The University of Sheffield

G. E. James

**Principals' and Teachers' Experiences and Perceptions
Of School Inspection in Primary Schools in
St. Vincent and the Grenadines**

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education (EdD)

July 2016

Principals' and Teachers' Experiences and Perceptions of School Inspection in Primary Schools in St. Vincent and the Grenadines

Godwin E. James

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
Requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education (EdD)

School of Education

University of Sheffield

July 2016

Acknowledgements

I express profound gratitude to Professor Pat Sikes for her forthright professional leadership and guidance during the various stages of the Caribbean Ed.D programme. To Dr Themesa Neckles, who skilfully guided me through the thesis phase of the Ed.D voyage, I extend profuse thanks. This thesis experience would not have been what it was without her steadfast, professional, calm, respectful, and astute supervision. Through her constant encouragement, optimism, prayers, and words of counsel, during times of profound emotional challenge and wavering, I was able to reach a successful completion. Her supervision was par excellence. For this, I am most grateful.

A special thank you to my friends: Descima Alexander-Hamilton, Laila, Karen, Beulah, and Kenneth for their moral and other support. I am indebted to my friend Allan Burnett who read every chapter of my thesis and provided valuable feedback. I am also thankful to my sister, Maralyn Sweetney, for her constant encouragement and support when I needed it most. To my cousin Curtis Scrubb, who willingly accommodated and transported me to and from the Sheffield study school sessions in Trinidad, I express sincere gratitude. Thanks to the rest of my extended family and friends for their support and encouragement.

Without the principals, teachers, and others participants this study would not have been successful. I wish to say a special thanks to them for their willingness to participate in this journey with me. I also extend thanks to the other educators who assisted in making this thesis a success.

Finally, I am eternally and profoundly grateful to my wife Lorette Coy-James for her unwavering support and unflinching commitment throughout the years of my studies. I could not do it without her being committed to me during the long and arduous thesis journey. To my sons G. Chikezi James and Faraji H. James who constantly enquired about my work and assisted with technology related issues, I say a heartfelt thank you. I am indebted to you all!

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my parents David and Agnes James who passed on in May 2013 and December 2014 respectively. I know they were proud that one of their nine children was able to attend university. I thank them eternally for the investment they made in me when it mattered most. Because of this, I am able to reach this far.

I also dedicate it to my wife Lorette Coy-James and my sons G. Chikezi James and Faraji H. James.

Abstract

This study aims to give voice to principals and teachers by interrogating their experiences and perceptions of the newly enacted phenomenon of school inspection (SI) in primary schools in St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG). It was a qualitative case study within the constructivist/interpretive paradigm, which grew out of my interest in school improvement issues. I utilised one-on-one interviews to unearth the experiences and perceptions of principals and teachers of four primary schools, and combined this with observations and document analysis to arrive at the findings. Since SI was enacted in the context of globalisation in education, I used the lens of postcolonial perspectives together with a theory of SI to critically analyse the experiences and perceptions of my participants.

This case study supports the large body of literature that views SI as a means of accountability and school improvement in education. There is a pervasive perception that SI can bring about school improvement. However, the colonial re-enactment of its top-down implementation concerns the study's participants. Despite SI's potential to lead to school improvement, the study revealed experiences of negative unintended consequences, of it, on school staff. Though SI confirms that leadership and management in primary schools is ineffective, there is some evidence that school leaders can make a substantial difference in primary schools operating in challenging circumstances. There is a predominance of traditional teacher-centred methods of teaching which can be linked to the historical development of primary education. While inspectors make recommendations for improving schools, their implementation is limited to those that are easy to enact. At the same time, the primary schools face challenges in implementing the recommendations that are likely to have the greatest impact on change in school culture. A bespoke system of SI may be enacted based on principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions. However, whether SI is the most appropriate method of school improvement for primary schools in SVG remains to be determined.

Godwin E. James

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

CAPE	Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination
CCSLC	Caribbean Certificate of Secondary Level Competence
CEO	Chief Education Officer
CPEA	Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment
CSEC	Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate
CXC	Caribbean Examinations Council
ER	Education Revolution
MoE	Ministry of Education
OECD	Organisation for European Economic Cooperation
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
SEO	Senior Education Officer
SI	School Inspection
SSE	School Self Evaluation
SVG	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization

CHAPTER ONE: THE CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction

School Inspection (SI) in its contemporary configuration is now a common feature of education in many developed (Jones & Tymms, 2014) as well as developing countries. Its prevalence is related to the development of the notions of autonomy, decentralisation, and the neoliberal agenda of 'value for money', which swept across Europe in the 1980s and blossomed during the course of the 1990s and into the initial years of the twenty-first century (Eurydice, 2007). Thus in Europe, as well as elsewhere, SI has emerged as a principal mechanism used within schools to make them accountable for the quality of education they offer (Jones & Tymms, 2014). School improvement is also a purpose of SI because it is believed if schools are held accountable through inspection then improvements will result. School improvement focuses on teaching and learning and student outcomes (Sun et al., 2007).

