrooms. These include difficulty with internet access, lack of administrative support and lack of reliable computers.

Student Engagement and the Use of Democratic Teaching Practices in the Primary Classroom

Student-centred instruction is indicated by the extent to which teachers use activities that involve high levels of student engagement. Teachers were given a list of activities, including traditional methods, those aligned with democratic principles, and student-centred approaches. They were asked to report the frequency with which students participated in these activities during the term. Tables 74 and 75 show the percentages of teachers who reported various frequencies of student engagement in these activities and the percentage of teachers using democratic teaching practices, respectively.

Summary

From the 2022 results, teachers have increased their use of technology in the classroom to allow students to access lessons online. With this, primary teachers are utilising the internet more to assist with information for their classes and engaging students more in online forums and chats. Additionally, primary teachers are finding technology more useful to assist with tests and homework preparations for their students, with most primary teachers using technology for grading purposes. Despite the increase in these areas, the data shows that from 2017-2022, primary teachers have not been using software to teach concepts or skilled games to enforce concepts. Digital devices, for example, cameras, are not being used, and an increase in 2022 shows that most teachers never use them in the classroom. Teachers reported that there are factors that hinder the use of technology in the classrooms. Most teachers from both years report that they have the knowledge to integrate technology to enhance the curriculum and are equipped with the necessary computer skills. The data from 2022 shows that there is an increase in the unavailability of computers and lack of proper internet access, which hinders teachers from utilising technology in

their lessons. Students would often engage in the lessons through group work and hands-on activities in class. Allowing the students to lead discussions, do research work over the internet, and share ideas with peers has increased over time. However, there has been a decrease from 2017-2022 in whole classroom discussions. Journals have not been utilised within the classroom by students from both years. Over the years, teachers have used didactic questions in their lessons, along with collaborative learning and play. Teachers have reported increased role-play, demonstrations and peer assessment activities in their practices. However, teachers do not encourage debates and allow students to explain phenomena scientifically. The use of physical restraint for student misconduct has increased by teachers since 2017. Additionally, teachers have increased threats of sending children out of class, calling parents, and sending notes about students' behaviour.

Table 72: Primary Teachers' Frequency of Use of Technology for Specific Purposes

Purpose of using Technology:	2017 (N=55)						2022 (N=98)					
	Frequency of Use over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Use over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL
Access lessons from the internet	20.0	9.1	18.2	18.2	34.5	100	27.6	34.7	16.3	15.3	6.1	100
Create instructional materials	32.8	18.2	9.1	0.0	34.5	100	46.0	40.8	6.1	3.1	3.1	100
Design multimedia presentations (e.g. PowerPoint)	29.1	14.5	14.5	0.0	34.5	100	16.3	35.7	31.6	12.2	4.1	100
Engage students in online discussion (e.g., blogs, chat rooms, social networking sites	0.0	1.8	1.8	61.8	34.5	100	8.2	9.2	21.4	56.1	5.1	100
Formulate tests for students.	27.3	29.1	7.3	1.8	34.5	100	57.1	20.4	8.2	10.2	4.1	100
Get information from the Internet for use in lessons	47.3	16.4	1.8	0.0	34.5	100	76.5	16.3	2.0	1.0	4.1	100
Have students use the internet for researching subject content	9.1	16.4	23.6	16.4	34.5	100	24.5	30.6	28.6	11.2	5.1	100
Post homework assignments online	1.8	1.8	0.0	61.8	34.5	100	22.4	21.4	27.6	24.5	4.1	100
Prepare homework assignments	16.4	25.5	10.9	12.7	34.5	100	41.8	26.5	21.4	6.1	4.1	100
Produce handouts for students	**25.5**	21.8	10.9	7.3	34.5	100	29.6	32.7	18.4	16.0	4.1	100
Record student grades	27.3	10.9	16.4	10.9	34.5	100	55.1	14.3	13.3	12.2	5.1	100
Send lesson information, assignments and other communication to students by email	1.8	0.0	0.0	63.6	34.5	100	11.2	10.2	22.4	53.1	3.1	100
Share material, ideas and/or information with other teachers	16.4	18.2	27.3	3.6	34.5	100	26.5	44.9	15.3	9.2	4.1	100
Use digital cameras to enhance lessons	1.8	9.1	12.7	41.8	34.5	100	10.2	13.3	18.4	54.1	4.1	100
Use LCD projectors to present lessons	21.8	18.2	14.5	10.9	34.5	100	23.5	25.5	19.4	27.6	4.1	100
Use scanners to prepare for lessons	9.1	16.4	12.7	27.3	34.5	100	8.2	19.4	23.5	44.9	4.1	100
Use skill games to reinforce concepts taught	12.7	21.8	27.3	3.6	34.5	100	25.5	42.9	13.3	14.3	4.1	100
Use software for remediation of basic skills	3.6	14.5	20.0	27.3	34.5	100	16.3	20.4	32.7	23.5	7.1	100
Use software to teach concepts	10.9	21.8	14.5	18.2	34.5	100	18.4	33.3	25.5	19.4	5.1	100
Use videos or DVS to teach concepts	25.5	23.6	10.9	5.5	34.5	100	51.0	20.4	13.3	11.2	4.1	100

Table 73: Factors Affecting the Use of Technology by Primary Teachers

Purpose of using Technology:	2017 (N=55)						2022 (N=98)					
	Extent of Influence (% of sample)						Extent of Influence (% of sample)					
	To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	A Little Bit	Not At All	No Response	TOTAL	To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	A Little Bit	Not At All	No Response	TOTAL
Not enough computers available	34.5	7.3	12.7	10.9	34.5	100	50.0	9.2	12.2	21.4	7.1	100
Unreliable computers	34.5	7.3	12.7	10.9	34.5	100	37.8	15.3	16.3	20.4	10.2	100
Internet not easily accessible	7.3	16.4	21.8	20.0	34.5	100	13.3	30.6	20.4	29.6	6.1	100
Lack of good instructional software	23.6	7.3	29.1	5.5	34.5	100	20.4	24.5	23.5	20.4	11.2	100
Inadequate training opportunities	16.4	16.4	20.0	12.7	34.5	100	13.3	24.5	27.6	21.4	13.3	100
Lack of administrative support	5.5	12.7	16.4	30.9	100	100	10.2	23.5	25.5	28.6	12.2	100
Lack of support regarding ways to integrate technology into the curriculum	9.1	18.2	14.5	23.6	100	100	8.2	28.6	15.3	35.7	12.2	100
Lack of technical support or advice	14.5	16.4	21.8	19.4	34.5	100	8.2	22.4	24.5	32.7	12.2	100
Lack of relevant computer skills	5.5	7.3	16.4	36.4	34.5	100	5.1	12.2	24.5	45.9	12.2	100
Inadequate amount of computer peripherals	18.2	25.5	14.5	7.3	34.5	100	25.5	20.4	20.4	20.4	13.3	100
Lack of knowledge in ways to integrate technology to enhance the curriculum	0.0	18.2	21.8	25.5	34.5	100	5.1	11.2	29.6	42.9	11.2	100
Use of technology not integrated into curriculum documents	9.1	12.7	23.6	20.0	34.5	100	12.2	19.4	25.5	30.6	12.2	100

Table 74: Primary Teachers' Reported Student Engagement in Activities

Activity:	2017 (N=55)						2022 (N=98)					
	Frequency of Engagement (%)						Frequency of Engagement (%)					
	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL
Worked on projects that took a week or longer	7.3	14.5	32.7	10.9	34.5	100	6.1	27.6	35.7	22.4	8.2	100
Worked in small groups to come up with solutions or approaches to problems.	10.9	25.5	23.6	5.5	34.5	100	21.4	41.8	19.4	9.2	8.2	100
Engaged in a writing activity in which they were expected to explain their thinking or reasoning at some length	10.9	23.6	16.4	14.5	34.5	100	21.4	36.7	22.4	11.2	8.2	100
Suggested or helped plan classroom activities	5.5	18,2	25.5	16.4	34.5	100	14.3	25.5	30.6	22.4	7.1	100
Worked individually answering questions in textbooks or worksheets	54.5	5.5	5.5	0.0	34.5	100	71.4	11.2	5.1	4.1	8.2	100
Led discussions	9.1	29.1	18.2	9.1	34.5	100	16.3	39.8	17.3	15.3	11.2	100
Gave presentations	10.9	21.8	27.3	5.5	34.5	100	16.3	34.7	22.4	18.4	8.2	100
Worked in small groups to complete an assignment	12.7	32.7	18.2	1.8	34.5	100	23.5	33.7	26.5	8.2	8.2	100
Worked on their own assignment at their own desks.	47.3	9.1	7.3	1.8	34.5	100	68.4	14.3	6.1	3.1	8.2	100
Wrote in a journal	9.1	14.5	12.7	29.1	34.5	100	6.1	14.3	22.4	46.9	10.2	100
Participated in interactive/hands-on classroom activities	29.1	21.8	12.7	1.8	34.5	100	52.0	33.7	4.1	3.1	7.1	100
Conducted research for projects via the Internet	5.5	14.5	18.2	27.3	34.5	100	15.3	22.4	28.6	22.4	11.2	100
Worked on individual tasks for portfolios	23.6	14.5	10.9	16.4	34.5	100	23.5	13.3	26.5	27.6	9.2	100
Engaged in whole-class activities	60.0	3.6	0.0	1.8	34.6	100	82.7	9.2	0.0	1.0	7.1	100
Demonstrated their work to others (teachers/students)	32.7	16.4	12.7	3.6	34.5	100	44.9	34.7	10.2	3.1	7.1	100

Table 75: Primary Teachers' Reported Use of Democratic Instructional Practices

Practice:	2017 (N=55)					2022 (N=98)				
	Frequency of Use (%)					Frequency of Use (%)				
	Never Uses	Uses	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL	Never Uses	Uses	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL
Used didactic questions (Who? What? Where? When? How?)	0.0	61.8	3.6	34.5	100	1.0	88.7	2.0	8.2	100
Used demonstrations	0.0	64.5	0.0	34.5	100	1.0	90.8	0.0	8.2	100
Used guided methods (e.g. Guided reading)	1.8	61.8	1.8	34.5	100	2.0	86.9	3.1	8.2	100
Used shared methods (e.g. Shared writing)	1.8	61.9	1.8	34.5	100	4.1	80.6	3.1	12.2	100
Used journals	29.1	30.9	5.5	34.5	100	35.7	48.0	5.1	11.2	100
Used learning logs	27.3	25.5	12.7	34.5	100	34.7	44.9	6.1	14.3	100
Used research projects	14.5	43.7	7.3	34.5	100	19.4	65.3	3.1	12.2	100
Used learning centres	18.2	41.8	5.5	34.5	100	30.6	48.0	9.2	12,2	100
Used learning contracts	36.4	18.2	10.9	34.5	100	34.7	36.7	15.3	13.3	100
Used differentiated instruction	36.4	18.2	10.9	34.5	100	4.1	81.6	3.1	11.2	100
Used problem-solving approaches	0.0	63.7	1.8	34.5	100	7.1	76.5	6.1	10.2	100
Used case-based method	25.5	29.1	10.9	34.5	100	20.4	54.1	9.2	16.3	100
Used reflective discussions	3.6	52.7	9.1	34.5	100	5.1	77.6	0.0	17.3	100
Used simulations	12.7	47.3	5.5	34.5	100	12.2	65.2	5.1	17.3	100
Used field observation	7.3	54.6	3.6	34.5	100	14.3	68.3	2.0	15.3	100
Used role play	1.8	63.6	0.0	34.5	100	23.5	39.8	14.3	22.4	100
Used service learning	20.0	23.6	21.8	34.5	100	5.1	78.6	2.0	14.3	100
Used cooperative and collaborative learning	3.6	58.1	3.6	34.5	100	5.1	78.6	2.0	14.3	100
Used controversial discussions	10.9	43.6	3.6	34.5	100	14.3	64.3	6.1	15.3	100
Used debates	25.5	36.4	1.8	34.5	100	25.5	56.1	4.1	14.3	100
Used peer partner learning	7.3	58.2	0.0	34.5	100	6.1	83.0	0.0	10.2	100

Practice:	2017 (N=55)					2022 (N=98)				
	Frequency of Use (%)					Frequency of Use (%)				
	Never Uses	Uses	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL	Never Uses	Uses	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL
Told the students the objectives of an assessment activity	0.0	63.7	1.8	34.5	100	3.1	82.6	2.0	12.2	100
Allowed the students to rate their own work before you graded it	14.5	49.1	1.8	34.5	100	25.5	60.2	4.1	10.2	100
Allowed the students to engage in peer assessment activities	9.1	52.8	3.6	34.5	100	7.1	75.6	5.1	12.2	100
Taught students strategies for reading in your subject area	5.5	58.2	1.8	34.5	100	3.1	80.6	7.1	9.2	100
Gave time for reading books of own choice	3.6	60.0	1.8	34.5	100	3.1	79.6	7.1	10.2	100
Allowed choice of reading material	5.5	58.2	1.8	34.5	100	3.1	78.6	5.1	13.3	100
Provided support for struggling readers in your classroom	1.8	63.7	.0.0	34.5	100	0.0	86.8	4.1		100
Encouraged students to read for pleasure	1.8	61.8	1.8	34.5	100	0.0	88.7	2.0	9.2	100
Encouraged students to read for information	0.0	63.7	1.8	34.5	100	0.0	84.7	3.1	12.2	100
(Re)Wrote instructional materials to facilitate diverse reading ability in the classroom	7.3	56.4	1.8	34.5	100	7.1	70.5	7.1	15.3	100
Assigned grade- and ability-appropriate open-ended mathematics problems for students to solve	9.1	41.8	14.5	34.5	100	6.1	64.4	16.3	13.3	100
Encouraged students to talk about the mathematics that they are learning in the classroom	3.6	52.7	9.1	34.5	100	5.1	66.3	15.3	13.3	100
Led the students in grade and ability-appropriate investigations of mathematics concepts	12.7	41.9	10.9	34.5	100	7.1	59.2	15.3	18.4	100
Allowed students to submit mathematics projects and investigations using different modes	29.1	23.6	12.7	34.5	100	23.5	43.9	15.3	17.3	100
Allowed students to explain phenomena scientifically	16.4	27.3	21.8	34.5	100	23.5	37.7	20.4	18.4	100

Practice:	2017 (N=55)					2022 (N=98)				
	Frequency of Use (%)					Frequency of Use (%)				
	Never Uses	Uses	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL	Never Uses	Uses	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL
Allowed students to evaluate and design scientific enquiry	23.6	20.0	21.8	34.5	100	25.5	37.7	17.3	19.4	100
Allowed students to interpret data and evidence scientifically	12.7	38.2	14.5	34.5	100	13.3	53.0	16.3	17.3	100
Rewarded positive behaviours with incentives (e.g. stars, stickers)	0.0	65.5	0.0	34.5	100	3.1	80.6	1.0	15.3	100
Used physical restraint for misbehaving students	23.6	40.0	1.8	34.5	100	38.8	45.0	3.1	13.3	100
Threatened to send students out of the classroom if they do not behave	21.8	43.7	0.0	34.5	100	20.4	61.3	1.0	17.3	100
Sent home notes to parents about students' good behaviour	18.2	41.8	5.5	34.5	100	31.6	55.1	0.0	13.3	100
Called parents about students' misbehaviour	3.6	60.0	1.8	34.5	100	9.2	77.5	0.0	13.3	100
Worked with students to establish a code of classroom behaviour and consequences for infractions	1.8	61.8	1.8	34.5	100	3.1	82.6	1.0	13.3	100

Secondary Teachers' Classroom Practices

Secondary Teachers' Frequency of Using Technology for Various Purposes

The questionnaire included a list of activities where technology might be utilised in teaching and learning. Teachers were asked to reflect on their practices over the past academic year and indicate how often they use technology for these purposes. The percentages of the teachers in the sample reporting the frequency of use of technology for each activity are presented in Table 76.

Most of the teachers in 2017 indicated that students could access lessons from the Internet, while in 2022, most teachers reported that they seldom did this. Creating instructional materials was consistent throughout 2017 and 2022, with teachers reporting that they often did this. In 2017, teachers reported that they seldom designed multimedia presentations, while in 2022, teachers indicated that they sometimes and rarely designed them. In 2017 and 2022, teachers consistently reported never engaging students in online discussion through blogs, chat rooms, or social networking sites. Teachers indicated for 2017 and 2022 that they often formulated tests for students. Teachers in 2017 and 2022 indicated that they often get information from the internet for use in lessons. In 2017, most teachers indicated that the students used the internet to research subject content, while in 2022, teachers reported that they often and sometimes had the students use the internet to research subject content. Most teachers in 2017 indicated that they never posted homework online, while in 2022, teachers indicated that they seldom and sometimes posted homework assignments online. Teachers reported in 2017 and 2022 that they often prepared homework assignments. In 2017, teachers reported that they sometimes produced student handouts, while in 2022, teachers reported that they often and sometimes did this. Teachers in 2017 and 2022 consistently indicated that they often recorded student grades. Teachers in 2017 reported that they seldom and never sent lesson information, assignments and other communication to students by email, while in 2022, teachers reported that they sometimes, seldom and never did this. In 2017, teachers indicated that they sometimes and seldom shared materials, ideas and/or information with other teachers, while in 2022, most teachers indicated that they sometimes shared materials with other teachers. In 2017 and 2022, teachers reported never using digital cameras to enhance lessons. Teachers in 2017 reported the same percentages for often and never (17.2%) using LCD projectors, while teachers also indicated the same percentages for seldom and sometimes (18.3%) using an LCD projector. Most teachers in 2017 and 2022 indicated

they never used scanners to prepare for lessons. Teachers in 2017 reported the same percentages for sometimes and never (21.5%) using skilled games to reinforce concepts taught, while in 2022, most teachers indicated that they sometimes and seldom used skill games to reinforce concepts. The majority of teachers in 2017 indicated that they never used software for the remediation of basic skills, while in 2022, teachers consistently reported that they seldom and never (32.4%) used software for the remediation of basic skills. Most teachers reported in 2017 and 2022 that they never used software to teach concepts. Teachers in 2017 indicated that they sometimes and never used videos or DVDs to teach concepts, while in 2022, teachers reported that they sometimes used them to teach concepts.

Teachers were provided with a list of factors that impact the frequency of technology use in teaching and learning. They were asked to specify how each factor influenced their use of technology in their practice. Table 77 presents the percentages of teachers in the sample who reported various levels of influence for each factor.

Teachers in 2017 and 2022 indicated that not enough computers were available to a great and moderate extent. In 2017, teachers indicated that there are only a few unreliable computers, while in 2022, teachers reported that there are unreliable computers to a moderate and great extent and not at all unreliable. In 2017 and 2022, teachers indicated that internet is not easily accessible to a great extent. Teachers in 2017 indicated a moderate lack of good instructional software, while in 2022, teachers indicated that lack of good instructional software was only a little bit existent. In 2017 and 2022, teachers indicated that there were only a few inadequate training opportunities. Teachers in 2017 indicated a little bit of a lack of administrative support, while in 2022, teachers reported no lack. In 2017, teachers reported that there was no lack of support regarding ways to integrate technology into the curriculum, while in 2022, teachers indicated that there was little to none regarding the lack of support mentioned above. Teachers reported in 2017 and 2022 that there was a little lack of technical support or advice. In 2017 and 2022, teachers consistently indicated that there was not at all a lack of relevant computer skills. In 2017, the majority of the teachers stated that there was an inadequate amount of computer peripherals to a great extent, while in 2022, teachers indicated that there was a little bit of an insufficient amount of computer peripherals. Teachers in 2017 indicated the same percentages (28%) for a little bit and did not at all lack the knowledge to integrate technology to enhance the curriculum; in 2022, teachers indicated the same for the aforementioned. In 2017, teachers indicated that technology was not

integrated into the curriculum document to a moderate extent and not at all, while in 2022, teachers indicated that technology was not integrated a little bit or not at all.

Student Engagement and the Use of Democratic Teaching Practices in the Secondary Classroom

Student-centred instruction is indicated by the extent to which teachers use activities that involve high levels of student engagement. Teachers were given a list of activities, including traditional methods, those aligned with democratic principles, and student-centred approaches. They were asked to report the frequency with which students participated in these activities during the term. Tables 78 and 79 show the percentages of teachers who reported various frequencies of student engagement in these activities and the percentage of teachers using democratic teaching practices.

In 2017 and 2022, the data remained consistently high for the following student engagement activities. Teachers reported that they often had students work individually, answering questions in textbooks or worksheets, working on their own assignments at their own desks and engaging in whole-class activities. Suggested or helped plan classroom activities, making presentations and writing in journals consistently recorded the lowest percentages for student engagement activities. The data remained consistent for 2017 and 2022. There were no drastic increases or decreases in student engagement in the secondary classroom.

It should be noted that the use of democratic teaching practices in secondary schools had some statements that stood out in 2017 and 2022. Teachers overwhelmingly selected using didactic questions, demonstrations and guided methods, all with an increase of 20% in 2022. Teachers also convincingly selected using guided methods in 2017. Using cooperative and collective learning was also selected in 2017, with an increase of 10% in 2022. Telling students the objectives of an assessment activity was consistent for 2017 and 2022. Providing support for struggling readers in the classroom was overwhelmingly selected in 2017 and had an increase of 8% in 2022. Most teachers in 2017 selected that they encouraged students to read for pleasure, which increased by 13% in 2022. Most teachers in 2017 selected that they worked with students to establish a code of classroom behaviour and consequences for infractions, with a 14% increase in 2022.

Teachers in 2017 selected often for the following categories: used shared methods, used problem-solving approaches, used reflective discussions, used simulations, used peer partner learning, and taught students strategies for reading in your subject area.

Summary

Between 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers' frequent use of technology increased across all categories. In 2017, the highest use was for creating instructional materials, formulating tests for students, getting information from the internet for use in lessons and recording student grades, while the least used included engaging students in online discussions, posting homework assignments online, using digital cameras to enhance lessons and use software for remediation of basic skills.

In 2022, having students use the internet for researching subject content was commonly used. For secondary school teachers, administrative support, technical advice, or relevant computer skills did not influence technology use in both years. However, insufficient computers and limited internet access remain significant barriers. Unreliable computers, which greatly hindered technology use in 2017, moderately increased by 2022, while inadequate instructional software, peripherals, and training opportunities had minimal impact by 2022.

Overall, teachers selected several strategies for use in 2017 and 2022. However, in 2022, the number of strategies increased from the ones used in 2017.

Table 76: Secondary Teachers' Frequency of Use of Technology for Specific Purposes

Purpose of using Technology:	2017 (N=93)						2022 (N=105)					
	Frequency of Use over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Use over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL
Access lessons from the internet	22.6	20.4	12.9	**15.1**	29.0	100.0	20.0	15.2	**28.6**	23.8	12.4	100.0
Create instructional materials	**38.7**	24.7	6.5	1.1	29.0	100.0	**40.0**	38.1	10.5	0	11.4	100.0
Design multimedia presentations (e.g. PowerPoint)	18.3	**19.4**	22.6	10.8	29.0	100.0	22.9	**36.3**	25.7	6.7	13.3	100.0
Engage students in online discussion (e.g., blogs, chat rooms, social networking sites	7.5	8.6	14.0	**40.9**	29.0	100.0	8.6	26.7	21.0	**29.5**	14.3	100.0
Formulate tests for students.	**38.7**	16.1	5.4	10.8	29.0	100.0	**55.2**	21.9	9.5	2.9	10.5	100.0
Get information from the Internet for use in lessons	**47.3**	20.4	3.2	0	29.0	100.0	**60.0**	28.6	0	1.0	10.5	100.0
Have students use the internet for researching subject content	26.9	**32.3**	10.8	1.1	29.0	100.0	**35.2**	34.3	18.1	1.9	10.5	100.0
Post homework assignments online	7.5	9.7	14.0	**39.8**	29.0	100.0	9.5	**28.6**	**28.6**	21.9	11.4	100.0
Prepare homework assignments	**30.1**	22.6	12.9	5.4	29.0	100.0	**36.2**	33.3	13.3	5.7	11.4	100.0
Produce handouts for students	**24.7**	28.0	14.0	4.3	29.0	100	33.3	**34.3**	14.3	7.6	10.5	100.0
Record student grades	**44.1**	9.7	6.5	10.8	29.0	100.0	**56.2**	18.1	9.5	4.8	11.4	100.0
Send lesson information, assignments and other communication to students by email	15.1	16.1	20.4	**19.4**	29.0	100.0	17.1	21.0	22.9	**27.6**	11.4	100.0
Share material, ideas and/or information with other teachers	16.1	**22.6**	23.7	8.6	29.0	100.0	21.0	**39.0**	21.0	8.6	10.5	100.0
Use digital cameras to enhance lessons	1.1	5.4	10.8	**53.8**	29.0	100.0	1.9	6.7	18.1	**61.0**	12.4	100.0
Use LCD projectors to present lessons	17.2	18.3	18.3	**17.2**	29.0	100.0	17.1	**28.6**	16.2	27.6	10.5	100.0
Use scanners to prepare for lessons	6.5	17.2	16.1	**31.2**	29.0	100.0	7.6	24.8	21.9	**33.3**	12.4	100.0
Use skill games to reinforce concepts taught	8.6	**21.5**	19.4	21.5	29.0	100.0	12.4	**31.4**	23.8	20.0	12.4	100.0
Use software for remediation of basic skills	4.3	7.5	19.4	**39.8**	29.0	100.0	2.9	17.1	**32.4**	**32.4**	15.2	100.0
Use software to teach concepts	4.3	10.8	23.7	**32.3**	29.0	100.0	4.8	23.8	28.6	**31.4**	11.4	100.0
Use videos or DVDs to teach concepts	8.6	**22.6**	18.3	21.5	29.0	100.0	10.5	**33.3**	22.9	21.9	11.4	100.0

Table 77: Factors Affecting the Use of Technology by Secondary Teachers

Influence:	2017 (N=93)						2022 (N=105)					
	Extent of Influence (% of sample)						Extent of Influence (% of sample)					
	To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	A Little Bit	Not at All	No Response	TOTAL	To a Great Extent	To a Moderate Extent	A Little Bit	Not at All	No Response	TOTAL
Not enough computers available	**24.7**	20.4	15.1	10.8	29.0	100.0	**31.4**	25.7	20.0	15.2	7.6	100.0
Unreliable computers	**16.1**	11.8	28.0	15.1	29.0	100.0	25.7	**26.7**	16.2	22.9	8.6	100.0
Internet not easily accessible	**32.3**	18.3	19.4	1.1	29.0	100.0	**46.7**	24.8	15.2	4.8	8.6	100.0
Lack of good instructional software	17.2	**25.8**	17.2	10.8	29.0	100.0	15.2	23.8	**28.6**	18.1	14.3	100.0
Inadequate training opportunities	12.9	**18.3**	24.7	15.1	29.0	100.0	15.2	21.0	**28.6**	23.8	11.4	100.0
Lack of administrative support	8.6	15.1	25.8	**21.5**	29.0	100.0	5.7	17.1	29.5	**36.2**	11.4	100.0
Lack of support regarding ways to integrate technology into the curriculum	8.6	15.1	22.6	**24.7**	29.0	100.0	6.7	18.1	32.4	**33.3**	9.5	100.0
Lack of technical support or advice	9.7	15.1	24.7	**21.5**	29.0	100.0	7.6	24.8	**31.4**	26.7	9.5	100.0
Lack of relevant computer skills	2.2	6.5	28.0	**34.4**	29.0	100.0	9.5	17.1	28.6	**34.3**	10.5	100.0
Inadequate amount of computer peripherals	28.0	**11.8**	19.4	11.8	29.0	100.0	19.0	20.0	**29.5**	20.0	11.4	100.0
Lack of knowledge in ways to integrate technology to enhance the curriculum	3.2	11.8	28.0	**28.0**	29.0	100.0	3.8	19.0	32.4	**34.3**	10.5	100.0
Use of technology not integrated into curriculum documents	9.7	20.4	17.2	**23.7**	29.0	100.0	11.4	22.9	**27.6**	26.7	11.4	100.0

Table 78: Secondary Teachers' Reported Student Engagement in Activities

Activity:	2017 (N=93)						2022 (N=105)					
	Frequency of Engagement (%)						Frequency of Engagement (%)					
	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL	Often 8+times	Sometimes 3-7 times	Seldom 1-2 times	Never	No Response	TOTAL
Worked on projects that took a week or longer	3.2	**24.7**	36.6	6.5	29.0	100.0	6.7	32.4	**40.0**	7.6	13.3	100.0
Worked in small groups to come up with solutions or approaches to problems.	16.1	**30.1**	21.5	3.2	29.0	100.0	15.2	**40.0**	27.6	2.9	14.3	100.0
Engaged in a writing activity in which they were expected to explain their thinking or reasoning at some length	12.9	**34.4**	17.2	6.5	29.0	100.0	23.8	**34.3**	22.9	5.7	13.3	100.0
Suggested or helped plan classroom activities	3.2	22.6	**32.3**	12.9	29.0	100.0	11.4	24.8	**34.3**	18.1	11.4	100.0
Worked individually answering questions in textbooks or worksheets	**49.5**	14.0	7.5	0	29.0	100.0	**51.4**	25.7	9.5	1.0	12.4	100.0
Led discussions	14.0	**23.7**	24.7	8.6	29.0	100.0	16.2	**34.3**	31.4	4.8	13.3	100.0
Gave presentations	7.5	**28.0**	29.0	6.5	29.0	100.0	15.2	**36.2**	27.6	9.5	11.4	100.0
Worked in small groups to complete an assignment	17.2	**38.7**	14.0	1.1	29.0	100.0	25.7	**46.7**	15.2	1.0	11.4	100.0
Worked on their own assignment at their own desks.	**41.9**	19.4	9.7	0	29.0	100.0	**53.3**	22.9	7.6	3.8	12.4	100.0
Wrote in a journal	7.5	6.5	**15.1**	41.9	29.0	100.0	1.9	16.2	22.9	47.6	11.4	100.0
Participated in interactive/hands-on classroom activities	**20.4**	29.0	15.1	6.5	29.0	100.0	24.8	**42.9**	17.1	1.9	13.3	100.0
Conducted research for projects via the Internet	9.7	**37.6**	18.3	5.4	29.0	100.0	21.9	**36.2**	20.0	10.5	11.4	100.0
Worked on individual tasks for portfolios	**6.5**	**15.1**	19.4	30.1	29.0	100.0	13.2	**30.5**	15.2	28.6	12.4	100.0
Engaged in whole-class activities	**38.7**	22.6	8.6	1.1	29.0	100.0	**51.4**	27.6	6.7	1.0	13.3	100.0
Demonstrated their work to others (teachers/students)	24.7	**21.5**	22.6	2.2	29.0	100.0	30.5	**38.1**	14.3	4.8	12.4	100.0

Table 79: Secondary Teachers' Reported Use of Democratic Teaching Practices

Activity:	2017 (N=93)							2022 (N=105)						
	Frequency of Use (%)							Frequency of Use (%)						
	Never Uses	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL	Never Uses	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL
Used didactic questions (Who? What? Where? When? How?)	1.1	4.3	12.9	51.6	1.1	29.0	100.0	0	2.9	13.3	70.5	0	13.3	100.0
Used demonstrations	1.1	4.3	18.3	47.3	0	29.0	100.0	0	1.0	19.0	66.7	0	13.3	100.0
Used guided methods (e.g. Guided reading)	1.1	9.7	23.7	35.5	1.1	29.0	100.0	0	6.7	21.9	57.1	1.0	13.3	100.0
Used shared methods (e.g. Shared writing)	9.7	19.4	28.0	8.6	5.4	29.0	100.0	5.7	16.2	32.4	29.5	1.0	15.2	100.0
Used journals	35.5	22.6	5.4	6.5	1.1	29.0	100.0	39.0	30.5	12.4	4.8	1.0	12.4	100.0
Used learning logs	7.5	19.4	6.5	3.2	7.5	29.0	100.0	38.1	18.1	11.4	10.5	5.7	16.2	100.0
Used research projects	7.5	22.6	32.3	6.5	2.2	29.0	100.0	11.4	25.7	28.6	19.0	1.0	14.3	100.0
Used learning centres	36.6	19.4	8.6	2.2	4.3	29.0	100.0	39.0	25.7	9.5	5.7	2.9	17.1	100.0
Used learning contracts	41.9	12.9	5.4	1.1	9.7	29.0	100.0	46.7	18.1	5.7	6,7	7.6	15.2	100.0
Used differentiated instruction	5.4	12.9	29.0	22.6	1.1	29.0	100.0	4.8	12.4	22.9	41.0	1.0	18.1	100.0
Used problem-solving approaches	12.9	26.9	30.1	71.0	1.1	29.0	100.0	3.8	6.7	20.0	52.4	1.9	15.2	100.0
Used case-based method	22.6	16.1	8.6	15.1	8.6	29.0	100.0	15.2	26.7	19.0	19.0	3.8	16.2	100.0
Used reflective discussions	6.5	9.7	30.1	19.4	5.4	29.0	100.0	5.7	15.2	24.8	34.3	3.8	16.2	100.0
Used simulations	15.1	12.9	23.7	11.8	7.5	29.0	100.0	9.5	21.0	25.7	21.9	4.8	17.1	100.0
Used field observation	23.7	14.0	21.5	6.5	5.4	29.0	100.0	21.9	23.8	23.8	11.4	4.8	14.8	100.0
Used role play	14.0	15.1	24.7	14.0	3.2	29.0	100.0	14.3	20.0	23.8	21.0	3.8	17.1	100.0
Used service learning	26.9	17.2	12.9	2.2	11.8	29.0	100.0	30.5	21.9	9.5	9.5	9.5	19.0	100.0
Used cooperative and collaborative learning	7.5	8.6	22.6	30.1	2.2	29.0	100.0	2.9	11.4	28.6	40.0	1.9	15.2	100.0
Used controversial discussions	11.8	23.7	17.2	15.1	3.2	29.0	100.0	6.7	23.8	30.5	21.0	1.0	17.1	100.0
Used debates	25.8	14.0	20.4	8.6	2.2	29.0	100.0	15.2	24.8	26.7	18.1	1.0	14.3	100.0

Activity:	Never Uses	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL	Never Uses	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Unsure / Not Applicable	No Response	TOTAL
Used peer partner learning	8.6	15.1	25.8	20.4	1.1	29.0	100.0	5.7	14.3	31.4	32.4	1.0	15.2	100.0
Told the students the objectives of an assessment activity	2.2	4.3	14.0	48.4	2.2	29.0	100.0	1.9	6.7	21.9	53.3	1.9	14.3	100.0
Allowed the students to rate their own work before you graded it	23.7	19.4	15.1	11.8	1.1	29.0	100.0	16.2	21.9	26.7	20.0	1.0	14.3	100.0
Allowed the students to engage in peer assessment activities	7.5	16.1	31.2	15.1	1.1	29.0	100.0	4.8	21.0	34.3	23.8	1.0	15.2	100.0
Taught students strategies for reading in your subject area	10.8	14.0	24.7	18.3	3.2	29.0	100.0	12.4	18.1	23.8	28.6	1.9	15.2	100.0
Provided support for struggling readers in your classroom	15.1	8.6	17.2	23.7	6.5	29.0	100.0	4.8	21.9	21.9	31.4	1.9	18.1	100.0
Encouraged students to read for pleasure	8.6	11.8	15.1	30.1	5.4	29.0	100.0	3.8	11.4	23.8	43.8	1.0	16.2	100.0
Encouraged students to read for information	4.3	0	19.4	44.1	3.2	29.0	100.0	1.0	4.8	15.2	61.0	1.0	17.1	100.0
(Re)Wrote instructional materials to facilitate diverse reading ability in the classroom	18.64.0	12.9	28.0	11.8	4.3	29.0	100.0	8.6	18.1	25.7	28.6	1.0	18.1	100.0
Rewarded positive behaviours with incentives (e.g. stars, stickers)	8.6	10.8	26.9	24.7	0	29.0	100.0	3.8	9.5	26.7	41.0	1.0	18.1	100.0
Used physical restraint for misbehaving students	45.2	11.8	4.3	4.3	5.4	29.0	100.0	37.1	13.3	14.3	13.3	2.9	19.0	100.0
Threatened to send students out of the classroom if they do not behave	14.0	14.0	20.4	19.4	3.2	29.0	100.0	8.6	14.3	36.2	23.8	0	17.1	100.0
Sent home notes to parents about students' good behaviour	36.6	14.0	9.7	9.7	1.1	29.0	100.0	31.4	23.8	16.2	9.5	1.0	18.1	100.0
Called parents about students' misbehaviour	12.9	21.5	19.4	16.1	1.1	29.0	100.0	16.2	22.9	26.7	17.1	16.2	17.1	100.0
Worked with students to establish a code of classroom behaviour and consequences for infractions	6.5	17.2	22.6	24.7	0	29.0	100.0	1.0	16.2	26.7	38.1	1.0	17.1	100.0

School Leadership

One section of the questionnaire aimed to capture teachers' perspectives on the conduct of their school leaders. Both primary and secondary teachers were asked for their perspectives on their school's leadership.

Primary Teacher Perspectives on School Leadership

The tool utilised for this purpose was the teacher's short form of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS; Hallinger & Wang, 2015). This instrument comprises 22 behaviours associated with school leadership. Teachers were asked to assess the extent to which they observed these behaviours in their school principal during the preceding school year, utilising a rating scale ranging from 1 (Almost Never) to 5 (Almost Always). The instrument allows for scoring and analysis on a comprehensive scale and across three dimensions of school leadership or ten functions/jobs of school principals. The distribution of responses from teachers in 2017 is outlined in Table 80, while the corresponding data for 2022 is presented in Table 81. The option with the most significant sample proportion is in bold font.

There has been a general increase in teachers' perspectives on school leaders from 2017-2022. Areas that saw significant changes included making clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders), Encouraging teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practising new skills and concepts, ensuring that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school and complimenting teachers privately for their efforts or performance

Summary

Generally, the teachers have reported improvements in school leadership. Teachers reported that school leaders clarified who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders). Additionally, they encouraged teachers to use the instructional time for teaching and practising new skills and concepts, ensured that the classroom priorities of teachers were consistent with the goals and direction of the school and complimented teachers privately for their efforts or performance. Teachers mentioned that principals do not acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files. Most areas remained constant from 2017-2022

Table 80: Primary Teachers' Responses on PIMRS Short Form 2017 (N=55)

To what extent does your principal …?	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Response	Total
Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	0.0	7.3	7.3	25.5	20.0	40.0	100
Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	3.6	5.5	5.5	25.5	20.0	40.0	100
Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	3.6	5.5	10.9	20.0	20.0	40.0	100
Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	5.5	7.3	12.7	16.4	18.2	40.0	100
Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	3.6	3.6	12.7	23.6	16.4	40.0	100
Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	1.8	9.1	5.5	29.1	14.5	40.0	100
Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	7.3	3.6	14.5	21.8	12.7	40.0	100
Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	10.9	3.6	3.6	23.6	18.2	40.0	100
Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	3.6	7.3	14.5	18.2	16.4	40.0	100
Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	5.5	9.1	18.2	12.7	14.5	40.0	100
Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	3.6	9.1	16.4	18.2	12.7	40.0	100
Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	1.8	7.3	16.4	18.2	16.4	40.0	100
Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	1.8	3.6	12.7	20.0	21.8	40.0	100
Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	5.5	5.5	18.2	18.3	12.7	40.0	100
Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	1.8	7.3	7.3	25.5	16.4	40.0	100
Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	1.8	12.7	12.7	16.4	16.4	40.0	100
Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	21.8	9.1	14.5	5.5	9.1	40.0	100
Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	12.7	9.1	20.0	12.7	5.5	40.0	100
Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	1.8	12.7	10.9	18.2	16.4	40.0	100
Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	5.5	5.5	10.9	10.9	27.3	40.0	100
Recognise superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	9.1	18.2	14.5	9.1	9.1	40.0	100
Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	1.8	12.7	25.5	7.3	12.7	40.0	100

Table 81: Primary Teachers' Responses on PIMRS Short Form 2022 (N=98)

To what extent does your principal …?	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Response	M	SD
Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	3.1	6.1	15.3	36.7	20.4	18.4	3.80	1.02
Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	5.1	2.0	15.3	32.7	24.5	20.4	3.87	1.08
Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	3.1	6.1	15.3	36.7	20.4	18.4	3.80	1.02
Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	6.1	8.2	14.3	30.6	21.4	19.4	3.66	1.19
Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	6.1	4.1	13.3	30.6	25.5	20.4	3.82	1.17
Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	2.0	8.2	14.3	37.8	19.4	81.6	3.79	1.00
Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	4.1	4.1	24.5	34.7	14.3	18.4	3.63	.99
Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	4.1	4.1	14.3	31.6	27.6	81.6	3.91	1.08
Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	4.1	6.1	18.4	31.6	20.4	19.4	3.72	1.08
Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	5.1	6.1	21.4	27.6	19.4	20.4	3.63	1.12
Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	4.1	13.3	20.4	23.5	21.4	17.3	3.54	1.18
Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	4.1	6.1	15.3	28.6	28.6	17.3	3.86	1.12
Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	0.0	6.1	7.1	28.6	41.8	16.3	4.27	.90
Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	4.1	4.1	16.3	31.6	27.6	16.7	3.94	.95
Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	1.0	5.1	18.4	30.6	26.5	18.4	3.94	.95
Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	5.1	4.1	21.4	25.5	26.5	82.7	3.78	1.14
Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	20.4	10.2	20.4	12.2	6.1	30.6	2.62	1.31
Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	12.2	12.2	17.3	15.3	14.3	28.6	3.10	1.37.
Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	3.1	10.2	15.3	28.6	19.4	23.5	3.67	1.19
Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	0.0	8.2	11.2	29.6	31.6	19.4	4.05	.97
Recognise superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	10.2	19.4	14.3	23.5	10.2	22.4	3.05	1.27
Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	7.1	17.3	19.4	20.4	11.2	24.5	3.15	1.21

Secondary Teachers' Perspectives on School Leadership

The tool utilised to gain information on secondary teachers' perspectives of their school's leadership was the same tool used for primary teachers: the teacher's short form of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS; Hallinger & Wang, 2015). This instrument comprises 22 behaviours associated with school leadership. Teachers were asked to assess the extent to which they observed these behaviours in their school principal during the preceding school year, utilising a rating scale ranging from 1 (Almost Never) to 5 (Almost Always). The instrument allows for scoring and analysis on a comprehensive scale and across three dimensions of school leadership or ten functions/jobs of school principals. The distribution of responses from teachers in 2017 is outlined in Table 82, while the corresponding data for 2022 is presented in Table 83. The option with the most significant sample proportion is in bold font.