Further to this, globalisation of education is a contributing factor to the spread of education policies from the US and Europe to the rest of the world (Al'Abri, 2011). European countries, which controlled a broad swathe of the world during colonisation, still have "control" over what happens in many of their former colonies. Thus, a link exists between educational development in former colonial countries and external assistance from supranational institutions like the World Bank and UNESCO. Caribbean education systems implant many of the education reforms pursued in international countries (Lavia, 2007) through these supranational institutions. Often, they do not place emphasis on the local contextual factors of these countries (Crossley, 2010).

External donors who funded many of the initiatives of the Education Revolution (ER) propelled the need for accountability in education in SVG. The European Union (EU), the World Bank, the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB), and the government of SVG financed the ER (2002-2010) (Ministry of Education, 2012). The view of the Prime Minister of SVG was for the ER to be, 'the mid-wife, handmaiden, servant and leader of the emerging postcolonial economy in all its

manifold dimensions' (Gonsalves, 2010, p.19). He further suggested that, 'an Office of Standards in Education be established in the Ministry of Education to guide the twin process of monitoring and assessment' (Gonsalves, 2010, p.47). These are the principal factors that led to the establishment of a School Inspection and Supervision (SIS) Unit in SVG in 2012. However, this important reform in education did not allow for meaningful input from critical stakeholders.

Therefore, I feel it is important to seek out the views of principals and teachers on SI as, 'very seldom…[are] the personal interpretations of those who operate within the education system and who are merely expected to play a part according to a preconceived notion of their set functions within the system [heard]' (Simon, 2014, p.20). In addition, often times there is no empirical study of education reform policies in SVG. This study hopes to assist in correcting the deficiencies of a weak research culture in the MoE of SVG, which the consultants pointed out in the *Education Sector Development Plan (ESDP) 2012-2017* (Ministry of Education, 2012). The study also hopes to provide local policymakers with initial empirical evidence on SI in primary schools in SVG.

This research therefore focuses on principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions of school inspection (SI) in primary schools in St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG). Having provided the background and rationale to the study, this chapter now presents an outline of the research: the aim, research questions, and research methodology and methods. Following this, I state the significance of the study, my background/positionality, and the research problem. In order to establish a clear context of the study, I then review the geography, a brief history, and the structure and nature of education in SVG. Finally, I present the structure and organisation of the study and the chapter's conclusion.

1.2 Outline of the Research

1.2.1. Aim of the Study

The main aim of this research is to gain an in-depth understanding of the new phenomenon of SI in primary schools in SVG. The study privileges the experiences and perceptions of eleven principals and teachers, illustrating that their

views may be indispensable to understanding SI within the study setting. The study also aims to highlight what SI indicates about teaching, learning, leadership, and management in Vincentian primary schools. It does this by interrogating the implementation of the inspection recommendations and the challenges encountered in doing so in the individual primary schools. Additionally, the study explores the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding how to enact SI to meet the contextual realities of Vincentian primary schools.

1.2.2. Research Questions

Bryman (2008) considers research questions as integral to the literature search, data collection and analysis, and the writing-up phase. When I submitted my research proposal in 2014, I had a central research question that focused on principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions of SI. There were also six subsidiary questions. However as I read further, analysed the data, and wrote the various drafts of the thesis the research questions were constantly tweaked. Eventually, I settled on these questions:

1. How is SI in four primary schools in SVG experienced and perceived by principals and teachers?
2. What do the results of the SI process indicate about teaching and learning, leadership and management in primary schools in SVG?
3. To what extent have the inspection recommendations for teaching and learning, leadership, and management been implemented, and what are the challenges to implementing them in the individual primary schools?
4. How, from the perspectives of principals and teachers, should SI be enacted in primary schools in SVG?

1.2.3. Methodology and Methods

This is a qualitative case study utilising a constructivist-interpretive approach. Investigating the case of SI in primary schools in SVG inevitably meant that schools had to be treated as mini-cases. I chose to do a case study because it allows me to obtain 'an in-depth account of events, relationships, experiences, [and] processes' (Denscombe , 2003, p.32) of SI in the study context. I link my choice of methodology to my personal history, biography, and professional background. The

methods of semi-structured interviews, observations, and document analysis which were utilised to gather the data, are those often used in qualitative case studies (Yin, 2003) as I will explain in chapter five.