Summary

Framing School Goals

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that they 'sometimes' developed a focused set of annual school-wide goals. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers frequently' used data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals. In 2017 and 2022, 25.8 of the secondary teachers 'frequently' developed goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school.

Communicating School Goals

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers 'frequently' communicated the school's mission effectively to members of the school community. In 2017 and 2022, secondary school teachers 'frequently' referred to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that they 'frequently' ensured that the classroom priorities of teachers were consistent with the goals and direction of the school.

Supervising and Evaluating Instruction

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers 'sometimes' reviewed student work products when evaluating classroom instruction. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers 'almost always' made clear who was responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels.

Coordinating the Curriculum

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers 'frequently' drew upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated consistently that they 'sometimes', 'frequently' and 'almost always' participated actively in the review of curricular materials.

Monitoring Student Progress

In 2017, most secondary teachers indicated that their principals 'sometimes' met individually with teachers to discuss student progress, while principals in 2022 'frequently' met with the teachers. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that principals 'frequently' used tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward schools.

Protecting Instructional Time

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that their principals 'almost always' encouraged teachers to use the instructional time for teaching and practising new skills and concepts.

Maintaining High Visibility

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that principals 'almost always' took the time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks. Secondary teachers also indicated in 2017 and 2022 that principals 'almost always' attended or participated in extra and co-curricular activities.

Providing Incentives for Teachers

In 2017, secondary teachers indicated that their principals 'sometimes' complimented them privately for their efforts or performance, while in 2022, this was increased as it was reported that principals 'frequently' complimented teachers for their efforts. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated principals 'sometimes' acknowledged their exceptional performance by writing memos on their personnel files. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that principals 'sometimes' created professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for exceptional contributions to the school.

Table 82: Secondary Teachers' Responses on PIMRS Short Form 2017 (N=93)

To what extent does your principal …?	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Response	Total
Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	3.2	3.2	23.7	**15.1**	19.4	35.5	100.0
Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	4.3	4.3	10.8	24.7	**20.4**	35.5	100.0
Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	3.2	3.2	17.2	25.8	**15.1**	35.5	100.0
Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	4.3	2.2	20.4	23.7	**14.0**	35.5	100.0
Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	4.3	7.5	14.0	23.7	**15.1**	35.5	100.0
Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	3.2	8.6	18.3	**23.7**	10.8	35.5	100.0
Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	9.7	7.5	22.6	**19.4**	5.4	35.5	100.0
Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	6.5	5.4	15.1	18.3	**19.4**	35.5	100.0
Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	6.5	5.4	15.1	24.7	**12.9**	35.5	100.0
Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	9.7	14.0	12.9	**14.0**	14.0	35.5	100.0
Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	10.8	12.9	**17.2**	14.0	9.7	35.5	100.0
Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	4.3	11.8	18.3	19.4	**10.8**	35.5	100.0
Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	1.1	4.3	10.8	22.6	**25.8**	35.5	100.0
Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	4.3	9.7	15.1	17.2	**18.3**	35.5	100.0
Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	7.5	6.5	10.8	17.2	**22.6**	35.5	100.0
Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	3.2	8.6	23.7	14.0	**15.1**	35.5	100.0
Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	12.9	16.1	18.3	8.6	8.6	**35.5**	100.0
Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	15.1	15.1	**21.5**	5.4	7.5	35.5	100.0
Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	5.4	14.0	**18.3**	16.1	10.8	35.5	100.0
Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	3.2	11.8	15.1	**14.0**	20.4	35.5	100.0
Recognise superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	11.8	12.9	**11.8**	14.0	14.0	35.5	100.0
Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	11.8	14.0	**17.2**	11.8	9.7	35.5	100.0

Table 83: Secondary Teachers' Responses on PIMRS Short Form 2022 (N=105)

To what extent does your principal …?	Almost Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Frequently	Almost Always	No Response	Total
Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	3.8	8.6	17.1	29.5	25.7	15.2	100.0
Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	2.9	8.6	18.1	27.6	27.6	15.2	100.0
Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	1.9	9.5	21.9	31.4	21.9	13.3	100.0
Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	7.6	5.7	21.0	30.5	23.8	11.4	100.0
Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	3.8	13.3	19.0	26.7	21.9	15.2	100.0
Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	3.8	10.5	22.9	28.6	12.0	13.3	100.0
Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	5.7	9.5	32.4	27.6	8.6	16.2	100.0
Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	1.9	14.3	15.2	27.6	26.7	14.3	100.0
Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	2.9	15.2	21.0	31.4	15.2	14.3	100.0
Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	4.8	10.5	23.8	22.9	22.9	15.2	100.0
Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	7.6	21.0	30.5	21.9	6.7	12.4	100.0
Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	3.8	11.4	17.1	33.3	19.0	15.2	100.0
Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	1.0	5.7	20.0	29.5	31.4	12.4	100.0
Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	3.8	6.7	23.8	23.8	29.5	12.4	100.0
Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	8.6	5.7	19.0	28.6	25.7	12.4	100.0
Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	4.8	11.4	21.9	26.7	22.9	12.4	100.0
Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	18.1	17.1	25.7	15.2	2.9	21.0	100.0
Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	11.4	20.0	25.7	18.1	7.6	17.1	100.0
Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	2.9	13.3	33.3	22.9	11.4	16.2	100.0
Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	3.8	11.4	16.2	30.5	24.8	13.3	100.0
Recognise superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	7.6	9.5	31.4	20.0	13.3	18.1	100.0
Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	8.6	18.1	30.5	10.5	14.3	18.1	100.0

Promoting Professional Development

In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that their principals 'sometimes' led or attended teacher in-service activities concerned with instructions. In 2017, teachers also indicated that principals 'almost always' set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities, while in 2022, there was a decrease from 2017, where teachers indicated that principals 'frequently' set aside time.

Providing Incentives for Learning

In 2017, secondary teachers indicated that principals mostly recognised superior student achievement or improvement by seeing students in the office with their work. This was also 'frequently' done in 2022. In 2017 and 2022, secondary teachers indicated that their principals 'sometimes' contacted parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions.

Primary Principals' Perspectives on School Leadership

One section of the survey was designed to provide a profile of principals' leadership. The tool utilised for this purpose was the principal form of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS; Hallinger & Wang, 2015). This section included fifty behavioural statements that describe principal job practices and behaviours. Principals were asked to consider each statement concerning their leadership over the past academic year and circle the appropriate response based on its frequency in their practices and behaviours. Response categories range from 5 (Almost Always) to 1 (Almost Never). The distribution of principal responses to each statement can be found in Table 84.

Table 84: Primary Principals' Leadership Practices

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=9)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS												
Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	12.5
Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	0.0	11.1	22.2	22.2	11.1	33.3	25.0	0.0	37.5	25.0	12.5	0.0
Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development	0.0	22.2	22.2	11.1	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5
Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	0.0	11.1	0.0.	33.3	22.2	33.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	37.5	50.0	0.0
Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	0.0	11.1	0.0	33.3	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0
COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS												
Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	0.0	0.0	33.3	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	62.5	25.0	0.0
Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5	0.0
Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.6	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5
Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress)	33.3	0.0	33.3	22.2	0.0	33.3	37.5	0.0	25.0	37.5	0.0	0.0
Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)	0.0	11.1	33.3	22.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	37.5	37.5.	0.0	25.0

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=9)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION												
Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5
Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM												
Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	25.0
Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions the school's curricular objectives	0.0	0.0	22.2	44.4	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	0.0
Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	27.5	25.0
Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests	0.0	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	33.3						

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=9)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS												
Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses	0.0	0.0	11.1	55.6	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	0.0
Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	0.0	0.0	11.1	33.3	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0
Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)	11.1	0.0	33.3	11.1	11.1	33.3	0.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	0.0
Inform students of school's academic progress	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME												
Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements	11.1	11.1	0.0	11.1	33.3	33.3	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	37.5
Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time	11.1	22.2	0.0	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time	22.2	11.1	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	25.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	0.0	0.0
Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0
Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time	0.0	11.1	0.0	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	62.5	12.5	12.5
Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=9)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students	0.0	11.1	11.1	44.4	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0
Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	0.0	0.0	33.3	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	37.5	25.0	37.5	0.0
Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives	0.0	11.1	11.1	11.1	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	37.5	0.0
Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes	0.0	0.0	33.3	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	12.5	25.0	12.5
PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS												
Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos	0.0	11.1	0.0	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	0.0
Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	87.5	0.0
Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	12.5	25.0	12.5	25.0	12.5	12.5
Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition	11.1	22.2	11.1	22.2	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0
Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	11.1	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	37.5	25.0	12.5	25.0
PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT												
Ensure that in-service activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5
Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during in-service training	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4	22.2	33.3	0.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	25.0	0.0
Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important in-service activities	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	44.4	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5
Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	0.0	0.0	11.1	44.4	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	25.0	12.5

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=9)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	0.0	0.0	22.2	11.1	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	12.5	37.5	37.5	12.5
PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING												
Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honour roll or mention in the principal's newsletter	11.1	0.0	33.3	11.1	11.1	33.3	12.5	0.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	12.5
Use assemblies to honour students for academic accomplishments or for behaviour or citizenship	11.1	0.0	0.0	22.2	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0
Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	33.3	0.0	22.2	0.0	11.1	33.3	0.0	12.5	50.0	12.5	12.5	12.5
Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	11.1	11.1	22.2	11.1	11.1	33.3	0.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	12.5	0.0
Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class	0.0	0.0	22.2	22.2	22.2	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.5	37.5	25.0

Summary

There was a general improvement from 2017-2022 regarding the school goals. The areas that had the most improvement were developing a focused set of annual school-wide goals and developing goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school, moving from sometimes to frequently. Communicating the school's goals saw an increase in numbers over the years in communicating the school's mission effectively to members of the school community and discussions regarding the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings. The supervision and evaluation area did not see any significant changes. Improvements were also seen in making a clear distinction: who was responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders) and using tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward school goals. The monitoring of students' progress saw improvements across all areas. To protect instructional time, there was a significant improvement in ensuring that students are not called to the office during instructional time and encouraging teachers to use the instructional time for teaching and practising new skills and concepts. To provide incentives for teachers, significant improvement was seen only when complimenting teachers privately for their efforts or performance. All other areas remained consistent.

Secondary Principals' Perspectives on School Leadership

One section of the survey was designed to provide a profile of principals' leadership. The tool utilised for this purpose was the principal form of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS; Hallinger & Wang, 2015). This section included fifty behavioural statements that describe principal job practices and behaviours. Principals were asked to consider each statement concerning their leadership over the past academic year and circle the appropriate response based on its frequency in their practices and behaviours. Response categories range from 5 (Almost Always) to 1 (Almost Never). The distribution of principal responses to each statement can be found in Table 85.

Table 85: Secondary Principals' Leadership Practices

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=5)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS												
Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	0	0	0	0	40.0	60.0	0	0	37.5	37.5	25.0	0
Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	62.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	12.5	0	37.5	25.0	25.0	0
Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0
Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	37.5	37.5	25.0	0
COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS												
Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0
Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings	0	0	0	0	40.0	60.0	0	0	0	62.5	37.5	0
Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	37.5	25.0	37.5	0
Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress)	0	20.0	0	20.0	0	60.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	0	0
Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)	0	0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0	0	0	37.5	12.5	50.0	0
SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION												
Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	0	100.0	0	0

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=5)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	62.5	12.5	0
Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	50.0	37.5	12.5	0
Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	0	0	0	0	40.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0
Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0
COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM												
Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	0	75.0	25.0	0
Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions the school's curricular objectives	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	25.0	62.5	12.5	0
Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	37.5	37.5	25.0	0
Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	37.5	62.5	0	0
Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	37.5	0
MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS												
Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	25.0	62.5	12.5	0

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=5)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	12.5	50.0	37.5	0
Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0
Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)	0	0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0	0	0	12.5	25.0	62.5	0
Inform students of school's academic progress	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	37.5	0
PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME												
Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	0	37.5	0
Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time	0	20.0	20.0	0	0	60.0	0	0	75.0	12.5	12.5	0
Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	37.5	37.5	12.5	0
Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	0	50.0	50.0	0
Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0
MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY												
Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0
Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	37.5	50.0	12.5	0
Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	0	0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0
Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0	0

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=5)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes	0	0	0	40.0	0	60.0	25.0	0	25.0	50.0	0	0
PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS												
Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos	0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0	60.0	0	0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0
Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	0	0.0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	0	12.5	25.0	62.5	0
Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	0	20.0	0	0	20.0	60.0	0	25.0	50.0	12.5	12.5	0
Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition	0	0	40.0	0	0	60.0	25.0	0	75.0	0	0	0
Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	0	20.0	0	20.0	0	60.0	25.0	0	25.0	37.5	12.5	0
PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT												
Ensure that in-service activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	12.5	37.5	50.0	0
Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during in-service training	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	0	12.5	50.0	37.5	0
Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important in-service activities	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	0	25.0	75.0	0
Lead or attend teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0
Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from in-service activities	0	0	0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0
PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING												
Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honour roll or mention in the principal's newsletter	0	20.0	0	0	20.0	60.0	12.5	0	50.0	12.5	25.0	0

Behavioural Statement	2017 (N=5)						2022 (N=8)					
	Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)						Frequency of Occurrence over the Academic Year (% of sample)					
	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response	1 Almost Never	2 Seldom	3 Some-times	4 Frequ-ently	5 Almost Always	No Response
Use assemblies to honour students for academic accomplishments or for behaviour or citizenship	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0
Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	0	20.0	20.0	0	0	60.0	12.5	25.0	50.0	12.5	0	0
Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0	0
Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class	0	0	20.0	0	20.0	60.0	0	0	37.5	12.5	50.0	0

Summary

Framing the School Goals

In 2017, principals reported that they 'almost always' developed a focused set of annual school-wide goals, while in 2022, principals indicated that they 'sometimes' and 'frequently' developed a focused set of school-wide yearly goals. Regarding framing the school's goals regarding staff responsibility for meeting them, principals indicated that they 'frequently' and 'almost always' did that, while principals in 2022 indicated that they 'sometimes' framed the schools' goals. Principals in 2017 'frequently' and 'almost always' used assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development, while principals in 2022 'sometimes' used assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input and goal development. Most principals in 2017 indicated that they 'sometimes' and frequently used data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals, while fifty percent of the principals in 2022 indicated that they 'almost always' did this. In 2017, principals indicated that they 'frequently' developed goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school.

Communicate the School Goals

In 2017, principals indicated that they 'sometimes' and 'frequently' communicated the school's mission effectively to members of the school community. In 2022, fifty percent of principals indicated communicating the school's mission 'frequently'. In 2017, principals indicated that they 'almost always' discussed the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings, while most principals in 2022 indicated that they 'frequently' discussed the school's academic goals with teachers. Concerning the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers, principals in 2017 and 2022 indicated that they 'almost always' did this. In 2017, principals 'seldom' and 'frequently' ensured that the school's academic goals were reflected in highly visible displays in the school, while in 2022, principals 'almost never'. 'sometimes' and 'seldom' did this. In 2017, principals 'sometimes' and 'frequently' referred to the school's goals or mission in forums with students, while in 2022, principals 'almost always' referred to the school's goals or mission in forums with students.

Supervise and Evaluate Instruction

Principals in 2017 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ ensured that the classroom priorities of teachers were consistent with the goals and direction of the school. Principals in 2022 ‘frequently’ ensured that the classroom priorities were consistent with the goals and priorities of the school. Reviewing student work products when evaluating classroom instruction saw principals in 2017 indicating that they ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ did this, while principals in 2022 ‘frequently’ reviewed students’ work products. Principals in 2017 indicated that they ‘frequently and ‘almost always’ conducted informal observations in classrooms regularly, while principals in 2022 indicated that they ‘sometimes’ conducted informal observations in classrooms regularly. Principals in 2017 ‘almost always’ pointed out specific strengths in teachers’ instructional practices in post-observation feedback, while principals in 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ did this. Principals in 2017 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ pointed out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback, while principals in 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ pointed out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices.

Coordinate the Curriculum

Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ made clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions about the school’s objectives. Principals in 2017 ‘frequently’ monitored the classroom curriculum to see that it covered the school’s curricular objectives, while principals in 2022 ‘sometimes’ and ‘frequently’ did this. In 2017 and 2022, principals frequently assessed the overlap between the school’s curricular objectives and achievement tests. Principals in 2017 ‘frequently’ participated actively in the review of curricular materials, while principals in 2022 ‘sometimes’, ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ participated actively in the review of curricular materials.

Monitor Student Progress

Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ met with teachers to discuss student progress. In 2017 and 2022, principals frequently discussed academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ used tests and other performance measures to assess progress toward school goals. Principals in

2017 ‘sometimes’ and ‘frequently’ informed teachers of the school’s performance results in written form, while principals in 2022 ‘almost always’ informed teachers of the school’s performance results in written form. Principals in 2017 ‘sometimes’ and ‘almost always’ informed students of the school’s academic progress, while principals in 2022 mostly ‘almost always’ informed students of the school’s academic progress.

Protect Instructional Time

Principals in 2017 did not limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements, while principals in 2022 ‘almost always’ limited disruption of instructional time by public address announcements. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘sometimes’ ensured that students were not called to the office during instructional time. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ ensured that tardy and truant students suffered specific consequences for missing instructional time. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ encouraged teachers to use the instructional time for teaching and practising new skills and concepts. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ limited the intrusion of extra and co-curricular activities on instructional time.

Maintain High Visibility

Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ took time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess breaks. Most principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ talked informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks. Most principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ visited classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students and attended/participated in extra and co-curricular activities. Principals in 2017 ‘frequently’ and ‘almost always’ covered classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives, while principals in 2022 ‘sometimes’ and ‘frequently’ covered classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives. Principals in 2017 and 2022 ‘frequently’ tutored students or provided direct instruction to classes.

Provide Incentives for Teachers

Principals in 2017 ‘sometimes’ and ‘frequently’ reinforced superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos, while principals in 2022 ‘sometimes’ reinforced superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos. Principals in 2017

'sometimes' and 'almost always' complimented teachers privately for their efforts or performance, while principals in 2022 'almost always' complimented teachers privately for their efforts or performance. Principals in 2017 'seldom' and 'almost always' acknowledged teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files, while principals in 2022 'sometimes' acknowledged teachers' outstanding performance by writing memos for their personnel files. Principals in 2017 and 2022 'sometimes' rewarded special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition. Principals in 2017 'sometimes' and 'frequently' created professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for exceptional contributions to the school, while in 2022, principals 'seldom', 'sometimes' and 'frequently' created professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for extraordinary contributions to the school.

Promote Professional Development

Principals in 2017 'frequently' and 'almost always' ensured that in-service activities attended by staff were consistent with the school's goals, while principals in 2022 'almost always' ensured that in-service activities attended by staff were consistent with the school's goals. Principals in 2017 'sometimes' and 'almost always' actively support the use of skills acquired during in-service training, while principals in 2022, principals 'sometimes' actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during in-service training. Principals in 2017 'frequently' and 'almost always' obtained the participation of the whole staff in important in-service activities, while principals in 2022 'almost always' obtained the involvement of the entire staff in important in-service activities. Principals in 2017 'frequently' and 'almost always' led or attained teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction, while 'almost always' led or attained teacher in-service activities concerned with instruction. Principals 'frequently' and 'almost always' set aside time mat faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas and information from in-service activities, while principals in 2022 'almost always' set aside time mat faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas and information from in-service activities.

Provide Incentives for Learning

Principals in 2017 'seldom' and 'almost always' recognised students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter, while principals in 2022 'seldom' recognised students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter. Principals in 2017 'sometimes' and 'almost always'

used assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments or for behavior or citizenship, while principals in 2022 'almost always' used assemblies to honor students for academic achievements or for behavior or citizenship. In 2017, principals 'seldom' and 'sometimes' contacted parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions, while in 2022, principals 'sometimes' contacted parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions. Principals in 2017 'sometimes' and 'almost always' supported teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class, while principals in 2022 'almost always' supported teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and achievements in class.

School Characteristics

Data were compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics to create a profile of the primary and secondary schools in the sample.

Primary School Characteristics

School Roll and Number of Personnel in Primary Schools

Principals were asked to report on their school's roll by sex and the number of personnel in their schools. The reported student roll and number of personnel are shown in Tables 86 and 87.

Table 86: Primary School Roll by Sex

Number of students	2017 (N=9)				2022 (N=8)			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Female	46	168	93.1	53.0	43	169	99.3	48.0
Male	62	175	99.3	48.7	47	164	103.5	40.8

Table 87: Primary School Personnel

Number of personnel	2017 (N=9)				2022 (N=8)			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Teachers (Female)	5	23	10.8	6.5	12	24	15.5	4.6
Teachers (Male)	0	3	1.33	1.03	0	6	2.2	2.4
Librarians	0	1	.67	.51	0	1	.71	.48
Guidance Counsellors	0	2	.50	.83	0	1	.40	.54
Ancillary Staff	2	7	4.33	4.0	2	9	5.3	2.2
Other	2	7	1.86	2.64	1	5	2.6	1.5

Other staff members reported by principals included cleaners, lab assistants and YES program interns.

Student and Teacher Absenteeism in Primary Schools

Absenteeism is an issue of concern in schools in St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Principals were asked to indicate how much student and teacher absenteeism challenges their school. The distribution of responses can be found in Table 88.

Table 88: Student and Teacher Absenteeism in Primary Schools

Issue	2017 (%) (N=9)				2022 (%) (N=8)			
	No Challenge at All	A Moderate Challenge	A Big Challenge	No Response	No Challenge at All	A Moderate Challenge	A Big Challenge	No Response
Student Absenteeism	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	12.5	87.5	0.0	0.0
Teacher Absenteeism	44.4	22.2	0.0	33.3	37.5	37.5	12.5	12.5

The 2017 data shows principals had split reviews on their students' absenteeism rate. Principals agreed that some had no challenges, whilst others had moderate challenges. Where the teachers' absenteeism is concerned, most principals had no challenge with this area. In 2022, there was an increase in principals being concerned regarding student absenteeism as a moderate challenge and an equal concern regarding teachers being a challenge to moderate.

Primary School Facilities

To gain insight into the environment of the participating schools, attention was directed toward the available facilities and their utilisation. To accomplish this, school principals were asked to complete an item prompting them to indicate the presence of certain facilities at the school and, if available, whether they were currently in use. The percentages of primary principals' responses to each facility listed are shown in Table 89.

Table 89: Primary School Facilities Present and in Use

School facility	2017 (N=9)				2022 (N=8)			
	Present & In Use	Present & Not in Use	Not Present	No Response	Present & In Use	Present & Not in Use	Not Present	No Response
Library	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Computer Lab	11.1	0.0	55.6	33.3	37.5	25.0	37.5	0.0

Canteen	55.6	11.1	0.0	33.3	12.5	12.5	62.5	0.0
Sickbay	33.3	11.1	22.2	33.3	37.5	12.5	50.0	0.0
Playing Field	11.1	0.0	55.6	33.3	37.5	0.0	50.0	12.5
Hard Courts	22.2	0.0	44.4	33.3	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
Science Labs	0,0	0.0	66.7	33.3	25.0	12.5	62.5	0.0
Art Rooms	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	12.5	0.0	75.0	12.5
IA Rooms	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5
HE Rooms	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	62.5	37.5
Music Room	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	87.5	12.5
Special subject rooms (e.g. math room, geography room)	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	25.0	0.0	75.0	0.0

Data from the 2017 study revealed that principals stated all schools had a library and were being utilised. Most schools had a canteen. Some schools had a hard court and a sick bay, including a school with this facility (sick bay) but not in use. Not all schools had science labs, art rooms, IA rooms, health education rooms, music rooms, or rooms for special subjects. In 2022, there was an increase in libraries and computer labs and a decrease in canteens and sick bays. Schools still lack IA Rooms, HE Rooms, and music rooms.

Primary School Class Structure

Principals were asked to indicate if classes were best described as grouped by ability or mixed ability grouping. They were also asked how the school day was divided into lessons, including the length of each lesson. Principal responses to these items can be found in Tables 90 and 91.

Table 90: Ability Grouping in Primary Schools

Class organisation	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Ability Grouping	0	0	1	12.5
Mixed Ability Grouping	6	66.7	6	75.0
No Response	3	33.3	1	12.5
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

In the 2017 study, all principals described their classes as having mixed ability grouping. In 2022, the group had three missing responses. In 2022, there was a mixture of abilities, with more principals saying they had mixed ability grouping.

Table 91: Number and Length of Lessons in Primary School

Lesson variable	2017 (N=9)				2022 (N=8)			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
No. in a day	6	8	7.50		7	8	7.75	.46
Length (mins)	30	45	35.8		25	40	30.6	4.1

Primary School Reading Policies

Principals were asked to indicate if their school had a reading policy and if their school's timetable included a designated time for leisure reading. Principal responses to these items can be found in Table 92.

Table 92: Primary School Reading Policies

	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
School has a reading policy?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	0	0	5	62.5
No	6	66.7	2	25.0
No Response	3	33.3	1	12.5
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**
Timetabled reading for leisure?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	4	44.4	8	100
No	2	22.2	0	0.0
No Response	3	33.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

Principals highlighted from the 2017 study that there was no reading policy for students in school. However, four principals selected yes that there is timetable time for reading, with two saying no. In 2022, all schools had timetabled reading for leisure.

Primary School Extracurricular Activities

Principals were asked to indicate whether their school had a policy on extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities and whether their school's timetables included a designated time for these activities. Principal responses to these items can be found in Table 93.

Table 93: Primary School Extracurricular Activities

	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
School has a policy on extracurricular and/or cocurricular activities?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**

Yes	0	0	4	50.0
No	6	66.7	4	50.0
No Response	3	33.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**
Timetabled extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	2	22.2	5	62.5
No	4	44.4	2	25.0
No Response	3	66.7	1	12.5
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

All principals in 2017 shared that their schools did not have an extracurricular and cocurricular activities policy. Three principals did not respond to this question. However, two principals indicated that their school timetabled extracurricular activities, with most principals selecting no. They did not have timetabled co-curricular activities. In 2022, there was an increase in schools having an extracurricular policy, with an increase in timetables and extra activities.

Summary

In 2017, there was a maximum of 168 and a minimum of 46 females in primary school with an average of 93.1, and 175 maximum and 62 minimum males with an average of 99.3. In 2022, there were 169 maximum and 43 minimum females and 164 maximum and 27 minimum males. The maximum number of female teachers in 2017 was 23, and the minimum was 5. For males, the maximum was three, and the minimum was 0. In 2022, the maximum was 24, and the minimum was 12 for females, with the maximum being 6 and 0 for males. Librarians remained constant, and a slight increase in ancillary staff was noted. In 2017, principals had split thoughts on student absenteeism being no challenge or moderate challenge. For teachers, there were no challenges in this regard. There was an increase in principals seeing student absenteeism as a moderate challenge and teachers as no challenge to a moderate challenge. One principal saw it as a big challenge. In 2017, facilities at the primary schools included libraries and canteens. Some schools had hard courts and a sick bay, but they were not being utilised. None of the schools had Science Labs, Art Rooms, IA rooms, Heath Education rooms, Music rooms or rooms for special subjects. In 2022, there was an increase in libraries and computer labs and a decrease in canteens and sick bays. Schools still lack IA Rooms, HE Rooms, and music rooms. In 2017, none of the principals reported that classes comprised of mixed ability students. However, this changed in 2022, when there was an increase in students being assigned to classes according to ability. The maximum number of lessons per day in 2017 and 2022 was 8. The minimum in 2017 was six, while in 2022 increased

to 7. The shortest period in 2017 was 30 minutes, which decreased to 25 minutes in 2022, and the longest period in 2017 was 45 minutes, which saw a decrease to 40 minutes. There was a significant increase in reading policies in schools in 2022 and a significant increase in timetabled leisure reading. This was also reflected in extracurricular activities policy and timetabled extracurricular activities in school.

Secondary School Characteristics

School Roll and Number of Personnel in Secondary Schools

Principals were asked to report on their school's roll by sex and the number of personnel in their schools. The reported student roll and number of personnel are shown in Tables 94 and 95.

Table 94: Secondary School Roll by Sex

Number of students	2017 (N=5)				2022 (N=8)			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Female	49	122	82	37	54	639	226.5	179.6
Male	74	138	110.3	32.8	79	285	202.8	78.9

Table 95: Secondary School Personnel

Number of personnel	2017 (N=5)				2022 (N=8)			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Teachers (Female)	9	12	10.3	1.5	11	44	22.5	10.9
Teachers (Male)	4	8	6.0	2.0	3	32	13.1	8.7
Librarians	1	1	1.0	.0	1	2	1.1	.4
Guidance Counsellors	1	1	1.0	.0	1	1	1.0	.0
Ancillary Staff	4	5	4.3	.0	3	13	8.1	3.0
Other	2	6	4.0	2.8	2	2	2.0	0

Personnel increased in 2022 for female and male teachers, librarians, and ancillary staff. Other staff members decreased in 2022, and the number of guidance counsellors remained the same in 2017 and 2022.

Student and Teacher Absenteeism in Secondary Schools

Absenteeism is a concern in schools in St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Principals were asked to indicate how much student and teacher absenteeism challenges their school. The distribution of responses can be found in Table 96.

Table 96: Student and Teacher Absenteeism in Secondary Schools

Issue	2017 (%) (N=5)				2022 (%) (N=8)			
	No Challenge at All	A Moderate Challenge	A Big Challenge	No Response	No Challenge at All	A Moderate Challenge	A Big Challenge	No Response
Student Absenteeism	0	40.0	20.0	40.0	12.5	75.0	12.5	0
Teacher Absenteeism	20.0	20.0	20.0	40.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	0

Student absenteeism increased by 35% in 2022 and was described as a moderate challenge, while teacher absenteeism was mostly perceived equally in 2017 as no challenge at all, a moderate challenge, and a big challenge. In contrast, in 2022, it was mainly described as no challenge.

Secondary School Facilities

Attention was directed toward the available facilities and their use to gain insight into the environment of the participating schools. To accomplish this, school principals were asked to complete an item prompting them to indicate the presence of certain facilities at the school and, if available, whether they were currently in use. The percentages of Secondary principals' responses to each facility listed are shown in Table 97.

Table 97: Secondary School Facilities Present and in Use

School facility	2017 (%) (N=5)				2022 (%) (N=8)			
	Present & In Use	Present & Not in Use	Not Present	No Response	Present & In Use	Present & Not in Use	Not Present	No Response
Library	40.0	20.0	0	40.0	62.5	0	37.5	0
Computer Lab	60.0	0	0	40.0	87.5	0	12.5	0
Canteen	40.0	0	20.0	40.0	87.5	12.5	0	0
Sickbay	0	0	60.0	40.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0
Playing Field	40.0	0	20.0	40.0	62.5	0	37.5	0
Hard Courts	40.0	0	20.0	40.0	62.5	0	37.5	0
Science Labs	60.0	0	0.0	40.0	75.0	0	25.0	0
Art Rooms	0	0	60.0	40.0	37.5	25.0	37.5	0
IA Rooms	60.0	0	0	40.0	12.5	0	50.0	37.5
HE Rooms	40.0	0	20.0	40.0	37.5	0	50.0	12.5
Music Room	0	0	60.0	40.0	50.0	12.5	37.5	0
Special subject rooms (e.g. math room, geography room)	40.0	0	20.0	40.0	12.5	12.5	75.0	0

Most rooms increased in usage in 2022 except for the Industrial Arts and Home Economics rooms. Some facilities/rooms, such as the canteen, sickbay, art room, and music room, were present but not in use in 2022.

Secondary School Class Structure

Principals were asked to indicate if classes were best described as grouped by ability or mixed ability grouping. They were also asked how the school day was divided into lessons, including the length of each lesson. Principal responses to these items can be found in Tables 98 to 99.

Table 98: Ability Grouping in Secondary Schools

Class organisation	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Ability Grouping	2	40.0	3	37.5
Mixed Ability Grouping	1	20.0	5	62.5
No Response	2	40.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

Ability grouping remained consistent throughout 2017 and 2022. However, mixed ability grouping increased in 2022 compared to 2017.

Table 99: Number and Length of Lessons in Secondary School

Lesson variable	2017 (N=5)				2022 (N=8)			
	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Mean	SD
No. in a day	8	8	8.0	.0	5	8	6.2	1.4
Length (mins)	40	40	40.0	.0	30	60	50.0	11.9

The minimum number of lessons per day decreased in 2022. The length of lessons also varied, ranging from 30 to 60 minutes per lesson.

Secondary School Reading Policies

Principals were asked to indicate if their school had a reading policy and if their school's timetable included a designated time for leisure reading. Principal responses to these items can be found in Table 100.

Table 100: Secondary School Reading Policies

	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
School has a reading policy?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	2	40.0	2	25.0
No	1	20.0	6	75.0
No Response	2	40.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**
Timetabled reading for leisure?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	0	0	1	12.5
No	2	40.0	7	87.5
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

In 2022, 75% of schools did not have reading policies, a significant 55% increase from 2017. Reading for pleasure was not timetabled in 2017 but was timetabled in 2022.

Secondary School Extracurricular Activities

Principals were asked to indicate whether their school had a policy on extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities and whether their school's timetables included a designated time for these activities. Principal responses to these items can be found in Table 101.

Table 101: Secondary School Extracurricular Activities

	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
School has a policy on extracurricular and/or cocurricular activities?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	0	0	1	12.5
No	2	40.0	7	87.5
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**
Timetabled extracurricular and/or co-curricular activities?	**n**	**%**	**n**	**%**
Yes	0	0	4	50.0
No	2	40.0	4	50.0
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

One principal indicated that their school has a policy on extra/extracurricular activities, which is an increase of 12.5% compared to 2017. There was also an increase in timetabled extracurricular activities in 2022.

Secondary Students' Academic Track

Secondary students were asked to indicate their academic track and whether they chose this track for themselves. If they did not choose their educational track, students were asked who decided for them to follow this academic track. Secondary students were also asked to indicate their planned career choices. The distribution of responses on these items can be seen in Tables 102 to 105.

Table 102: Secondary Students' Academic Track

Current Academic Track	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Arts (e.g. Languages, Literature, History, Geography)	254	47.5	52	16.7
Business (e.g. Accounts, Business, Management)	128	23.9	61	19.6
Science (e.g. Biology, Chemistry, Physics)	46	8.6	31	10.0
Technical and Vocational (e.g. Building Technology, Building drawing; Home management; textiles; food & beverage technology)	54	10.1	22	7.1
Visual and Performing Arts (e.g. Art, Theatre, Music, Dance)	0	0	7	2.3
Other	20	3.7		
Cross-discipline (a combination of two or more tracks)	41	7.6	115	37.0
No Response	53	9.9	23	7.4

Several students reported multiple academic tracks, including Languages, Literature, History, and Geography. Others include Accounts, Business, Management, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. At the same time, other students selected academic tracks in Technical and vocational fields such as Building Technology, Building drawing, Home Management, textiles, and food and beverage technology.

Table 103: Secondary Students' Choosing Their Academic Track

Is your current academic track your choice?	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	387	72.3	251	80.7
No	114	21.3	30	9.6
No Response	34	6.4	30	9.6
TOTAL	**535**	**100.0**	**311**	**100.0**

In 2017, 72.7% of the students indicated that they chose their academic track, while in 2022, 80.7% indicated that they chose their academic track.

Table 104: Person Who Chose Secondary Students' Academic Track

If someone other than you chose your academic track, the decision was made by:	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
The teachers at the school	87	16.3	21	6.8
My mother	64	12.0	21	6.8
My father	34	6.4	9	2.9
Other	41	7.6	16	5.1

In 2017, it was found that school teachers (16.3%) were the leading category of persons who chose students' academic tracks. In 2022, teachers and students' mothers were consistent with 6.8% in choosing students' academic tracks. Fathers recorded the lowest percentages for 2017 and 2022.

Table 105: Secondary Students' Planned Career Choice Areas

Area of Career Choice	2017 (N=535)		2022 (N=311)	
	n	%	n	%
Medicine & Health Services (e.g. paediatrician, pharmacist, nurse, psychologist, physiotherapist)	25	4.6	62	19.9
Law (e.g. lawyer)	8	1.4	24	7.7
Arts (e.g. journalist, photographer, singer, artist)	29	5.4	11	3.5
Technology (e.g. IT engineer, YouTuber, game developer)	8	1.4	5	1.6
Technical and Vocational (e.g. mechanic, needleworker)	11	2.0	20	6.4
Science (e.g. forensic scientist, veterinarian, marine biologist, aerospace engineer)	7	1.3	7	2.3
Business (e.g. accountant, entrepreneur, bank manager)	31	5.8	45	14.5
Beauty & Aesthetics (e.g. barber, hairdresser, nail technician)	1	0.1	3	1.0
Tourism/Hospitality (e.g. chef, air hostess, hotel manager)	11	2.0	22	7.1
Fashion & Design (e.g. interior designer, architect)	4	0.7	5	1.6
Sports (e.g. footballer, track athlete)	19	3.5	18	5.8
Public Sector (e.g. special needs teacher, policeman, soldier, firefighter, social worker)	23	4.2	33	10.6
Don't know	14	2.6	12	3.9
No Response	0	0	44	14.1
TOTAL	**191**	**35.7**	**311**	**100.0**

There was an increase in career choices in 2022 in areas such as medicine and health services, law, technical and vocational areas, business areas, beauty and aesthetics, tourism and hospitality, fashion and design and public sector areas. The areas that indicated decreases in 2022 are the arts, technology, and sports. Science remained consistent throughout 2017 and 2022, with the number of students increasing and not knowing their career choice in 2022.

Summary

Students chose their academic tracks, including arts, business, science and technical vocational areas. Most students indicated that they chose their track, while others indicated that their teacher and/or parents influenced their decision in the academic track selected. The most popular career choices were medicine, law, and business, with the least popular areas including technology, fashion design, science, beauty, and aesthetics.

Factors with Indirect Influences: Views on Common Educational Practices

This section explores the perspectives of primary and secondary teachers and principals on several common educational practices in St. Vincent and the Grenadines. These issues include feelings about teaching, extra lessons, the Common Entrance Examination (CEE) streaming, and grade retention. These educational practices are often linked to teacher expectations, which research shows profoundly influences student outcomes. Teacher expectations can be influenced by various factors, including stereotypes and preconceived notions about students' abilities, which in turn affects teachers' instruction and interaction with students (Rubie-Davies, 2009). These preconceived notions of ability may be influenced by the results of standardised tests, placement in certain schools or classes and whether a student has had to repeat a grade.

Primary Teachers' Views on School and Other Education-Related Issues

Primary Teachers' Feelings About Teaching

Teachers in the sample were asked to indicate their feelings about teaching in general. Their responses are summarised in Table 106.

Table 106: Primary Teachers' Feelings About Teaching

I like teaching in general.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Sometimes True	8	14.5	22	22.4
Always True	25	45.5	66	67.3
No Response	22	40.0	10	10.2
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

In 2017, 25 (45.5%) of teachers reported that their general feeling regarding liking the profession was always true. This was the group that produced the most results. 8 (14.5%) teachers reported

that it was sometimes true, with 22 (40%) not responding. In 2022, there was an increase in teachers' liking of the profession by 21.8%. None of the teachers from both years felt that this was never true.

Primary Teachers' Feelings about Current School

Teachers were asked to indicate their feelings about their current school. Their responses are summarised in Table 107.

Table 107: Primary Teachers' Feelings About Their Current School

I like teaching at this school.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	2	3.6	1	1.0
Sometimes True	11	20.0	23	23.5
Always True	20	36.4	63	64.3
No Response	22	40.0	11	11.2
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

Concerning their feelings about teaching at their current school, 20 (36.4%) reported that they liked teaching at that school. 11 (20%) reported that it was sometimes true, with 2 (3.6) teachers reporting that statement to be never true. Twenty-two teachers did not respond to the question. In 2022, there was a decrease in teachers not liking the school where they teach and an increase of 27.9%

Primary Teachers' Attitudes Toward Out-of-School Lessons

Three questionnaire items address the issue of teachers delivering instruction beyond regular school hours. The teachers' responses in the primary school sample are presented in Tables 108 to 110.