1.3. The Significance of my Research

My research is significant because there is no current study of SI in SVG. Therefore, it should meet policymakers' need for information regarding SI in Vincentian primary schools. I also hope it will contribute to a reassessment of SVG's model of SI. In the upcoming section, I explore my background and positionality to let my readers know, from the outset, what my biases are as the researcher.

1.3.1. My Background and Positionality

At the beginning of the thesis process, my supervisor asked me to write my life history, and later to read the piece *on intellectual craftsmanship* by C. Wright Mills. As I engaged with these exercises and did further readings, I began to question and reflect on how and why I came to do research on SI. As I reflected, I realise that my choice of research topic relates to my biography, history, personal, and professional experiences.

I graduated from secondary school in 1984 and was successful in my Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) and General Certificate of Education (GCE) subjects. This allowed me to obtain a job as a teacher at the lone secondary school on Union Island, the four square mile island of approximately 3500 people, where I was born. Union Island is part of the state of SVG. On many occasions walking back to the staffroom, the feeling of not having done a good job in some of the lessons I had taught often enveloped me. After two years as an untrained teacher, I felt the urging to be more effective in the classroom and at the same time gain upward mobility in a profession that was never my intended career choice. Therefore, I applied to the local teacher's college for training. There, I took a liking to pedagogical courses and education psychology. This was the beginning of my interest in teaching and learning.

In 2006, I became the first native of Union Island to be appointed to the position of principal of the lone secondary school there. At that time, I was pursuing a postgraduate diploma in educational leadership and management. This course whetted my appetite for school improvement. Moreover, there was the overwhelming expectation of the natives of Union Island in my ability to improve the school. I inherited a very young staff of which more than fifty per cent had no pedagogical training. Most had fewer than ten years of teaching experience. Adding to this challenge, I became principal just three years after the implementation of universal access to secondary education in SVG. This meant that secondary schools now accepted students on a wide continuum of literacy and numeracy skills. My main challenges were to improve students' academic performance and discipline. I held sessions in my office for teachers to give them some rudimentary pedagogical skills. In the five years I was principal, we were able to move the school from the bottom tier of performance in the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) - CSEC exams, to the top ten of the twenty-six secondary schools in SVG. Therefore, the focus in my study on teaching and learning, leadership and management relate to my previous professional experience with school improvement.

After serving as a teacher for twenty-seven years, I then became a lecturer in teacher education in 2012. This started my close interaction with primary schools in SVG. I observed the belligerent attitude of teachers towards students in classes nearby to where I assessed student teachers' lessons. The use of corporal punishment was pervasive. The rote method of teaching reminded me of my primary school education in the 1970s and suggested that little had changed in education in over three decades. I wrote a short paper on my initial experiences observing teachers on practicum in primary schools. I shared this experience with Prof Pat Sikes, as I was then in contact with her just prior to starting doctoral studies. She sent me Laurette Bristol's 2008 PhD thesis, which helped me to gain an initial understanding of the use of postcolonial theory in educational research. I began, then, to make a link between postcolonial theory and education in SVG.

I first encountered the term SI at a Ministry of Education (MoE) secondary school principals' meeting. One of the Senior Education Officers (SEO), from the MoE, made a brief presentation on it. She had just returned from England on a study tour of

the Office for Standards in Education Children Services and Skills (Ofsted) model of SI there. About three years later, principals and a handful of senior teachers attended seminars to orient them to SI. The seminars came a few weeks ahead of the establishment of the School Inspection and Supervision (SIS) Unit within the MoE of SVG. By then, I was a lecturer in teacher education. Therefore, out of an interest in SI as an education reform initiative, I sought permission from the MoE to attend the final day of the seminars. At that time, I was preparing for my second doctoral assignment in part one of the University of Sheffield's Caribbean Ed.D programme. I opted to research SI as a contemporary educational issue in SVG for my assignment. Researching this topic heightened my interest in SI as it unearthed issues in education in which I am interested. I learnt SI encompasses a number of issues inter alia school improvement, school effectiveness, leadership and management; the experiences highlighted here are among the reasons I chose to use postcolonial theory, a focus on primary schools, teaching and learning, and leadership and management in my study of SI in primary schools in SVG.

1.3.2. The Research Problem

The research problem regarding SI in primary schools in SVG is a confluence of issues that range from the top-down approach in its introduction, disparity between education and training and student achievement; and the nature of leadership and management, and teaching and learning.

The introduction of SI in SVG in 2012 was in the usual top-down manner of implementing education reform initiatives in the country. A team of consultants, who in 2008, set up the National Education Inspectorate (NEI) of Jamaica, worked on the SIS Unit of SVG. Some MoE officials went to Jamaica for training in SI. One studied the Ofsted SI system in England, as I mentioned earlier. The consultants trained some principals and teachers to conduct simulated SI exercises in a small sample of primary and secondary schools. There was no broad-based national consultation with principals, teachers, and other stakeholders on what the SI model of SVG should be like. This is why I feel it is important to privilege the voices of principals and teachers in my study. I believe the perspectives of those who the implementation of

SI is directly influencing are critical to constructing knowledge and understanding of it in primary schools in SVG.