Table 108: Primary Teachers' Provision of Extra Lessons Outside of School Time

I provide extra lessons for students in my class outside of school hours.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	17	30.9	48	49.0
Sometimes True	7	12.7	25	25.5
Always True	9	16.4	5	5.1
No Response	22	40.0	19	19.4
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

The data showed that 30.9% (17) of the 2017 study respondents were willing to provide extra lessons outside of school. The group that had the least was those who selected that this statement was sometimes true. The 2022 study revealed that teachers sometimes provided extra lessons, but the majority still did not engage in this activity.

Table 109: Primary Teachers' Perceptions of Parent's Willingness to Pay for Extra Lessons

Parents at this school are willing to pay for extra lessons for their children.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	14	25.5	28	28.6
Sometimes True	13	23.6	46	46.9
Always True	6	10.9	5	5.1
No Response	22	40.0	19	19.4
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

The 2017 study showed that 25.5% of teachers reported that parents were unwilling to pay for extra lessons, with 10.9% saying yes. For this question, the lack of responses (40%) was greater than that of the teachers who responded. The 2022 results showed an increase in parents who are willing to pay for lessons by 23.3%.

Table 110: Primary Teachers' Perceptions of Teachers Being Paid to Provide Extra Lessons Outside of School

Teachers should be paid for extra lessons.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	26	47.3	70	71.4
No	7	12.7	13	13.3
No Response	22	40	15	15.3
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

In 2017, 47.3% of teachers agreed that teachers should be paid to provide extra lessons. This was reflected in the 2022 results, where 71.4% of teachers agreed. In 2017, 12.7% disagreed, and 13.3% disagreed in 2022. This shows that teachers' perceptions of being paid to provide extra lessons have increased over the years.

Primary Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Common Entrance Examination

Teachers in the sample were asked to express their support for specific practices embedded within the current St. Vincent and the Grenadines education system. One such practice involves using the

CEE results to allocate students to secondary schools. Table 111 illustrates the extent of teachers' endorsement of this practice.

Table 111: Primary Teachers' Support for Use of CEE for Secondary School Placement

Using the common entrance examination for secondary school placement.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	29	52.7	61	62.2
I do not support this	3	5.5	17	17.3
Not Applicable/No Opinion	1	1.8	8	8.2
No Response	22	40.0	12	12.2
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

Teachers from the 2017 study agreed that CEE should be used for secondary placement. Only 2 (5.5%) of the cohort disagreed, while one person had no opinion. There were 22 teachers with no response. From the 2022 study, 62.2% agreed that CEE should be used for secondary school placement, with 17.3% disagreeing. 8.2% of the teachers had no opinion, and 12.2% did not respond.

Primary Teachers' Attitudes Toward Streaming and Grade Retention

Teachers in the sample were asked about their endorsement of the practices of streaming students based on academic ability and grade retention (having students repeat grades until they pass). Their responses are outlined in Tables 112 and 113, respectively.

Table 112: Primary Teachers' Support for Streaming According to Ability

Streaming classes according to ability.	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	22	40.0	75	76.5
I do not support this	10	18.2	9	9.2
Not Applicable/No Opinion	1	1.8	3	3.1
No Response	22	40	11	11.2
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

More teachers agreed with this view where streaming according to ability is concerned (23-41.8%). The least number of teachers disagreed. (16.4%). In 2022, 76.5% of the teachers agreed to stream according to ability, while 9.2% disagreed. Most of the teachers in 2017 supported the view of grade retention, whilst 9 (16.4%) teachers did not support this view. This was reflected in the 2022

study, where 571% of the teachers agreed with grade retention, compared to the 14.3% who did not agree.

Table 113: Primary Teachers' Support for Grade Retention

Grade Retention	2017 (N=55)		2022 (N=98)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	23	41.8	56	57.1
I do not support this	9	16.4	14	14.3
Not Applicable/No Opinion	1	1.8	16	16.3
No Response	22	40	12	12.2
TOTAL	**55**	**100**	**98**	**100**

Summary

Teachers were asked about their feelings towards the profession, with the majority reporting that they like to teach generally. This statement saw an increase over the years. The teachers also reported that they enjoyed teaching at their current schools, with most not providing extra lessons after school. Parents not willing to pay for lessons remained average, though there was a slight increase in their willingness to pay. Teachers believe they should be paid extra for providing lessons after school, with a significant increase from no to yes from 2017 to 2022 for this statement. The teachers support the Common Entrance Examination being used as a streaming tool for secondary school. Additionally, they support the idea that children should be streamed according to ability and that grade retention should occur.

Secondary Teachers' Views on School and Other Education-Related Issues

Several current issues in education in St. Vincent and the Grenadines were investigated, including feelings about teaching, extra lessons, the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment (CPEA), streaming and grade retention.

Secondary Teachers' Feelings About Teaching

Teachers in the sample were asked to indicate their feelings about teaching in general. Their responses are summarised in Table 114.

Table 114: Secondary Teachers' Feelings About Teaching

I like teaching in general.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	0	0	1	1.0
Sometimes True	21	22.6	35	33.3
Always True	37	39.8	59	56.2
No Response	35	37.6	10	9.5
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

In 2017, 21 secondary teachers reported that they sometimes liked teaching, and 37 responded that they always liked teaching. In 2022, 59 teachers responded that they always liked teaching, 35 responded that they sometimes liked teaching, and one responded that they never liked teaching. The category of always liking teaching increased by 22 teachers in 2022.

Secondary Teachers' Feelings about Their Current School

Teachers were asked to indicate their feelings about their current school. Their responses are summarised in Table 115.

Table 115: Secondary Teachers' Feelings About Their Current School

I like teaching at this school.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	2	2.2	3	2.9
Sometimes True	31	33.3	53	50.5
Always True	25	26.9	37	35.2
No Response	35	37.6	12	11.4
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

33.3% of teachers in 2017 selected that they sometimes like teaching at their school, and 50.5% of teachers in 2022 also selected that they sometimes like teaching at their school.

Secondary Teachers' Attitudes Toward Out-of-School Lessons

Three questionnaire items address the issue of teachers delivering instruction beyond regular school hours. The teachers' responses in the secondary school sample are presented in Tables 116-118.

Table 116: Secondary Teachers' Provision of Extra Lessons Outside of School Time

I provide extra lessons for students in my class outside of school hours.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	17	18.3	37	35.2
Sometimes True	26	28.0	39	37.1
Always True	15	16.1	19	18.1
No Response	35	37.6	10	9.5
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

28% of teachers in 2017 and 37.1% of teachers in 2022 indicated that they sometimes provide extra lessons for students in their classes outside of school hours.

Table 117: Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of Parent's Willingness to Pay for Extra Lessons

Parents at this school are willing to pay for extra lessons for their children.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Never True	24	25.8	46	43.8
Sometimes True	27	29.0	41	39.0
Always True	7	7.5	0	0
No Response	35	37.6	18	17.1
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

In 2017, 29% of teachers indicated that parents at the school are sometimes willing to pay for extra lessons for their children, while in 2022, 43.8% of teachers indicated that it is never true that parents are willing to pay for extra lessons for their children.

Table 118: Secondary Teachers' Perceptions of Teachers Being Paid to Provide Extra Lessons Outside of School

Teachers should be paid for extra lessons.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	41	44.1	79	75.2
No	17	18.3	9	8.6
No Response	35	37.6	17	16.2
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

44.1% of teachers in 2017 and 75.2% in 2022 indicated that teachers should be paid for extra lessons.

Secondary Teachers' Attitudes Toward the Common Entrance Examination

Teachers in the sample were asked to express their support for specific practices embedded within the current Vincentian education system. One such practice involves using the CPEA results to allocate students to secondary schools. Table 119 illustrates the extent of teachers' endorsement of this practice.

Table 119: Secondary Teachers' Support for Use of CPEA for Secondary School Placement

Using the CPEA examination for secondary school placement.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	48	51.6	71	67.6
I do not support this	8	8.6	14	13.3
Not Applicable/No Opinion	2	2.2	8	7.6
No Response	35	37.6	12	11.4
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

Teachers in 2017 and 2022 support using the CPEA examination for secondary school placement. 51.6% of teachers indicated such in 2017 and 67.6% for 2022.

Secondary Teachers' Attitudes Toward Streaming and Grade Retention

Teachers in the sample were asked about their endorsement of the practices of streaming students based on academic ability and grade retention (having students repeat grades until they pass). Their responses are outlined in Tables 120 and 121, respectively.

Table 120: Secondary Teachers' Support for Streaming According to Ability

Streaming classes according to ability.	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	51	54.8	80	76.2
I do not support this	7	7.5	11	10.5
Not Applicable/No Opinion	0	0	4	3.8
No Response	35	37.6	10	9.5
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

Most teachers indicated that they support streaming classes according to ability. 54.8% indicated this in 2017, while 76.2% indicated this for 2022.

Table 121: Secondary Teachers' Support for Grade Retention

Grade Retention	2017 (N=93)		2022 (N=105)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	49	52.7	70	66.7
I do not support this	5	5.4	14	13.3
Not Applicable/No Opinion	4	4.3	10	9.5
No Response	35	37.6	11	10.5
TOTAL	**93**	**100.0**	**105**	**100.0**

Most teachers indicated that they support grade retention. 52.7% supported this in 2017, while 66.7% indicated this for 2022.

Summary

Teachers in 2017 and 2022 indicated that they like teaching in general. These results stayed consistent with teachers selecting 'always true' on their questionnaire. In 2017 and 2022, teachers indicated they sometimes liked teaching at their school. It was only agreed among teachers in 2017 and 2022 that it was 'sometimes true' that teachers provide extra lessons for students in their classes outside of school hours. 2017 data indicates that parents were sometimes willing to pay for extra lessons, while in 2022, teachers indicated that parents were never willing to pay for extra lessons. However, it was overwhelmingly selected for 2017 and 2022 that teachers should be paid to provide extra lessons to students in class outside of regular school time.

In 2017 and 2022, most teachers supported using the CPEA examination for secondary school placement. They also supported streamed classes according to ability and grade retention.

Primary Principals' Views on Other Education-Related Issues

Several current issues in education in St. Vincent and the Grenadines were investigated from primary principals' perspectives, including feelings about extra lessons, the Common Entrance Examination (CEE), streaming and grade retention.

Primary Principals' Attitudes Toward Out-of-School Lessons

The questionnaire addressed the concern of teachers delivering instruction beyond regular school hours. The principals' responses in the primary school sample are presented in Table 122.

Table 122: Primary Principals' Perceptions of Teachers Being Paid to Provide Extra Lessons Outside of Regular School Hours

Teachers should be paid for extra lessons.	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	5	55.6	5	62.5
No	1	11.1	2	25.0
No Response	3	33.3	1	12.5
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

5 (55.6%) principals from the 2017 cohort said teachers should be paid to provide extra lessons outside regular school hours, compared to 1 principal who disagreed. Three principals did not respond. In 2022, 62.5% of principals reported that teachers should be paid to provide extra lessons outside regular school hours.

Primary Principals' Attitudes Toward the Common Entrance Examination

Principals in the sample were asked to express their support for specific practices embedded within the current Vincentian education system. One such practice involves using the CEE results to allocate students to secondary schools. Table 123 illustrates the extent of Principals' endorsement of this practice.

Table 123: Primary Principals' Support for Use of CEE for Secondary School Placement

Using the common entrance examination for secondary school placement.	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	5	55.6	4	50.0
I do not support this	1	11.1	2	28.6
Not Applicable/No Opinion	6	66.7	1	12.5
No Response	3	33.3	1	12.5
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

When asked if CEE should be used for secondary school placement in 2017, 6 (66.7%), principals had no opinion. 5 (55.6%) agreed, while one principal did not support this view. Support for the use of CEE for secondary placement declined in 2022.

Primary Principals' Attitudes Toward Streaming and Grade Retention

Principals in the sample were asked about their endorsement of the practices of streaming students based on academic ability and grade retention (having students repeat grades until they pass). Their responses are outlined in Tables 124 and 125, respectively.

Table 124: Primary Principals' Support for Streaming According to Ability

Streaming classes according to ability.	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	5	55.6	6	75.0
I do not support this	1	11.1	2	25.0
No Response	3	33.3	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

Table 125: Primary Principals' Support for Grade Retention

Grade Retention	2017 (N=9)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	4	44.4	4	50.0
I do not support this	2	22.2	1	12.5
Not Applicable/No Opinion	0	0	3	37.5
No Response	3	3	0	0.0
TOTAL	**9**	**100**	**8**	**100**

The majority of the principals in 2017 agreed that students should be streamed based on their academic ability. One principal disagreed, while three did not respond. This was also reflected regarding grade retention, where 4 (44.4%) principals supported this view. Two disagreed, and three did not respond. In 2022, there was a slight increase in streaming for ability. Support for grade retention remained consistent.

Summary

Primary school principals from 2017 and 2022 had the same perception that teachers should be paid for extra lessons. There was a decrease in 2022 from 2017 in support that the Common Entrance Examination should be used for secondary placement. However, there was an increase in streaming students according to their abilities, while views on grade retention saw no change for both yes, with most principals supporting this practice.

Secondary Principals' Views on Other Education-Related Issues

Several current issues in education in St. Vincent were investigated from Secondary principals' perspectives, including feelings about extra lessons, the Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment (CPEA), streaming and grade retention.

Secondary Principals' Attitudes Toward Out-of-School Lessons

The questionnaire addressed the concern of teachers delivering instruction beyond regular school hours. The principals' responses in the Secondary school sample are presented in Table 126.

Table 126: Secondary Principals' Perceptions of Teachers Being Paid to Provide Extra Lessons Outside of Regular School Hours

Teachers should be paid for extra lessons.	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
Yes	0	0	5	62.5
No	2	40.0	3	37.5
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

62.5% of principals in 2022 indicated that teachers should be paid for extra lessons, compared to 40% of principals in 2017, who disagreed with this. In contrast, 40% of principals in 2017 indicated that teachers should not be paid for extra lessons, while 37.5% indicated that they should not be paid for extra lessons in 2022.

Secondary Principals' Attitudes Toward the Common Entrance Examination

Principals in the sample were asked to express their support for specific practices embedded within the current Vincentian education system. One such practice involves using the CPEA results to allocate students to secondary schools. Table 127 illustrates the extent of the principals' endorsement for this practice.

In 2022, 62.5% of principals supported using the CPEA for secondary school placement, a 40% increase from 2017.

Table 127: Secondary Principals' Support for Use of CPEA for Secondary School Placement

Using the common entrance examination for secondary school placement.	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	1	20.0	5	62.5
I do not support this	0	0	3	37.5
Not Applicable/No Opinion	1	20.0	0	0
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

Secondary Principals' Attitudes Toward Streaming and Grade Retention

Principals in the sample were asked about their endorsement of the practices of streaming students based on academic ability and grade retention (having students repeat grades until they pass). Their responses are outlined in tables 128 and 129, respectively.

Table 128: Secondary Principals' Support for Streaming According to Ability

Streaming classes according to ability.	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	1	20.0	6	75.0
I do not support this	1	20.0	2	25.0
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

In 2022, 75% of principals indicated that they supported streaming according to ability, a 55% increase from 2017.

Table 129: Secondary Principals' Support for Grade Retention

Grade Retention	2017 (N=5)		2022 (N=8)	
	n	%	n	%
I support this	2	40.0	5	75.0
I do not support this	0	0	3	37.5
No Response	3	60.0	0	0
TOTAL	**5**	**100.0**	**8**	**100.0**

75% of principals supported grade retention, a 35% increase from 2017.

Summary

Most principals in 2022 indicated that teachers should be paid more for extra lessons, that the CPEA should be used for placement into secondary schools, that classes should be streamed according to ability and that grades should be retained.

The Impact of COVID-19 on Teaching and Learning

This section focuses on the factors associated with COVID-19 that affect student achievement. Primary and secondary students were asked various questions about their experiences during online schooling, including the challenges and positive aspects of learning online, how they accessed lessons, the support they received from the school and at home and their feelings about the impact of online schooling on their attitude toward learning. Primary and secondary teachers were asked questions about teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic, including the challenges they experienced, the technology they used, the support they provided to their students and the impact of teaching online on their overall attitudes toward teaching.

Primary Students' Experiences of Schooling During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Student School Attendance During Lockdown in Primary Schools

Two questionnaire items asked students how they attended school during the island-wide lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic. Primary student responses can be found in Tables 130 and 131.

Table 130: Primary Students' Attendance During Lockdown (N=154)

How did you attend classes during the COVID-19 lockdown?	n	%
I did not attend classes during the lockdown	19	12.3
I accessed classes online during the lockdown	135	87.8
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Table 131: Primary Students' Method of Accessing Lessons During Lockdown (N=154)

Methods of access to lessons	n	%
I had no access to lessons	15	9.7
I had access to lessons on the radio	7	4.5
I had access to lessons on television	20	13.0
My teachers sent me worksheets to do	95	61.7
Other	26	16.9

Other methods reported by primary students include the use of tablets and laptops.

Challenges Faced During Online Schooling by Primary Students

Primary students were asked to indicate whether they experienced any challenges during online schooling and, if so, what kinds of technological challenges they experienced. They were also asked to indicate more general challenges when adjusting to online schooling. The proportion of primary students facing challenges and the kinds of challenges are reported in Tables 132 to 134.

Table 132: Primary Students' Experiencing Challenges in Online Schooling (N=154)

Did you experience challenges doing schooling online?	n	%
Yes	116	75.3
No	29	18.8
No Response	9	5.8
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Table 133: Primary Students' Technology Challenges in Online Schooling (N=154)

Challenges in online schooling:	n	%
Didn't own a device	17	11.0
Device did not always work	33	21.4
No access to internet	16	10.4
Internet always dropping out	65	42.2
Had to share a device	22	14.3
Did not know how to use the learning platform (Google Classroom, Teams)	28	18.2
Trouble logging in to meeting spaces (e.g., Zoom)	88	57.1
Other	10	6.5

Other technology challenges reported by students included devices not charging correctly and not understanding the material due to learning style, as no visuals were used with the platforms, e.g. whiteboard.

Table 134: Primary Students' Challenges Adjusting to Online Schooling (N=154)

Challenges shifting to online schooling:	n	%
Difficulty keeping up with my schoolwork	78	50.6
Difficulty organizing my time (e.g., getting to classes on time)	55	35.7
Not able to get extra help with schoolwork from teachers	31	20.1
Not feeling like doing schoolwork	30	19.5
Difficulty finding a quiet place to work	89	57.8
Other	6	3.9

Positive Experiences During Online Schooling by Primary Students

Primary students were asked to indicate whether or not they had any positive experiences during online schooling and, if so, to indicate what kinds of experiences they perceived as positive. The proportion of primary students reporting positive experiences associated with online learning and the kinds of positive experiences are reported in Tables 135 and 136, respectively.

Table 135: Primary Students' Positive Experiences during Online Schooling (N=154)

Did you have any positive experiences attending school online?	n	%
Yes	118	76.6
No	29	18.8
No Response	7	4.5
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Table 136: Primary Students' Technology Challenges in Online Schooling (N=154)

Positive experiences in online schooling:	n	%
More time with family	81	52.6
More time for other activities	63	40.9
Not having to travel to school	50	32.5
More rest time	52	33.8
Staying in bed longer in the morning before having to get up for school	61	39.6
Others	4	2.6

Primary Students' Preferred Learning Environment

Students were asked about their preferences for face-to-face, online, or hybrid learning, and their responses can be found in Table 137.

Table 137: Primary Students' Preferred Teaching Modality (N=154)

In which one of the following modalities do you prefer to attend school?	n	%
Face-to-face only	110	71.4
Online only	4	2.6
Some face-to-face and some online	16	10.4
Other modality	3	1.9
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Other preferred learning environments reported by students included none.

Support Received by Primary Students

Primary students were asked what support they received during online schooling from the school and at home and their level of satisfaction with the support they received. Student responses to these items on the survey are shown in Tables 138 to 141.

Table 138: School Support Provided to Primary Students During Online Schooling (N=154)

What additional support did you receive from the school/teachers?	n	%
I did not receive any additional support from my school/teachers.	43	27.9
Home visits from teachers	11	7.1
One-on-one sessions with teachers when necessary	19	12.3
Additional time for completing classwork and assignments	64	41.6
Direction to online learning resources to support my learning	52	33.8
Other	3	1.9

Table 139: Primary Students' Satisfaction with Support from School (N=154)

How satisfied are you with the support you received from the SCHOOL for schooling online?	n	%
Very satisfied	88	57.1
Moderately satisfied	29	18.8
Barely satisfied	17	11.0
Not satisfied at all	18	11.1
No Response	2	1.3
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Most students (57.1 %) were very satisfied with the support they received from their teachers, while 11.1 % were not satisfied. 27.9% of students stated that they did not receive support from teachers during online learning. However, most students highlighted that they had additional time for completing classwork and assignments and had resources that supported their learning.

Table 140: Home Support Provided to Primary Students During Online Schooling (N=154)

What additional support did you receive at home?	n	%
I did not receive any additional support at home.	29	18.8
I got an appropriate device of my own	64	41.6
One-on-one sessions with teachers when necessary	24	15.6
Additional time for completing classwork and assignments	45	29.2
Direction to online learning resources to support my learning	36	23.4
Other	1	.6

Table 141: Primary Students' Satisfaction with Home Support (N=154)

How satisfied are you with the support you received at HOME for schooling online?	n	%
Very satisfied	87	56.6
Moderately satisfied	28	18.2
Barely satisfied	14	9.1
Not satisfied at all	20	13.0
No Response	5	3.2
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Most students (55.6%) were very satisfied with the support they received from home, while 13% were not satisfied. Most students had an appropriate device of their own and were given additional time to complete assignments.

Primary Students' Access to Technology During Online Schooling

Primary students were asked to indicate how often they had the technology they needed during online schooling, and their responses can be found in Table 142.

Table 142: Primary Students' Access to Technology During Online Schooling (N=154)

When you had online schoolwork, how often did you have the technology you needed?	n	%
Always	84	54.5
Often	27	17.5
Sometimes	32	20.8
Seldom	9	5.8
Never	1	.6
No Response	1	.6
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

54.5% of the children always had the appropriate device to access online classes. 20.8% sometimes had a device, while 17.5% often had it. One child did not have a device for class.

Primary Students' Perceptions and Experiences During the Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly impacted the lives of primary students, and they were asked about their perspectives, views and experiences during this time. Students were asked to rate the difficulty they experienced transitioning to online schooling and following safety protocols. They were also asked about the overall effect of the pandemic on their attitude toward learning. The results can be found in Tables 143 to 145.

Table 143: Ease of Following Safety Protocols for Primary Students during COVID-19 (N=154)

Statements that BEST applies to following rules when attending face-to-face school during COVID-19:	n	%
It was **always hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	45	29.2
It was **sometimes hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	43	27.9
It was **seldom hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	12	7.8
It was **never hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	52	33.8
No Response	2	1.3
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

There was a thin result between some children not finding it hard to follow safety rules while others found that it was always hard, resulting in only a 4.6% difference. This suggests that most children found following the Covid-19 safety rules difficult.

Table 144: Ease of Changing from Face-to-Face to Online for Primary Students (N=154)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **very hard** for me.	56	36.4
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **somewhat hard** for me.	14	9.1
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **a little hard** for me.	38	24.7
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **not hard at all** for me.	43	27.9
No Response	3	1.9
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Most of the students (36.4%) found it very hard to switch from face-to-face to online learning. Several (27.9%) had no issues switching, while some (24.7%) found the switch a little challenging.

Table 145: Impact of COVID-19 on Primary Students' Attitude to School (N=154)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **very good effect** on how I feel about school.	31	20.1
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **fairly good effect** on how I feel about school.	18	11.7
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **no effect** on how I feel about school.	37	24.0
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a fairly bad effect** on how I feel about school.	31	20.1
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a very bad effect** on how I feel about school.	35	22.7
No Response	2	1.3
TOTAL	**154**	**100**

Similar responses were received regarding how children felt about school and COVID-19. Most students felt that COVID-19 had no effect on their thoughts regarding school. The same number of students felt that it had a very good effect and a fairly bad effect on their learning.

Summary

The results reveal that during the COVID-19 pandemic, most students had online classes, with their preference being face-to-face instead of a blended approach. Students could access lessons primarily through worksheets, while others accessed lessons via the television, and some had no access. Students faced challenges during this time that included finding a difficult space to work, keeping up with their schoolwork, being unable to organise their time properly, lacking the motivation to do work, and lacking help from their teachers. The students were very satisfied with the school and home support. This support included additional time to complete assignments and have an appropriate device of their own. Students' accessibility to technology during this time was high, though students had trouble accessing the learning platforms and internet connection. Despite the challenges, students mentioned positive outcomes from online learning. These included spending more time with family, not having to travel to school and finding more time for other activities. Following the safety protocols at school was difficult for most students to follow. The shift to online learning was difficult for many, although others found the transition smooth.

Secondary Students' Experiences of Schooling During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Student School Attendance During Lockdown in Secondary Schools

Two questionnaire items asked students how they attended school during the island-wide lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic. Secondary student responses can be found in Tables 146 and 147.

Table 146: Secondary Students' Attendance During Lockdown (N=311)

How did you attend classes during the COVID-19 lockdown?	n	%
I did not attend classes during the lockdown	24	7.7
I accessed classes online during the lockdown	256	82.3
No Response	31	10.0
TOTAL	311	100.0

During the COVID-19 lockdown, 82.3% of secondary students accessed classes online.

Other methods reported by secondary students include being online and on their devices. Most students indicated that their teachers sent the worksheets to do.

Table 147: Secondary Students' Method of Accessing Lessons During Lockdown (N=311)

Methods of access to lessons	n	%
I had no access to lessons	32	10.3
I had access to lessons on the radio	6	1.9
I had access to lessons on television	21	6.8
My teachers sent me worksheets to do	173	55.6
Other	59	19.0
No Response	32	10.3

Challenges Faced During Online Schooling by Secondary Students

Secondary students were asked to indicate whether they experienced any challenges during online schooling and, if so, what kinds of technological challenges they experienced. They were also asked to indicate more general challenges when adjusting to online schooling. The proportion of Secondary students facing challenges and the kinds of challenges are reported in Tables 148 to 150.

Table 148: Secondary Students' Experiencing Challenges in Online Schooling (N=311)

Did you experience challenges doing schooling online?	n	%
Yes	234	75.2
No	45	14.5
No Response	32	10.3
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

75.2% of secondary students experienced challenges while doing online schooling.

Table 149: Secondary Students' Technology Challenges in Online Schooling (N=311)

Challenges in online schooling:	n	%
Didn't own a device	20	6.4
Device did not always work	67	21.5
No access to internet	26	8.4
Internet always dropping out	168	54
Had to share a device	24	7.7
Did not know how to use the learning platform (Google Classroom, Teams)	42	13.5
Trouble logging in to meeting spaces (e.g., Zoom)	172	55.3
Other	12	3.9
No Response	37	11.9

Students' most common challenges in online schooling were trouble logging in to meeting spaces, the internet always dropping out, and the device not always working.

Table 150: Secondary Students' Challenges Adjusting to Online Schooling (N=311)

Challenges shifting to online schooling:	n	%
Difficulty keeping up with my schoolwork	181	58.2
Difficulty organizing my time (e.g., getting to classes on time)	139	44.7
Not able to get extra help with schoolwork from teachers	103	33.1
Not feeling like doing schoolwork	144	46.3
Difficulty finding a quiet place to work	116	37.3
Other	7	2.3
Other	4	1.2
No Response	44	14.1

Students mainly experienced challenges such as difficulty keeping up with their schoolwork, not feeling like doing any schoolwork, difficulty finding a quiet place to work, and not being able to get extra help with schoolwork from teachers.

Positive Experiences During Online Schooling by Secondary Students

Secondary students were asked to indicate whether they had any positive experiences during online schooling and, if so, what kinds of experiences they perceived as positive. The proportion of Secondary students reporting positive experiences associated with online learning and the kinds of positive experiences are reported in Tables 151 and 152, respectively.

Table 151: Secondary Students' Positive Experiences during Online Schooling (N=311)

Did you have any positive experiences attending school online?	n	%
Yes	189	60.8
No	82	26.4
No Response	44	14.1
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

60.8% of students indicated that they had positive experiences attending school online.

Table 152: Secondary Students' Technology Challenges in Online Schooling (N=311)

Positive experiences in online schooling:	n	%
More time with family	119	38.3
More time for other activities	104	33.4
Not having to travel to school	107	34.4
More rest time	137	44.1
Staying in bed longer in the morning before having to get up for school	129	41.5
Others (Please state below):	7	2.3
Other	7	2.3
No Response	48	15.4

Students indicated that having more rest time was a positive experience during online schooling, staying in bed longer in the morning, spending more time with family, not having to travel to school, and having more time for other activities.

Secondary Students' Preferred Learning Environment

Students were asked about their preferences for face-to-face, online, or hybrid learning, and their responses can be found in Table 153.

Table 153: Secondary Students' Preferred Teaching Modality (N=311)

In which one of the following modalities do you prefer to attend school?	n	%
Face-to-face only	184	59.2
Online only	10	3.2
Some face-to-face and some online	82	26.4
Other modality	1	0.3
No Response	34	10.9
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

The most preferred modalities to attend school were face-to-face, followed by some face-to-face and some online.

Support Received by Secondary Students

Secondary students were asked what support they received during online schooling from the school and at home and their level of satisfaction with the support they received. Student responses to these items on the survey are shown in Tables 154 to 157.

Table 154: School Support Provided to Secondary Students During Online Schooling (N=311)

What additional support did you receive from the school/teachers?	n	%
I did not receive any additional support from my school/teachers.	82	26.4
Home visits from teachers	20	6.4
One-on-one sessions with teachers when necessary	46	14.8
Additional time for completing classwork and assignments	132	42.4
Direction to online learning resources to support my learning	52	16.7
Other	3	1.0
No Response	32	10.3

Almost half of the students indicated that they received additional time to complete classwork and assignments, while about a quarter indicated that they did not receive any additional support from teachers.

Table 155: Secondary Students' Satisfaction with Support from School (N=311)

How satisfied are you with the support you received from the SCHOOL for schooling online?	n	%
Very satisfied	64	20.6
Moderately satisfied	106	34.1
Barely satisfied	68	21.9
Not satisfied at all	35	11.3
No Response	38	12.2
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

Being moderately satisfied with the support received from school for online schooling was the most significant indicator, with 34.1%, followed by barely satisfied, with 21.9%, then very satisfied, with 20.6%, and not satisfied at all, with 11.3%. 38% of students did not respond.

Table 156: Home Support Provided to Secondary Students During Online Schooling (N=311)

What additional support did you receive at home?	n	%
I did not receive any additional support at home.	62	19.9
I got an appropriate device of my own	125	40.2
One-on-one sessions with teachers when necessary	27	8.7
Additional time for completing classwork and assignments	90	28.9
Direction to online learning resources to support my learning	47	15.1
Other	5	1.6
No Response	33	10.6

Most students indicated that they had an appropriate device during online schooling, while others stated that they received additional time for completing classwork and assignments.

Table 157: Secondary Students' Satisfaction with Home Support (N=311)

How satisfied are you with the support you received at HOME for schooling online?	n	%
Very satisfied	104	33.4
Moderately satisfied	79	25.4
Barely satisfied	55	17.7
Not satisfied at all	32	10.3
No Response	41	13.2
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

Most students (33.4%) indicated that they were very satisfied with the support they received at home during online schooling. 25.4% indicated that they were moderately satisfied, 17.7% indicated that they were barely satisfied, 10.3% indicated that they were not satisfied at all, and 13.2% did not respond.

Secondary Students' Access to Technology During Online Schooling

Secondary students were asked to indicate how often they had the technology they needed during online schooling, and their responses can be found in Table 158.

Table 158: Secondary Students' Access to Technology During Online Schooling (N=311)

When you had online schoolwork, how often did you have the technology you needed?	n	%
Always	177	56.6
Often	45	14.5
Sometimes	46	14.8
Seldom	0	0
Never	7	2.3
No Response	36	11.6
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

56.6% of students indicated that they always had the technology they needed during online schooling, 14.8% indicated that they sometimes had the technology they needed, 14.5% indicated that they often had the technology they needed, 2.3% indicated that they never had the technology they needed, and 11.6% did not respond.

Secondary Students' Perceptions and Experiences During the Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic profoundly impacted secondary students' lives, and they were asked about their perspectives, views and experiences during this time. Students were asked to rate the difficulty they experienced transitioning to online schooling and following safety protocols. They were also asked about the overall effect of the pandemic on their attitude toward learning. The results can be found in Tables 159 to 161.

Table 159: Ease of Following Safety Protocols for Secondary Students during COVID-19 (N=311)

Statements that BEST applies to following rules when attending face-to-face school during COVID-19:	n	%
It was **always hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	80	25.7
It was **sometimes hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	120	38.6
It was **seldom hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	26	8.4
It was **never hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	45	14.5
No Response	40	12.9
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

38.6% of students indicated that it was sometimes hard for them to follow the safety rules, 25.7% indicated that it was always hard for them to follow the safety rules, 14.5% indicated that it was

never hard for them to follow the rules, 12.9% did not respond, and 8.4% indicated that it was seldom hard for them to follow the rules.

Table 160: Ease of Changing from Face-to-Face to Online for Secondary Students (N=311)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **very hard** for me.	117	37.6
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **somewhat hard** for me.	54	17.4
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **a little hard** for me.	66	21.2
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **not hard at all** for me.	36	11.6
No Response	38	12.2
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

37.6% of students indicated that changing from face-to-face school was very hard for them, 21.2% indicated that it was a little hard for them, 17.4% indicated that it was somewhat hard, 11.6% indicated that it was not hard at all for them, and 12.2% of students did not respond.

Table 161: Impact of COVID-19 on Secondary Students' Attitude to School (N=311)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **very good effect** on how I feel about school.	39	12.5
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **fairly good effect** on how I feel about school.	55	17.7
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **no effect** on how I feel about school.	68	21.9
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a fairly bad effect** on how I feel about school.	44	14.1
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a very bad effect** on how I feel about school.	62	19.9
No Response	43	13.8
TOTAL	**311**	**100.0**

12.5% of the students indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic had a very good effect on their feelings about teaching, 17.7% indicated that they had a fairly good effect, 21.9% indicated that they had a fairly bad effect, 14.1% indicated that they had a fairly bad effect, and 13.8% did not respond.

Summary

Most students attended classes during the COVID-19 lockdown. They had access to their lessons through worksheets that their teachers sent. 75% of students experienced challenges doing schooling online. Some of these challenges included trouble logging in to meeting spaces, the device not always working, and not knowing how to use the learning platforms. Students also indicated that they had difficulty keeping up with their schoolwork, difficulty organising their time, they did not feel like doing schoolwork, they had difficulty finding a quiet place to work and they

were not able to get extra help with schoolwork from teachers. However, despite the students' challenges, they indicated they had positive experiences attending school online. Some of these positive experiences included having more rest time, staying in bed longer in the morning before getting up for school, having more time with family, not having to travel to school and having more time for other activities. Students preferred face-to-face only as the modality to attend school. Students received additional support from their school teachers by receiving additional time to complete classwork and assignments. Students indicated they were moderately satisfied with the support they received from their schools during online schooling. Students were provided home support during online schooling by having an appropriate device. Students were very satisfied with the home support that they received. Students indicated that they always had the technology that they needed. Students indicated that it was sometimes hard to follow the safety rules and that changing from face-to-face to online school was very hard for them. The COVID-19 pandemic did not affect how the students felt about school.

Primary Teachers' Experiences of Schooling During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Engagement and Teaching Methods During Lockdown in Primary Schools

Two items on the questionnaire asked teachers how they engaged students during the island-wide lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic. Teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they engaged students and to report on the methods used for engagement. Primary teacher responses can be found in Tables 162 and 163.

Table 162: Primary Teachers' Engagement/Teaching During Lockdown (N=98)

How did you engage/teach your students during the COVID-19 lockdown?	n	%
I did not engage/teach my students during the lockdown	5	5.1
I engaged/taught my students online during the lockdown	78	79.6
No Response	15	15.3
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Table 163: Primary Teachers' Method of Engagement/Teaching During Lockdown (N=98)

Did you at any time use any of the following means to engage your students? If so, please indicate which methods you used	n	%
I used (or directed my students to) lessons on the radio	2	2.0
I used (or directed my students to) lessons on television	9	9.2
I sent my students worksheets to do	45	45.9
I used other means to engage my students	13	13.3
No Response	29	29.6
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Other methods engaged by teachers were selected but not reported.

Challenges Faced During Online Schooling by Primary Teachers

Teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they experienced any challenges during online schooling and, if so, to indicate what kinds of challenges they experienced. The proportion of teachers facing challenges and the types of challenges can be seen in Tables 164 and 165.

Table 164: Primary Teachers' Experiencing Challenges in Online Schooling (N=98)

Did you experience challenges doing schooling online?	n	%
Yes	76	77.6
No	3	3.1
No Response	19	19.4
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Table 165: Primary Teachers' Challenges in Online Schooling (N=98)

Challenges in online schooling:	n	%
Preparing lessons for online teaching	30	30.6
Creating appropriate assessment activities to gauge learning in the online setting	47	48.0
Didn’t own a device	2	2.0
Device did not always work	25	25.5
No access to internet	17	17.3
Internet always dropping out (unstable)	70	71.4
Had to share a device	9	9.2
Did not know how to use the learning platform (Google Classroom, Teams)	12	12.2
Trouble logging in to meeting spaces (e.g., Zoom)	26	26.5
Dealing with parents in the online setting	58	59.2
Other challenge	19	19.4

Primary Teachers' Preferred Teaching Modalities

Teachers were asked about their preferences for face-to-face, online, or hybrid teaching, and their responses can be found in Table 166.

Table 166: Primary Teachers' Preferred Teaching Modality (N=98)

In which one of the following modalities do you prefer to engage your students?	n	%
Face-to-face only	41	41.8
Some face-to-face and some online	37	37.8
Other modality	1	1.0
No Response	19	19.4
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Platforms, Devices and Internet Access for Primary Teachers During COVID-19

Teachers were asked about communication applications, learning platforms, and electronic devices, the source of those devices, and their internet access during online schooling. Tables 167 to 171 show primary teachers' responses to these items.

Table 167: Learning Platforms Used by Primary Teachers (N=98)

Which of the following learning platforms have you used to engage your students?	n	%
Google Suite/Google Classroom	15	15.3
Moodle	1	1.0
Edmodo	6	6.1
Other	40	40.8
No Response	36	36.8
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Table 168: Communication Applications Used by Primary Teachers (N=98)

Which of the following communication applications have you used to engage your students?	n	%
Zoom Conferencing	18	18.4
Google Meet	7	7.1
Microsoft Teams	73	74.5
WhatsApp Messaging	54	55.1
Other	3	3.1

Table 169: Devices Used by Primary Teachers for Online Schooling (N=98)

Which of the following devices have you used for online schooling?	n	%
A desktop computer	9	9.2
A laptop computer	63	64.3
A tablet	63	64.3
A smartphone	42	42.9
Other	17	17.3

Table 170: Sources of Devices Used by Primary Teachers for Online Schooling (N=98)

Who provided the device(s) that you used for online schooling?	n	%
I used my own throughout the entire period of online schooling	33	33.7
I used my own at first, but then the Ministry of Education assigned me a device	12	12.2
No Response	53	54.1
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Table 171: Source of Internet Access for Primary Teachers during Online Schooling (N=98)

How have you accessed Internet services for online schooling?	n	%
At home	72	73.5
At the school	69	70.4
From a neighbour	4	4.1
From a community hotspot	4	4.1
Other	2	2.0
No Response	18	18.4
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Additional Support Provided by Primary Teachers

Teachers were asked what additional support they were able to provide for their students during online schooling. Primary teacher responses are shown in Table 172.

Table 172: Additional Student Support Provided by Primary Teachers During Online Schooling (N=98)

What additional support did you provide for your students during online schooling?	n	%
I did not provide any additional support for my students.	5	5.1
I paid home visits to some students	5	5.1
I offered one-on-one sessions with students when necessary	27	27.6
I gave additional time for completing classwork and assignments	55	56.1
I directed students to online resources to support their learning	57	58.2
Other	3	3.1

Primary Teachers' Perceptions and Experiences During the Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted primary teachers' professional and personal lives, and they were asked about their perspectives, views and experiences during this time. Teachers were asked to rate various aspects of the online teaching experience and the difficulty they experienced transitioning to online schooling and following safety protocols. They were also asked about the overall effect of the pandemic on their attitude toward teaching. The results can be found in Tables 173 to 176.