There is a disparity between the significant investment in the education and training of principals and teachers in SVG's primary schools and corresponding student achievement (Ministry of Education, 2012). Prior to and early into the Education Revolution (ER) of 2002-2010, the qualifications for being a primary school principal was a two year teacher's certificate and ten years as a trained teacher. Up to that point, only about five primary school principals had held bachelor degrees (Gonsalves, 2010). Since then principals were trained to bachelor's degree level, mainly in leadership and management. To date, fifty-three of the fifty-seven principals in government owned primary schools have university degrees. Additionally, about three hundred primary school teachers were trained to the bachelor's degree level (Gonsalves, 2010), and in certificate programmes in literacy and numeracy. The number of primary school teachers in SVG is around eight hundred and ninety (Ministry of Education, 2013). It was hoped that the expenditure on training principals and teachers would have improved the low literacy and numeracy levels which became apparent when students transitioned to secondary school with the start of universal access to secondary education in 2003 (Ministry of Education, 2012).

Despite the improvements in the human resource capacity of primary schools, through the training of teachers and principals and other educational inputs, student performance in primary schools in SVG has not shown marked improvements in accountability tests (Ministry of Education, 2012). Therefore, the hope is that SI will contribute to school improvement in primary schools in SVG. It is on account of the concerns highlighted here that I wish to explore what SI reveals about leadership and management, and teaching and learning in primary school. These areas are most critical to school improvement, which is a central aim of SI. Moreover, the study will explore principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions of SI, which is new to practically all educators in primary schools in SVG.

1.4. St. Vincent & the Grenadines

It is important that readers have an understanding of the geography, history, and educational context of the study's setting in order to provide an appreciation of the research choices that have been made in relation to SI in primary schools in SVG. The different aspects of setting are also important in case studies (Stake, 2003).

1.4.1. The Geography

St. Vincent and the Grenadines is a multi-island archipelagic state located in the Eastern Caribbean. It consists of thirty-two (32) islands and cays spanning 389 sq. km (150 sq. miles). Of that area, 344 sq. km (133 sq. miles) is occupied by the main island St. Vincent (Government of St. Vincent & the Grenadines, 2013). The Grenadines extend forty-five (45) miles to the south of the mainland. The population of SVG is approximately 108, 570 (Government of St. Vincent & the Grenadines, 2013). Being a multi-island state, there may be challenges to operating a SI system in SVG.

1.4.2. A Brief History

The country was first inhabited by the 'Yellow Caribs'; however, contemporary historians prefer the term Kalinago as opposed to Caribs as the latter is a European derived derogatory term for the indigenous peoples of the island. Some historical texts claim, that Christopher Columbus discovered SVG in 1498. During the American War of Independence France announced war on Britain in 1778; the French then captured SVG in 1779. In 1783, the signing of the Treaty of Versailles gave SVG back to Britain (Colonial Office, 1965).

Following this tumultuous history on October 27th, 1969 SVG gained its first step towards independence through the attainment of statehood in association with Britain. Under statehood, the country was responsible for its internal affairs, the right to change its constitution, and to call its full independence while Britain retained control for external affairs and defence (The House of Assembly, 1970). Exactly ten years later, on October 27, 1979 SVG exercised its statehood right and declared independence from Britain.

1.4.3. The Structure and Nature of Education

The education system of SVG operates on a centralised organisational structure. This is an inheritance from its British colonial past. The Minister of Education is the head of the Ministry of Education (MoE). The structures also comprises, in hierarchical order, a Permanent Secretary (P.S), Chief Education Officer (CEO), Deputy Chief Education Officer, other Education Officers, and general civil servants.

Children commence formal education at age five. At the end of grade six (primary school), they write the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC)-Caribbean Primary Exit Assessment (CPEA) test which was done for the first time in 2014. The CPEA replaced the colonial Common Entrance Examination (CEE). At the secondary level, some students write CXC's Caribbean Certificate of Secondary Level Competence (CCSLC) examinations in the third year, and the Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) examinations in the fifth and final year. On completion of secondary school, most students attend the SVG Community College (SVGCC) to pursue various qualifications. The UWI open campus site offers some part-time degree programmes. The SVGCC has recently started offering two options of a bachelor's degree in education.