Summary

Results from the COVID-19 Pandemic show that despite isolation (lockdown), teachers could still engage their students using online platforms. The medium that was most used for engagement was worksheets. Most teachers did not use the television or radio to enhance engagement during the pandemic. The teachers preferred to engage students face-to-face only, with some consideration given to a blended approach. None of the teacher's preferences were online only. Teachers reported having experienced three significant challenges with teaching during the pandemic. The biggest was an unstable internet connection. The other two dealt with parents in the online classroom and planning activities to adequately assess the children. The least challenging factor was not having a device. Almost all teachers had access to a device. Different learning platforms and applications were utilised, with Microsoft Teams and WhatsApp being the most popular and Google Meet and Moodle being the least popular. Laptops and tablets were the more accessible devices that teachers used during the online platform, where most used their personal devices. Others were sourced from the Ministry of Education. Teachers used the online platforms at home or their schools. To provide additional support for students, most teachers offered extra time to complete assignments and directed students to internet sources for extra resources. Some provided one-to-one support. Teachers found that the Ministry of Education was supportive during this time, even more so than parents. Despite the additional support, teachers found teaching online to be very stressful. There was a fair response regarding their homes being conducive to teaching practises, likewise how comfortable they were with using skills necessary for this type of learning. They found that student's attendance was low, and participation was average. The same was reflected when asked about the teachers' motivation for online teaching. However, teachers were satisfied with the activities used during online teaching. Teachers found that it was sometimes hard for them to

follow the safety rules during the pandemic. Likewise, switching from face-to-face to online was somewhat hard for teachers. Despite the pandemic and all challenges, COVID-19 has not affected teachers' feelings about teaching.

Table 173: Primary Teachers' Perspectives on Various Aspects of Online Schooling (N=98)

Features	Ratings (% of sample)					
	0 Not at All Supportive	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Supportive**
How supportive was your school or Ministry of Education with respect to teaching online?	4.1	11.2	12.2	28.6	13.3	8.2
How supportive were your students' parents during online learning?	3.1	9.2	24.5	19.4	21.4	3.1
	0 Not at All Stressful	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Stressful**
How stressful did you find teaching online?	5.1	7.1	6.1	17.3	11.2	33.7
	0 Not at All Well	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Well**
How well were you able to balance work and personal life while teaching online?	3.1	5.1	7.1	33.7	15.5	14.3
	0 Not at All Conducive	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Conducive**
How conducive was your home environment for teaching online?	6.1	6.1	5.1	18.4	21.4	18.4
	0 Not at All Comfortable	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Comfortable**
How comfortable were you with using technology in online teaching?	2.0	12.2	23.5	16.3	25.5	79.6
	0 Extremely Poor	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Good**
How would you rate your students' learning in the online environment?	5.1	10.2	18.4	35.7	6.1	4.1
How would you rate your students' attendance for online classes?	6.1	17.3	22.4	23.5	10.2	1.0
How would you rate your students' participation?	2.0	6.1	23.5	28.6	17.3	3.1
	0 Not at All Motivated	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Motivated**
How motivated were you to teach online?	4.1	4.1	19.4	27.6	15.3	9.2
	0 Not at All Satisfied	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Satisfied**
How satisfied were you with your online teaching activities during the pandemic?	3.1	11.2	14.3	30.6	18.4	2.0

Table 174: Ease of Following Safety Protocols for Primary Teachers during COVID-19 (N=98)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
It was **always hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	10	10.2
It was **sometimes hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	33	33.7
It was **seldom hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	17	17.3
It was **never hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	16	16.3
No Response	22	22.4
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Table 175: Ease of Changing from Face-to-Face to Online for Primary Teachers (N=98)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **very hard** for me.	18	18.4
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **somewhat hard** for me.	20	20.4
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **a little hard** for me.	18	18.4
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **not hard at all** for me.	17	17.3
No Response	25	25.5
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Table 176: Impact of COVID-19 on Primary Teachers' Attitude to Teaching (N=98)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **very good effect** on how I feel about teaching.	3	3.1
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **fairly good effect** on how I feel about teaching.	19	19.4
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **no effect** on how I feel about teaching.	29	29.6
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a fairly bad effect** on how I feel about teaching.	13	13.3
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a very bad effect** on how I feel about teaching.	9	9.2
No Response	25	25.5
TOTAL	**98**	**100**

Secondary Teachers' Experiences of Schooling During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Engagement and Teaching Methods During Lockdown in Secondary Schools

Two items on the questionnaire asked teachers how they engaged students during the island-wide lockdown during the COVID-19 pandemic. Teachers were asked to indicate whether or not they engaged students and to report on the methods used for engagement. Secondary teacher responses can be found in Tables 177 and 178.

Table 177: Secondary Teachers' Engagement/Teaching During Lockdown (N=105)

How did you engage/teach your students during the COVID-19 lockdown?	n	%
I did not engage/teach my students during the lockdown	4	3.8
I engaged/taught my students online during the lockdown	90	85.7
No Response	11	10.5
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Most teachers (85.7%) engaged or taught their students during lockdown.

Table 178: Secondary Teachers' Method of Engagement/Teaching During Lockdown (N=105)

Did you at any time use any of the following means to engage your students? If so, please indicate which methods you used	n	%
I used (or directed my students to) lessons on television	8	7.6
I sent my students worksheets to do	64	61.0
I used other means to engage my students	12	11.4
No Response	21	22.0
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

During the COVID-19 lockdown, most teachers (61%) sent their students worksheets to do with a minority (7.6%) directed their students to lessons on television, and 11.4% used other means of engagement.

Challenges Faced During Online Schooling by Secondary Teachers

Teachers were asked to indicate whether they experienced any challenges during online schooling and, if so, what kinds of challenges they experienced. Tables 179 and 180 show the proportion of teachers facing challenges and the types of challenges.

Table 179: Secondary Teachers' Experiencing Challenges in Online Schooling (N=105)

Did you experience challenges doing schooling online?	n	%
Yes	87	82.9
No	5	4.8
No Response	13	12.4
TOTAL	105	100.0

Most teachers 82.9% of teachers indicated that they experienced challenges in online schooling.

The secondary teachers experienced challenges during online schooling, including creating appropriate assessment activities to gauge learning in the online setting (40%), unstable internet (67.6%), and dealing with parents in the online setting (28.6%).

Table 180: Secondary Teachers' Challenges in Online Schooling (N=105)

Challenges in online schooling:	n	%
Preparing lessons for online teaching	31	29.5
Creating appropriate assessment activities to gauge learning in the online setting	42	40.0
Didn't own a device	4	3.8
Device did not always work	14	13.3
No access to internet	10	9.5
Internet always dropping out (unstable)	71	67.6
Had to share a device	3	2.9
Did not know how to use the learning platform (Google Classroom, Teams)	9	8.6
Trouble logging in to meeting spaces (e.g., Zoom)	19	18.1
Dealing with parents in the online setting	30	28.6
Other challenge	26	24.8
No Response	21	22
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Secondary Teachers' Preferred Teaching Modalities

Teachers were asked about their preferences for face-to-face, online, or hybrid teaching; their responses are shown in Table 181.

Table 181: Secondary Teachers' Preferred Teaching Modality (N=105)

In which one of the following modalities do you prefer to engage your students?	n	%
Face-to-face only	46	43.8
Some face-to-face and some online	45	42.9
Other modality	1	1.0
No Response	13	12.4
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Teachers resoundingly preferred the face-to-face modality (43.8%) of engaging students and the hybrid method (42.9%) for their preferred teaching modalities.

Platforms, Devices and Internet Access for Secondary Teachers During COVID-19

Teachers were asked about communication applications, learning platforms, and electronic devices, the source of those devices, and their internet access during online schooling. Secondary teachers' responses to these items can be found in Tables 182 to 186.

Table 182: Learning Platforms Used by Secondary Teachers (N=105)

Which of the following learning platforms have you used to engage your students?	n	%
Google Suite/Google Classroom	41	39.0
Moodle	17	16.2
Edmodo	13	12.4
Other	50	47.6
No Response	10	9.5
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Teachers selected Google Suite/Google Classroom as the most used learning platform (39%), with 47.6% of teachers selecting that they use other learning platforms to engage students.

Table 183: Communication Applications Used by Secondary Teachers (N=105)

Which of the following communication applications have you used to engage your students?	n	%
Zoom Conferencing	41	39.0
Google Meet	26	24.8
Microsoft Teams	63	60.0
WhatsApp Messaging	46	43.8
Other	9	8.6
No Response	10	9.5
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Of all the communication applications used by Secondary Teachers, Microsoft Teams was the most popular (60%), followed by WhatsApp Messaging (43.8%), Zoom Conferencing (39%), and Google Meet (24.8%).

Table 184: Devices Used by Secondary Teachers for Online Schooling (N=105)

Which of the following devices have you used for online schooling?	n	%
A desktop computer	8	7.6
A laptop computer	82	78.1
A tablet	66	62.9
A smartphone	38	36.2
Other	2	1.9
No Response	10	9.5

Secondary teachers use a laptop computer (78.1%), a tablet (62.9%), and a smartphone (36.2%) for online schooling.

Table 185: Sources of Devices Used by Secondary Teachers' for Online Schooling (N=105)

Who provided the device(s) that you used for online schooling?	n	%
I used my own throughout the entire period of online schooling	65	61.9
I used my own at first, but then the school assigned me a device	1	1.0
I used my own at first, but then the Ministry of Education assigned me a device	28	26.7
No Response	11	10.5
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Secondary teachers used various devices for online schooling, including their own, throughout the entire period (61.9%). Some teachers initially used their own devices, but then the Ministry of Education assigned them a device (26.7%).

Table 186: Source of Internet Access for Secondary Teachers' during Online Schooling (N=105)

How have you accessed Internet services for online schooling?	n	%
At home	88	83.8
At the school	13	12.4
From a neighbour	2	1.9
Other	3	2.9
No Response	10	9.5

Most secondary school teachers accessed the internet at home (83.8%) during online schooling, while others accessed the internet at school (12.4%).

Additional Support Provided by Secondary Teachers

Teachers were asked what additional support they were able to provide for their students during online schooling. Secondary teacher responses are shown in Table 187.

Table 187: Additional Student Support Provided by Secondary Teachers' During Online Schooling (N=105)

What additional support did you provide for your students during online schooling?	n	%
I did not provide any additional support for my students.	3	2.9
I paid home visits to some students	7	6.7
I offered one-on-one sessions with students when necessary	26	24.8
I gave additional time for completing classwork and assignments	68	64.8
I directed students to online resources to support their learning	75	71.4
Other	8	7.6
No Response	10	9.5

During online schooling, teachers directed students to online resources to support their learning (71.4%), gave additional time for completing classwork and assignments (64.8%) and offered one-on-one sessions with students when necessary (24.8%).

Secondary Teachers' Perceptions and Experiences During the Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic impacted secondary teachers' professional and personal lives, and they were asked about their perspectives, views and experiences during this time. Teachers were asked to rate various aspects of the online teaching experience and the difficulty they experienced transitioning to online schooling and following safety protocols. They were also asked about the overall effect of the pandemic on their attitude toward teaching. The results can be found in Tables 188 to 191.

Secondary school teachers found the Ministry of Education to be moderately supportive (36.2%) along with the students' parents (26.7%). Teachers found online teaching to be very stressful (31.4%) and were able to moderately balance their work and personal life while teaching online (36.2%). Teachers indicated that their homes were conducive to online teaching (31.4%) and were very comfortable with using technology in online teaching (32.4%). Teachers rated their students' online learning as moderate (36.2%), with their attendance being almost good at 24.8%. Teachers rated the students' online participation as moderate with 33.3%. Teachers indicated they were moderately motivated to teach online (30.5%) and moderately satisfied (27.6%) with their online teaching activities.

Teachers reported that it was sometimes hard for them to follow the safety rules (29.5%), 28.6% indicated that it was seldom hard to follow the safety rules, and 24.8% reported that it was never hard for them to follow the safety rules.

During online teaching, teachers mainly found that changing from face-to-face school to online school was somewhat hard for them (31.4%), with 21.9% indicating that it was not hard at all.

Table 188: Secondary Teachers' Perspectives on Various Aspects of Online Schooling (N=105)

Features	Ratings (% of sample)					
	0 Not at All Supportive	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Supportive**
How supportive was your school or Ministry of Education with respect to teaching online?	1.0	10.5	7.6	36.2	20.0	11.4
How supportive were your students' parents during online learning?	5.7	16.2	22.9	26.7	6.7	7.6
	0 Not at All Stressful	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Stressful**
How stressful did you find teaching online?	1.9	3.8	14.3	21.0	14.3	31.4
	0 Not at All Well	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Well**
How well were you able to balance work and personal life while teaching online?	1.0	5.7	4.8	36.2	22.9	17.1
	0 Not at All Conducive	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Conducive**
How conducive was your home environment for teaching online?	1.9	5.7	8.6	17.1	21.0	31.4
	0 Not at All Comfortable	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Comfortable**
How comfortable were you with using technology in online teaching?	0	1.9	5.7	19.0	27.6	32.4
	0 Extremely Poor	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Good**
How would you rate your students' learning in the online environment?	3.8	10.5	36.2	31.4	4.8	1.0
How would you rate your students' attendance for online classes?	16.2	21.9	18.1	24.8	5.7	1.9
How would you rate your students' participation?	5.7	14.3	26.7	33.3	3.8	3.8
	0 Not at All Motivated	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Motivated**
How motivated were you to teach online?	4.8	4.8	14.3	30.5	22.9	10.5
	0 Not at All Satisfied	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Very Satisfied**
How satisfied were you with your online teaching activities during the pandemic?	2.9	9.5	18.1	27.6	22.9	4.8

Table 189: Ease of Following Safety Protocols for Secondary Teachers during COVID-19 (N=105)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
It was **always hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	6	5.7
It was **sometimes hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	31	29.5
It was **seldom hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	30	28.6
It was **never hard** for me to follow the safety rules.	26	24.8
No Response	12	11.4
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Table 190: Ease of Changing from Face-to-Face to Online for Secondary Teachers (N=105)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **very hard** for me.	16	15.2
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **somewhat hard** for me.	33	31.4
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **a little hard** for me.	20	19.0
Changing from face-to-face school to online school was **not hard at all** for me.	23	21.9
No Response	13	12.4
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

Table 191: Impact of COVID-19 on Secondary Teachers' Attitude to Teaching (N=105)

Statements that BEST applies:	n	%
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **very good effect** on how I feel about teaching.	7	6.7
The COVID-19 pandemic has had a **fairly good effect** on how I feel about teaching.	19	18.1
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **no effect** on how I feel about teaching.	39	37.1
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a fairly bad effect** on how I feel about teaching.	20	19.0
The COVID-19 pandemic has had **a very bad effect** on how I feel about teaching.	6	5.7
No Response	14	13.3
TOTAL	**105**	**100.0**

37.1% of teachers reported that the COVID-19 pandemic had no effect on their feelings about teaching, while 19% indicated that the pandemic had a fairly bad effect. 18.1% of teachers indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic had a fairly good effect on their feelings about teaching.

Summary

Teachers engaged their students online during the lockdown and mainly sent worksheets for their students to complete. Most teachers experienced challenges in online schooling, such as dealing

with unstable internet, creating appropriate assessment activities to gauge learning in the online setting, preparing lessons for online teaching, and dealing with parents in the online setting.

Teachers preferred face-to-face only and hybrid methods of engaging students during online teaching. Teachers preferred using Google Suite/Google Classroom as their learning platforms to engage students. Teachers also used Microsoft Teams, WhatsApp Messaging and Zoom conferencing to engage their students during online teaching. Devices used by teachers for online teaching include a laptop computer, a tablet and a smartphone. Most teachers used their own devices throughout the entire online schooling, and some teachers used their own devices at first, but then the Ministry of Education assigned them a device. Most teachers accessed the internet at home and school. Most teachers directed students to online resources to support their learning during online schooling, while some teachers gave additional time to complete classwork and assignments.

Teachers indicated that their school or Ministry of Education was moderately supportive with respect to teaching online and that the parents of students were moderately supportive during online learning. Teachers also indicated that teaching online was very stressful and that they could only moderately balance work and personal life while teaching online. However, their home environments were very conducive to teaching online. Most teachers indicated that they were comfortable using technology in online teaching and rated their students' learning in the online environment as moderate. Students' attendances were rated as moderate for online classes and student participation. Teachers were moderately motivated to teach online and were almost satisfied with their teaching online activities during the pandemic.

Teachers consistently indicated that following the safety rules was sometimes hard for some, seldom hard for some, and never hard for them. Most teachers also indicated that changing from face-to-face to online school was somewhat challenging. Most teachers also indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic did not affect their feelings about teaching.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Students

1. Examine the decline in reading with students at home. Implement more reading initiatives at schools and within the communities to help build relationships between students and community members and raise the importance of reading.
2. Examine why there has been a decline in participation in extracurricular activities. Make extracurricular activities mandatory at all schools. Each student should take part in at least one activity during school time.
3. Examine why student engagement has decreased at school, i.e. Why do they now find it boring? Allow students to use technology in schools to mirror and facilitate the new technological era. Have a healthy balance regarding homework, with more practical exercises and fewer worksheets and textbook sums for children.

Teachers

1. Implement incentives or local award programmes to encourage teachers who are performing exceptionally to continue to do so and to encourage other teachers who can improve tremendously to increase their performances.
2. Maintain support for initiatives that attract and retain female teachers while seeking ways to bring more male teachers into the primary education sector to enhance gender diversity.
3. Create and execute recruitment campaigns to increase the number of male teachers in primary education. Use outreach programs, scholarships, and other incentives to emphasise the advantages and career opportunities of teaching to male candidates.
4. Implement mentorship and support systems tailored explicitly for male teachers to boost their professional growth.
5. Motivate male teachers to take on prominent leadership positions and act as role models for students. Share their success stories to inspire others to pursue teaching.
6. Allocate extra resources and support to subjects with declining numbers of secondary teachers to ensure a balanced education for students. Investigate the factors behind the teacher shortages in certain subjects and develop strategies to address these challenges.

Principals

1. Advocate for and support efforts to increase the number of potential male principals pursuing leadership positions in primary education, aiming to achieve greater gender diversity in school administration.
2. Promote continuous professional development and obtain higher qualifications for primary and secondary school principals to ensure they possess the required expertise for effective leadership.
3. Continue and possibly augment professional development programs in school leadership and management to guarantee that principals are fully equipped for their roles in both primary and secondary schools.

What's Next…

In the pre-COVID (2017) and post-COVID (2022/2024) periods, data were collected from primary and secondary students, teachers and school principals from Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean to investigate certain home and school factors that known to influence academic achievement, both at the individual level and school level. This report focused on the data collected in St Vincent and the Grenadines. It provides a descriptive summary of the responses from the various participant groups in this country that shed light on the home and school factors investigated and, in some cases, discusses implications.

A follow-up to this report is imminent. The follow-up report will examine the relationship between home and school factors summarised in this current report and academic achievement at the school level. Using primarily correlational analysis, we will explore, for example, the link between:

- school leadership and students' attitudes to school and learning
- school leadership and teachers' instructional practices
- students' home literacy behaviour and school achievement
- students' attitudes to school and learning and school achievement
- students' perceptions of their school and school achievement

Such issues will be explored for the pre- and post-COVID periods.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Z., Ziden, A., Aman, R., & Mustafa, K. (2015). Students' attitudes towards information technology and the relationship with their academic achievement. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 6*(4), 338-354.

Agirdag, O., Yazici, Z., & Sierens, S. (2015). Trends in pre-school enrolment in Turkey: Unequal access and differential consequences. *Comparative Education, 51*(4), 537-554.

Akey, T. (2006). *School context, student attitudes and behaviour, and academic achievement: An exploratory analysis.* Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Albee, J., Smith, M., Arnold, J., & Dennis, L. (2019). Digging struggling students out of the summer reading slump. *The Reading Teacher, 73*(3), 291-299.

Allen, C., Diamond-Myrsten, S., & Rollins, L. (2018). School absenteeism in children and adolescents. *American Family Physician, 98*(12), 738–744.

Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the relationship among transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 10*(2), 1-22.

APA Presidential Task Force on Evidence-Based Practice. (2006). Evidence-based practice in psychology. *The American Psychologist, 61*(4), 271-285. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.61.4.271

Asoodeh, M., Asoodeh, M., & Zarepour, M. (2012). The impact of student-centered learning on academic achievement and social skills. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 46*, 560-564.

Bara, G., & Xhomara, N. (2020). The effect of student-centered teaching and problem-based learning on academic achievement in science. *Journal of Turkish Science Education, 17*(2), 180-198.

Bartley, M. (2024). Examining the School Climate Influence on Jamaican Secondary School Students: A Comprehensive Literature Review. *Caribbean Journal of Education and Development, 1*(3), 43-59.

Blackman, S. (2017). From charity education to inclusion: The development of special and inclusive education in Barbados. In S. Blackman & D. Conrad (Eds.) *Caribbean Discourse in Inclusive Education: Historical and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 3-20). Information Age Publishing.

Blackman, S. N. (2022). The impact of COVID-19 on education equity: A view from Barbados and Jamaica. *Prospects, 51*(4), 611-625.