Education policy in SVG is a combination of both national priorities and the policies of the OECS. The OECS Education Reform Unit (OERU), which is located in St. Lucia, is responsible for education policy formulation for the OECS sub-region. The unit has recently published the *OECS Education Sector Strategy (OESS) 2012-2021* document. The *OESS 2012-2021* shifts the emphasis from reform to, 'strengthening the leadership, management, and accountability systems within the education sector of the region' (OECS Education Reform Unit, 2012, p.9). This focus of the *OESS 2012-2021* relates to the concerns of this study.

1.5. Conclusion and Structure of Thesis

This chapter introduces readers to the topic of my research and set out its context as well as the significance for doing research on SI in primary schools in SVG. I presented the four research questions that guide my study and gave a brief preview of my research methodology and methods. I also discussed the problem, which merited

the conduct of the study. In chapter two, I give an overview of the history and development of primary education in SVG. It reviews colonial SI and discusses postcolonial perspectives and their relevance to my research.

Chapter 3 reviews the literature on SI relevant to the four research questions, begins with an introduction, and proceeds to a definition of the concept of SI. Then I discuss the purposes of SI followed by experiences and perceptions of it. I also highlight the issues relating to teaching and learning, leadership and management. The chapter then discusses the implementation of inspection recommendations and the challenges of implementing them. It ends with enacting SI and the chapter conclusion.

Since the basis of my study is SI in SVG chapter four, therefore, describes the SI model used in the country to present a thorough understanding of it as my case. Subsequently in chapter five, after a brief introduction, I explain my research methodology and methods. Then I outline my positionality. I follow this with the research strategy, then explain, and justify my three research methods. An explanation of the process of undergoing the fieldwork, along with selecting the sites and participants follows. I then proceed to the data collection process and approach to data analysis. The final part of this chapter deals with the ethical concerns as well as the limitations of the study's methodology and methods. The chapter culminates with my research diary.

Chapter 6 presents the findings of the four research questions I investigated. I present the findings for the four schools separately followed by those for the *respected others*. It ends with a summary of the findings. In chapter seven, I synthesise the findings from the previous chapter and discuss these in relation to the literature I reviewed in chapter three and my own analysis.

Chapter 8, the final chapter, presents the conclusions and recommendations that I arrive at in my study. It ends with my experiences during the research process and some final words.

CHAPTER TWO: THE HISTORY OF PRIMARY EDUCATION IN ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES

> *In the British West Indies, a great responsibility rests on the educational system. Its role should be that of a midwife to the emerging social order. Instead, it is the chambermaid of the existing social order* (Williams, 1946, p.10).

2.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the historical context of primary education in SVG as a means to understanding its contemporary setting and the case of SI. I believe, 'every well-considered social study-requires an historical scope of conception and a full use of historical material' (Wright Mills, 1959, p.145). This historical scope is useful to add depth, context, and meaning to the study. A more recent perspective that can justify the inclusion of this chapter is that of Crossley (2010) who cogently argues for cultural and contextual factors to have a prominent place in research on education in small states. History is an indispensable aspect of the contextual factors in small states, many of which have experienced the trauma of colonialism. Additionally, a historical background is critical to gaining an in-depth understanding of a case (Stake, 2003).

I begin this chapter by exploring the establishment and development of primary education. Next, I look at the nature of the curriculum and then analyse some of the challenges that impeded the development of primary education. The chapter also explores colonial SI and considers primary education in the post-independence years. A discussion on postcolonial perspectives follows this.

2.2. The Establishment and Development of Primary Education

The purpose of this section is to explore the issues relating to the establishment and development of primary education in SVG as a basis for understanding the background to the contemporary Vincentian primary school where SI is a new phenomenon.

2.2.1. The Beginning Period to the Early 20th Century

Throughout the British West Indies (BWI), religious bodies were responsible for establishing primary education (Gordon, 1963). The Church of England, Wesleyans, Church of Rome, and for a short time the Church of Scotland, were the religious bodies that played a significant role in establishing primary education in SVG. From the Latrobe report on Negro education: Windward and Leeward islands (1838) it can be deduced that primary education started in the late 1810s or early 1820s. This is deduced from the comment: "your Lordship will observe that in Grenada as well as in the islands of St. Vincent, Barbados and Tobago & c [sic] schools for the coloured children of the principal towns have existed for already 10 years or upwards" (Latrobe, 1838, p.9). Therefore, some degree of "education" was being provided in SVG during slavery, which was abolished in the BWI in 1838. It is well established that the churches' role in education was to allow children to gain a sufficiency of literacy skills to be able to read the bible (Bartle, 1992) and grow up to be "good" citizens of the British Empire. Gordon (1963) asserted that in the post-emancipation era the missionaries continued to provide education. However, as expected, their efforts were stoutly resisted by the planter class who felt educating former slaves would have made them too knowledgeable. Consequently, they would have wanted to leave the plantation, causing a loss of cheap labour and profits to the owners. In the late 1800s the churches' prominent role in the control of primary education began to wane somewhat.

As the beginning of the 20th century drew nearer, the colonial government was more involved in providing primary education. The Laws of SVG for 1809, 1820-1827 and 1784-1898 contain nothing about educational provision. In 1835, the colony received £800 for public education under the Negro Education Grant (Gordon, 1963). The 1898-1911 laws included provisions for education. In 1900, there were 31 primary schools; and in the 1930s, many schools still bore the names of the churches that were responsible for establishing them, as is still the case today. However, they were only responsible for the upkeep of the buildings while the government had responsibility for paying teachers and providing equipment (Colonial Office, 1932).

2.2.2. The Nature of the Curriculum

Religion and the curriculum were the main vehicles through which the colonists gained and maintained dominance over native peoples during conquest and settlement. For instance, in 1854 the subjects studied included: spelling, reading, writing, cyphering, geography, needlework, arithmetic, dictation, history, singing, catechism, and church-history (Colonial Office, 1854). Well into the second half of the 20th century, the curriculum of primary schools bore similarities to that of the 19th century. Dr Eric Williams, the Trinidad and Tobago historian and former Prime Minster, makes the poignant statement, 'it is taken as a matter of course that the curriculum in the colonial countries is based very largely on foreign material that have no relation to the daily lives of the pupils or to their environment' (Williams, 1946, p.15). In Dr Williams' view, we were *mimic men*, as V. S. Naipaul, the Trinidadian born Nobel Laureate titled one of his novels. The curriculum of schools during colonial times seems to have educated its students in this way for almost two centuries. C.L.R James penned it well in his novel *Beyond a Boundary*:

> It was only long years after that I understood the limitations on spirit, vision and self-respect which was imposed on us by the fact that our masters, our curriculum, our code of morals, *everything* (James' emphasis) began from…Britain … Both masters and boys accepted it as in the very nature of things. (James, 1986, pp.38-39)

The colonial curriculum was one of a number of ways used to subjugate colonial "subjects" and through which the inculcation of colonial values, norms, and mores took place.

It is clear from the previous paragraph that religious instruction was part of the official curriculum of colonial primary schools. While it was removed from the official post-independence curriculum, elements of religious instruction still remains rooted in the hidden curriculum, 'those unstated norms, values, and beliefs transmitted to students through the underlying structure of schooling, as opposed to the formally recognized and sanctioned dimensions of the schooling experience' (Giroux, 1978, p.148). I illustrate this in chapter six where I present the findings of the study.

2.2.3. Teacher Recruitment & Training

The focus of this section is to provide an understanding of teacher recruitment and training in the period during the establishment and development of primary education to provide a basis for understanding the culture of teaching and learning that pervades contemporary primary schools in SVG.

From the very beginning of primary education in SVG, as in the rest of the BWI, the quality of teachers, operating in the education system was substandard (Gordon, 1963). This was also the case in Britain (Cowie, 1957; Bibby, 1956). The Latrobe report of 1838 stressed, 'securing proper and efficient teachers is the most weighty [sic], and embraces one of the existing difficulties in the way of Negro education' (Latrobe, 1838, p.14). It was hardly likely that there would have been a sufficient number of qualified persons to take on the task of being teachers. To get a better perspective of the history of teacher recruitment and training in colonial SVG, a general idea of what was happening in education in Britain at that time is important.

In the first half of the 19th century two educators, Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster established a monitorial system of teaching to provide instruction to the poor children in an area of London (Bartle, 1992). This system of teaching recruited students from primary schools to be teachers in the monitorial schools set up by Bell and Lancaster. However, it was criticised by some educators as inexpensive, simple, and inappropriate to providing education for children of lower class families (Chance, 1950). To deal with the inadequacies of this structure, the pupil-teacher system came into effect. It was introduced to England from Holland by Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth (Cowie, 1957). However, according to Browne (1970) the quality of the pupil-teachers left a lot to be desired.

Unsurprisingly, a similar system of teacher recruitment to the one in Britain took root in SVG. As Dr. Eric Williams asserted, 'inevitably primary education and the education of the teachers in particular, their literary and cultural ideas and standards, follow the dominant pattern; it could not be otherwise' (Williams, 1946, p.11). In the pupil-teacher system in SVG, teachers were tutored, for at least an hour per day, by the Head teacher of the school to which they were attached

(Colonial Government, 1958). It was not until 1950 that an experimental system of institutional "training" began with the establishment of three pupil-teacher training centres in SVG. Pupil-teacher centres started in Britain around 1880, and were abolished there in the early part of the 20th century. Yet the colonial authorities saw them as suitable means of training teachers in SVG long after their abolition in England.