Boliver, V., & Capsada-Munsech, Q. (2021). Does ability grouping affect UK primary school pupils' enjoyment of Maths and English? *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility, 76*, 100629.

Boonk, L., Gijselaers, H. J., Ritzen, H., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2018). A review of the relationship between parental involvement indicators and academic achievement. *Educational Research Review, 24*, 10-30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.001

Bowe, A. (2012). A cross-cultural comparison of predictors of achievement amongst Caribbean students: Attitudes and behaviors that may explain the achievement gap between girls and boys in the English-speaking Caribbean. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota].

Bradbury, A. (2019, April). Rethinking 'fixed-ability thinking' and grouping practices: Questions, disruptions and barriers to change in primary and early years education. *Forum, 61*(1), 41-52

Brissett, N. (2021). A critical appraisal of education in the Caribbean and its evolution from colonial origins to twenty-first-century responses. In *Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of Education.* https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1650

Bristol, L. (2012). *Plantation Pedagogy: A Postcolonial and Global Perspective.* New York: Peter Lang.

Bristol, T. (2017). Why teachers and students stay home: A mixed-methods analysis of teacher and student absenteeism across nine schools in Guyana. *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development, 19*(4), 134–149.

Brown, L. I., Esnard, T., & Bristol, L. (2014). Relating professional in-school networks, school leadership, and assessment data to academic performance in Trinidad and Tobago: An exploration. *Caribbean Curriculum, pp. 22*, 1–34.

Bubb, S., & Jones, M. A. (2020). Learning from the COVID-19 home-schooling experience: Listening to pupils, parents/carers and teachers. *Improving Schools, 23*(3), 209–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480220958797

Campbell, T. (2021). In-class 'ability'-grouping, teacher judgements and children's mathematics self-concept: evidence from primary-aged girls and boys in the UK Millennium Cohort Study. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 51*(5), 563–587.

Caribbean Examinations Council (2022). *Annual Report 2022.* https://www.cxc.org/cxc-annual-report-2022/

Cook, L., & Ezenne, A. (2010). Factors influencing Students' absenteeism in primary schools in Jamaica: perspectives of community members. *Caribbean Curriculum, 17*, 33-57.

Cook-Sather, A. (2020). Student voices across contexts: fostering student agency in today's schools. *Theory Intro Practice,* 59(2), 182-191.

Crossley, M. (2019). Policy transfer, sustainable development and the contexts of education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2018.1558811

Darling, S., & Westberg, L. (2004). Parent involvement in children's acquisition of reading. *The Reading Teacher, 57*(8), 774.

Diery, A., Vogel, F., Knogler, M., & Seidel, T. (2020). Evidence-based practice in higher education: Teacher educators' attitudes, challenges, and uses. *Frontiers in Education, 5*, https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00062

Dulay, S., & Karadağ, E. (2017). The effect of school climate on student achievement. In E. Karadağ (Ed.). *The Factors Affecting Student Achievement: Meta-analysis of Empirical Studies* (pp 199-213). Springer.

Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*(1), 109–132.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. (2012). *Policy brief: Evidence-based policy making in the Caribbean.* https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstreams/bf1a46dc-18af-4db8-97af-ccbcf5845662/download

Edgerton, J., Peters, G., & Shamley, D. (2023). Community support and parental engagement in the Caribbean: A pathway to academic success. *Caribbean Journal of Education, 45*(1), 52–65.

Emanet, E., & Kezer, F. (2021). The effects of student-centered teaching methods used in mathematics courses on mathematics achievement, attitude, and anxiety: a meta-analysis study. *Participatory Educational Research, 8*(2), 240-259.

Escayg, K. A., & Kinkead-Clark, Z. (2018). Mapping the contours of Caribbean early childhood education. *Global Education Review, 5*(4), 236–253.

Eshetu, A. (2015). The impact of attending pre-school education on later academic achievement of students: Empirical evidences from Dessie, Ethiopia. Basic *Research Journal of Education Research and Review, 4*(3), 72–80.

Farooq, M., Chaudhry, A., Shafiq, M., & Berhanu, G. (2011). Factors affecting students' quality of academic performance: A case of secondary school level. *Journal of Quality and Technology Management, 7*(2), 1-14.

Fikuree, W., Shiyama, A., Muna, A., Naseer, B., & Mohamed, Z. (2021). Challenges to education from the Covid-19 pandemic: A SIDS perspective with special reference to the situation in the Maldives. *International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives, 20*(2), 5-22.

Fraser, S. (2018). The Effects of Computer Aided Instruction in Caribbean Studies on the Academic Performance of Students in the Lower Sixth Form at President's College. *International Journal of Arts Humantieis and Social Sciences, 2*(8), 1-6.

George, N. (2015). *Technology-Enabled learning in the Commonwealth Caribbean countries: A baseline study*. Commonwealth of Learning, BC.

Goos, M., Pipa, J., & Peixoto, F. (2021). Effectiveness of grade retention: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 34*, 100401.

Gorard, S., See, B., & Siddiqui, N. (2020). What is the evidence on the best way to get evidence into use in education? *Review of Education, 8*(2), 570-610. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3200

Greenhow, C., & Galvin, S. (2020). Teaching with social media: evidence-based strategies for making remote higher education less remote. *Information and Learning Sciences, 121*(7/8), 513-524. https://doi.org/ 10.1108/ILS-04-2020-0138

Hallinger, P., & Wang, W. (2015). *Assessing instructional leadership with the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Hancock, K., Lawrence, D., Shepherd, C., Mitrou, F., & Zubrick, S. (2017). Associations between school absence and academic achievement: Do socioeconomics matter? *British Educational Research Journal, 43*(3), 415-440.

Hartas, D. (2012). Inequality and the home learning environment: Predictions about seven-year-olds' language and literacy. *British Educational Research Journal, 38*(5), 859-879.

Haslip, M. (2018). The effects of public pre-kindergarten attendance on first grade literacy achievement: A district study. *International Journal of Child Care and Education Policy, 12*(1).

Heaven, G., & Bourne, P. (2016). Instructional leadership and its effect on students' academic performance. *Review of Public Administration and Management, 4*(3), 1-20.

Heppt, B., Olczyk, M., & Volodina, A. (2022). Number of books at home as an indicator of socioeconomic status: Examining its extensions and their incremental validity for academic achievement. *Social Psychology of Education, 25*(4), 903-928.

Hoffmann, T., Bennett, S., & Del Mar, C. (2023). *Evidence-based practice across the health professions.* Elsevier Health Sciences.

Hogrebe, N., & Strietholt, R. (2016). Does non-participation in preschool affect children's reading achievement? International evidence from propensity score analyses. *Large-scale Assessments in Education, 4*, 1-22.

Irvine J. (2010). Foreword. In Milner's H.R. (Ed.). *Culture, curriculum, and identity in education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jamil, F., & Khalid, R. (2016). Predictors of academic achievement in primary school students. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 31*(1), 45-61.

Jennings, Z., Cook, L., Anderson, S., & Huton, D. (2017). Interventions to address the root causes of absenteeism in remote rural primary schools in Jamaica: Challenges to sustainability and implications of the results. *Journal of Education & Development in the Caribbean, 16*(2).

Jerrim, J., Lopez-Agudo, L., & Marcenaro-Gutierrez, O. (2022). Grade retention and school entry age in Spain: a structural problem. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 34*(3), 331-359.

Jimerson, S. R., Durbrow, E. H., Adam, E., Gunnar, M., & Bozoky, I. K. (2006). Associations among academic achievement, attention, and adrenocortical reactivity in Caribbean village children. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 21*(1-2), 120–138. https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573506298899

Jules, T., & Williams, H. (2016). Education reform initiatives in the Caribbean basin. In I. Minto-Coy & E. Berman (Eds.) *Public Administration and Policy in the Caribbean* (pp. 247-293). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1201/b18667-16

Jules, D. (2010). Rethinking education for the Caribbean: A radical approach. In P. Mayo (Ed.) *Education in Small States: Global Imperatives, Regional Initiatives and Local Dilemmas* (pp. 79-90). Routledge

Keppens, G. (2023). School absenteeism and academic achievement: Does the timing of the absence matter? *Learning and Instruction, 86*, 101769.

Klein, M., Sosu, E. M., & Dare, S. (2022). School absenteeism and academic achievement: does the reason for absence matter? *AERA Open, 8*, 23328584211071115.

Knight, V., & Obidah, J. (2014). Instituting Universal Secondary Education: Caribbean Students' Perceptions of their Schooling Experiences. *Journal of Education and Practice, 5*(32).

Kobrin, J., & Michel, R. (2006). *The SAT as a predictor of different levels of college performance* (Report No. 2006-3). College Board Publications, New York. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED563073.pdf

Kocak, O. Goksu, I., & Goktas, Y. (2021). The factors affecting academic achievement: a systematic review of meta analyses. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET), 8*(1), 454-484.

Kpolovie, P. J., Joe, A. I., & Okoto, T. (2014). Academic achievement prediction: Role of interest in learning and attitude towards school. International *Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education, 1*(11), 73-100.

La Salle, T., Rocha-Neves, J., Jimerson, S., Di Sano, S., Martinsone, B., Majercakova Albertova, S., ... & Zvyagintsev, R. (2021). A multinational study exploring adolescent perception of school climate and mental health. *School Psychology, 36*(3), 155.

Layne, A., Jules, V., Kutnick, P., & Layne, C. (2008). Academic achievement, pupil participation and integration of group work skills in secondary school classrooms in Trinidad and Barbados. *International Journal of Educational Development, 28*(2), 176-194.

Leacock, C. (2009). Quality education for all in the eastern Caribbean: Rethinking the curriculum in the face of universal secondary education. *Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies, 34*(3), 19-38.

https://www.proquest.com/docview/216618629?parentSessionId=oAtYS0s%2BFwcjz6vFYomZ5XngQG%2BNTr9N9HeVrsjEsYU%3D&sourcetype=Scholarly%20Journals

Leacock, C. J., Thompson, B. P., Burnett, A. & Obidah, J. (2007). *The Academic Achievement of Barbados Public Primary and Secondary Schools 1999 – 2005: A Comprehensive Report*. Education Evaluation Centre, UWI Cave Hill.

Leacock, C. J., & Warrican, S. J. (2011, March). Learning with Technology: Experiences of Using an Online Environment to Promote Democracy in Caribbean Classrooms. In *Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 2883-2888). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE).

Leacock, C. J., & Warrican, S. J. (2020). Helping teachers to respond to COVID-19 in the Eastern Caribbean: issues of readiness, equity and care. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 46*(4), 576-585.

Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Education Sciences, 11*(8), 377.

Leseman, P., & De Jong, P. (1998). Home literacy: Opportunity, instruction, cooperation and social-emotional quality predicting early reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 33*(3), 294-318.

Lewis, W. (2020). *Teacher absenteeism and the perceived reasons for its effect on student achievement in three Barbadian secondary schools.* [Doctoral dissertation, Durham University].

Lipps, G., Lowe, G. A., Gibson, R. C., Halliday, S., Morris, A., Clarke, N., & Wilson, R. N. (2010). Symptoms among adolescents in three Caribbean countries. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 4*(6).

Luthans, F., Luthans, B., & Luthans, K. (2021). *Organizational behavior: An evidence-based approach* (14th ed.). Information Age Publishing.

Mariano, L., Martorell, P., & Berglund, T. (2018). The effects of grade retention on high school outcomes: Evidence from New York City schools. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness,* 1-31.

Marshall, D., & Jackman, M. (2015). Socio-economic status, parental involvement, and academic outcomes in Caribbean schools. *International Journal of Educational Development, 40,* 35-45.

Marshall, D., Jackman, M., & Simmons, S. (2014). Parental involvement and the "secondary slump" in Caribbean schools. *Caribbean Educational Research Journal, 2*(1), 12-28.

Martin, T. G., Martin, A. J., & Evans, P. (2016). Student engagement in the Caribbean region: Exploring its role in the motivation and achievement of Jamaican middle school students. *School Psychology International, 38*(2), 184-200. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034316683765

Maxwell, S., Reynolds, K. J., Lee, E., Subasic, E., & Bromhead, D. (2017). The impact of school climate and school identification on academic achievement: Multilevel modeling with student and teacher data. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02069

Miller, P. (2016) Caribbean Perspectives - Developing Successful and Effective School Leadership. In: *Successful School Leadership International Perspectives*. Bloomsbury, London, UK, pp. 81-91. ISBN 9781472586377

Milner, H. (2012). Beyond a test score: Explaining opportunity gaps in educational practice. *Journal of Black Studies,* 43(6), 693-718.

Mitchell, D., & Sutherland, D. (2020). *What really works in special and inclusive education: Using evidence-based teaching strategies.* Routledge.

Neuman, S. B. (2017). The information book flood: Is additional exposure enough to support early literacy development? *The Elementary School Journal, 118*(1), 1-27.

Neuman, S., & Moland, N. (2016). Book deserts: The consequences of income segregation on children's access to print. *Urban Education, 54*(1), 126-147.

Odongo, O., Otyola, W., & Loyce, K. (2021). Cognitive based classroom streaming and self-esteem among secondary school students in Lira district. *American Journal of Education and Practice, 5*(1), 22-36.

OECD (2023). *PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education*, PISA, OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en.

Papachristou, E., Flouri, E., Joshi, H., Midouhas, E., & Lewis, G. (2022). Ability-grouping and problem behavior trajectories in childhood and adolescence: Results from a UK population-based sample. *Child Development, 93*(2), 341-358.

Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher Education for the Future, 8*(1), 133-141.

Parsons, S., & Hallam, S. (2014). The impact of streaming on attainment at age seven: evidence from the Millennium Cohort Study. *Oxford Review of Education, 40*(5), 567-589.

Pilgrim, M., & Hornby, G. (2019). The implications of selective secondary education for inclusive education in Barbados. In S. Blackman, D. Conrad & L. Brown (Eds.). *Achieving Inclusive Education in the Caribbean and Beyond: From Philosophy to Praxis*, 35-49.

Precious, E., & Feyisetan, A. (2020). Influence of teacher-centered and student-centered teaching methods on the academic achievement of post-basic students in biology in Delta State, Nigeria. *Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies, 5*(3), 120-124.

Press Release. (2019). *National summary for CXC CSEC 2019.* Retrieved from https://www.nowgrenada.com/2019/08/national-summary-for-cxc-csec-2019/

Print, M., Ørnstrøm, S., & Nielsen, H. (2002). Education for democratic processes in schools and classrooms. *European Journal of Education, 37*(2), 193-210.

Rabiner, D., Godwin, J., & Dodge, K. (2016). Predicting academic achievement and attainment: The contribution of early academic skills, attention difficulties, and social competence. *School Psychology Review, 45*(2), 250-267.

Rodríguez-Rodríguez, D. (2022). Grade retention, academic performance and motivational variables in Compulsory Secondary Education: a longitudinal study. *Psicothema, 34*(3), 429-436.

Rubie-Davies, C. (2009). Teacher Expectations and Labeling. In L. Saha & A. Dworkin (Eds.), *International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 695-707). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-73317-3_43.

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 54-67.

Sackett, D., & Rosenberg, W. (1995). The need for evidence-based medicine. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 88*(11), 605-664. https://doi.org/10.1177/014107689508801105

Sammons, P., Toth, K., Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Siraj, I., & Taggart, B. (2015). The long-term role of the home learning environment in shaping students' academic attainment in secondary school. *Journal of Children's Services, 10*(3), 189-201.

Sappleton, S. J., & Adams, D. (2022). On Decolonizing US Education: Lessons from the Caribbean and South Africa. *Professional Educator, 45*(1), 42-57. https://doi.org/10.47038/tpe.45.01.11

Schlee, B., Mullis, A., & Shriner, M. (2009). Parents social and resource capital: Predictors of academic achievement during early childhood. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(2), 227-234.

Shah, K., & Kelman, I. (2024, April). *Institutional capacity, useability of data, and evidence-based decision-making for sustainable development in Small Island Developing States.* (ODI SIDS Future Forum 2024 Working Paper). https://odi.org/documents/9046/Shah_Institutional_capacity_useability_of_data_and_evidence-based_decision-making_for.pdf

Slavin, R. E. (2020). How evidence-based reform will transform research and practice in education. *Educational Psychologist*, *55*(1), 21-31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2019.1611432

Slavin, R., Cheung, A., & Zhuang, T. (2021). How could evidence based-reform advance education? *ECNU Review of Education, 4(*1), 7-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/2096531120976060

Smith, P. (December 4, 2020). *Ideological tensions across Englishes: Implications for literacy education.* Paper presented at the 2020 annual meeting of the Literacy Research Association Conference.

Steinmayr, R., Heyder, A., Naumburg, C., Michels, J., & Wirthwein, L. (2018). School-related and individual predictors of subjective well-being and academic achievement. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02631

Steinmayr, R., Meißner, A., Weidinger, A. F., & Wirthwein, L. (2014). *Academic achievement.* Oxford Bibliographies: Education. https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199756810-0108

Tadesse, S., & Muluye, W. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on education system in developing countries: a review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(10), 159.

Tan, C., Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2021). How school leadership practices relate to student outcomes: Insights from a three-level meta-analysis. *Educational Management Administration Leadership.* doi: 10.1177/17411432211061445

ter Meulen, S. (2023). *Long-term effects of grade retention* (No. 10212). CESifo Working Paper.

Thompson, B. P., Warrican, S. J., & Leacock, C. J. (2011). Education for the future: Shaking off the shackles of colonial times. In D. Dunkley (Ed.). *Readings in Caribbean history and culture: Breaking ground* (pp. 61–86). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

United Nations (2024). *The Antigua and Barbuda agenda for SIDS (ABAS) – a renewed declaration for resilient prosperity.* https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/2024-04/SIDS4%20-%20Co-Chairs%20FINAL.pdf

Valbuena, J., Mediavilla, M., Choi, Á., & Gil, M. (2020). Effects of grade retention policies: A literature review of empirical studies applying causal inference. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 35*(2), 408-451.

van Bergen, E., van Zuijen, T., Bishop, D., & de Jong, P. (2017). Why are home literacy environment and children's reading skills associated? What parental skills reveal. *Reading Research Quarterly, 52*(2), 147-160.

Veira, A. K., Leacock, C. J., & Warrican, S. J. (2014). Learning outside the walls of the classroom: Engaging the digital natives. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 30*(2).

Veletić, J., Price, H. E., & Olsen, R. V. (2023). Teachers' and principals' perceptions of school climate: the role of principals' leadership style in organizational quality. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 35*(4), 525-555.

Verešová, M., & Mala, D. (2016). Attitude toward school and learning and academic achievement of adolescents. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences: 7th International Conference on Education and Educational Psychology*, https://www.europeanproceedings.com/files/data/article/46/1381/article_46_1381_pdf_100.pdf

Warrican, S.J. (2005). *Hard words: The challenge of reading and writing for Caribbean students and their teachers*. Kingston, Jamaica: Ian Randle.

Warrican, S.J. (2015). Fostering true literacy in the Commonwealth Caribbean: Bridging the cultures of school and home. In P. Smith & A. Kumi-Yeboah (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Cross-Cultural Approaches to Language and Literacy Development* (pp. 367-392). IGI Global.

Warrican, S.J. (2020). Conducting research in the Caribbean. Peering through the lenses of Western frames. *Caribbean Educational Research Journal, 5*(1), 144-158.

Warrican, S.J. (2020). Towards caring language and literacy classrooms for black immigrant youth: Combatting raciolinguistic ideologies and moral licensing. *Teachers College Record, Yearbook Special Issue, 122*(13).

Warrican, S. J., Alleyne, M. L., Smith, P., Cheema, J., & King, J. R. (2019). Peer effects in the individual and group literacy achievement of high-school students in a bi-dialectal context. *Reading Psychology, 40*(2), 117-148.

Warrican, S. J., & Leacock, C. J. (2011). The Effectiveness of the Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean Project. *A report commissioned by the Organization of American States.*

Wilder, S. (2014). Effects of parental involvement on academic achievement: A meta-synthesis. *Educational Review*, *66*(3), 377-397.

Williams, H. M. A. (2016). A neocolonial warp of outmoded hierarchies, curricula and disciplinary technologies in Trinidad's educational system. *Critical Studies in Education*, *60*(1), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2016.1237982

Winter, E., Costello, A., O'Brien, M., & Hickey, G. (2021). Teachers' use of technology and the impact of Covid-19. *Irish Educational Studies*, *40*(2), 235-246.

Yildirim, E. (2023). The Effect of Student-Centered Practices on Academic Achievement in Life Science Course: A Meta-Analysis Study. *Journal of Educational Technology, 20*(2).

Zysberg, L., & Schwabsky, N. (2020). School climate, academic self-efficacy and student achievement. *Educational Psychology, 41*(4), 467-482.