From the 19th century, and well into the 20th century, almost all teachers in the primary schools came from among the pupils in the said schools as I found out from a retired principal:

> I passed the school-leaving exam in 1963. In those days, there were two options when you passed that exam either go on to secondary school or become a teacher. There was one secondary school in the country area and my family could not afford to send me to it so I became a teacher in January 1964 at age twelve (Marks, 2015, pers. comm., 11 February).

She became a supernumerary pupil teacher in 1964. The colonial authorities saw the supernumerary pupil teacher grade as the chief innovation when they implemented it in 1951 (Colonial Government, 1958). Such a low grade of teacher was an innovation more than one hundred years after the establishment of primary education. Wyllie (2001) mentioned that there was a gradual phasing out of the pupil teacher system between 1984 and 1988 in an effort to improve the quality of teachers in primary schools in SVG. This was almost fifty years after Williams (1946), referencing the Royal West India Commission of 1938/1939, maintained that the other BWI islands should abolish the pupil teacher system as did Barbados.

However, it must be conceded that the colonial authorities trained a handful of teachers in the other BWI territories where teachers' colleges were located. In the 1900s, a paltry two students went annually to the Rawle Training Centre in Barbados and sometimes to Jamaica (Lobb, 1919). In 1945, just three teachers received training at the Government Training College in Trinidad (Colonial Office, 1946). The colonial authorities, theoretically, accepted that, 'such meagre provision for teacher training is no solution to the problem as it exists in the Windward Islands' (Colonial Government, 1958, p.4). In the education reports from the beginning of the 20th century the problem of teacher training was acknowledged; but little else was done beyond this. It took the colonial

government approximately 115 years to establish a proper institution for training teachers, which they did in 1964. In 1965, SVG had a meagre sixty-eight (68) trained teachers and six hundred and sixty-four (664) untrained teachers. The extended period of the pupil teacher system and the establishment of teacher education over a hundred years after primary education, without doubt, impeded the development of primary education up to the postcolonial period.

2.2.4. Colonial School Inspection

I now look at the system of SI that preceded the contemporary one by over four decades. This is important as during my research I found there was no continuous narrative of SI's existence anywhere in the national education archives. It is important, as educational researchers in a postcolonial context that we document all facets of the history of education in our countries. It is also significant as a point of comparison with the contemporary SI process in primary schools.

Like other BWI territories, SVG had a system of SI from the 19th century (London, 2004). The job was done by an, 'Inspector of School [which] means any officer appointed by the Governor to inspect and examine school and to perform such other duties as may be imposed upon him by this ordinance or otherwise assigned to him by the Governor' (Colonial Government, 1912, p.1052). In the initial period of SI, individuals who already held other positions within the colonial Civil Service performed the inspector's job. For example, the head of the immigration department was also the Inspector of Schools (Anderson, 1938). Upon the re-establishment of the grammar school in 1908, the headmaster was an Inspector of Schools in addition to his substantive duties (Colonial Office, 1911).

The purpose of inspection, then, as well as now, was to play a pivotal role in improvement and accountability in primary education. For instance, on the appointment of the grammar school headmaster the St. Vincent Report for 1909-1910 intimated that , 'greater efficiency in teaching and otherwise is to be expected in the future as a result of the appointment of the inspector' (Colonial Office, 1911, p.18). The anticipation was that there would be, 'such close supervision of the working of these schools …. [which] was unavoidably absent in the past' (Colonial

Office, 1911, p.18). It is ironic that the colonial authorities set such high standards of achievement for primary education, when teachers were grossly undertrained.

There was a single school inspector in the early years of the 20th century. By the beginning of the 1960s, there was a school inspectorate of sorts within the Education Department, which comprised a Chief Inspector and two inspectors of schools (Colonial Office, 1962). The School Inspectors inspected all schools on the island with some getting more than one inspection in a year (Colonial Office, 1948). Schools experienced two forms of external inspections. The first was as described in the previous paragraph. The other was an annual inspection done by an inspector from the neighbouring colony of Grenada. The inspector assigned grades I, II, III to schools based on their performance or their level of efficiency (Colonial Office, 1915).

SI spanned almost the length of colonial rule in SVG. However, there were periods of dormancy. The abolition of SI took place when SVG attained statehood in 1969 and had the powers to make its own laws and so, 'the old terminology Inspector of School has been abolished and even the term Education Officer has been abolished. We have a Chief Education Officer, and the others are Education Officers' (The House of Assembly, 1970, p.134). With the power to make its own laws the government of SVG, disbanded the concept of the school inspector, as it brought stress on teachers in colonial primary schools (London, 2004). As a retired primary school principal claimed, 'they were up there, figures of authority, they were to be feared, they weren't coming to give correction but to see how much wrong things you did' (Marks, 2015, pers. comm., 11 February). Colonial school inspection was punitive and demoralising to teachers and principals (London, 2004). However, as education in the post-independence period loosened from one form of colonial tether another form took hold.

2.3. The Post-independence Period

Upon reclaiming its independence from Britain in 1979, SVG inherited a primary education system that required root and branch changes. This was a consequence of almost two centuries of neglect by the British. By the 1960s, there was universal access to primary education (Ministry of Education, 2012). However, as the

country became independent the quality of teaching in the primary schools was woefully inadequate for the task of helping to take the burgeoning nation towards a path of development. In 1986/1987, 71.4 per cent of primary school teachers were untrained (Wyllie, 2001). In the last decade of the 20th century, mid-1990s, only 51 per cent of them were trained (Ministry of Education, 2012). Nearly two decades of independence could not erase the negligible rate of teacher training that occurred under colonial rule. However, by 2014, 84 per cent of primary school teachers were college trained (Ministry of Education, 2014).

In the final two decades of the 20th century, a flurry of curriculum development and capacity building initiatives took place. A pupil-teacher training centre was opened with assistance from the British government. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and UNICEF helped to implement curriculum development initiatives. By 1983, the country satisfied membership to UNESCO (The House of Assembly, 1983). That said year, UNESCO finalised an education sector survey for the country. By the 1990s, external assistance in education had become institutionalised in SVG. The tentacles of globalisation in education that began in the 1980s are now fully entrenched in 21st century education reform initiatives in SVG. Studies of the pervasiveness of external assistance in education since the 1990s reveal that educational priorities of external entities were often different from those of small states and territories (Brock & Crossley, 2013). In the next section, I look at postcolonial perspectives as a theoretical framework for understanding SI in primary schools in SVG.

2.4. Postcolonial Perspectives

Many West Indian and other postcolonial literary writers have helped, through literary texts, to articulate how colonial education shaped the consciousness, values, and psyche of colonial societies. My experiences: of SVG's independence in 1979, studying West Indian literature and the African novel *Things Fall Apart* in secondary school, pursuing literature courses at university, and my master's study on the use of postcolonial theory in English teaching in secondary schools in SVG have developed my understanding of postcolonial theory for cultural education. This is arguably so because 'literature has constituted a vehicle for postcolonial

education' (Halloway, 2013, p.160). These aspects of my personal history and biography among other things (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008) have influenced my choice of postcolonial theory as a framework for analysing SI in my study.

The theory of postcolonialism is a contested and paradoxical concept (Tikly & Bond, 2013; Mezzadra & Rahola, 2006; Crossley & Tikly, 2004;). According to Shohat (1992) and Gandhi (1998) the post when hyphenated in postcolonial or *periodised* (Rizvi et al., 2006) is seen by some as the aftermath of colonialism through the attainment of political independence. Ironically, there are currently many small colonial territories, some in the Caribbean, that want to maintain their colonial status (Baldacchino, 2010). However, postcolonialism is more than the aftermath of colonialism through the attainment of political independence (Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012; Lavia, 2007). It is, 'a set of perspectives through which the contemporary world is re-interrogated, re-interpreted and re-positioned discursively through practices and policies *of* and *for* social justice' (Bristol, 2012, p.21) (author's emphasis). Postcolonialism helps us to deconstruct issues in contemporary societies like SVG so we can understand 'the experience of colonialism and its past and present effects' (Quayson, 2005, p.93) on our education system. I also find this theorisation of postcolonialism to be useful:

> as an aspirational project, intent on pursuing the hopefulness that can be found in the imagination of the Caribbean Diaspora. Postcoloniality, in this sense, makes connections between the past, present and the future as a necessary philosophical and methodological endeavour of educational practice (Lavia, 2006, p.281).

It allows me to interrogate the introduction of SI in primary schools in SVG. However, a theory of postcolonialism does not sit well with some as it threatens to unsettle the power structure of the world as they have experienced it from their privileged perch (Young, 2003). Thus, Lavia (2012) articulates that to privilege the perspective of colonised people is creating an act of resistance against those who feel threatened by postcolonialism. Crossley and Tikly make a claim for what postcolonial theory expects of those working within that space:

> Postcolonial theory demands that we place centre stage the continuing implications of Europe's expansion into Africa, Asia, Australasia and the Americas from the fifteenth century onwards, not only as a means of understanding the subsequent histories of these parts of the world but as a

defining moment in European history and modernity itself (Crossley & Tikly, 2004, pp.147-48).

It must be understood that European colonisation of the broad swathe of the world (cited by Crossley and Tikly) is partly, responsible for the advancement that is seen in many quarters of Europe today. Therefore, the "assistance" received from Europe for education reform is part of our inheritance that was not used to develop education in places like SVG during conquest and settlement.

However, postcolonialism is sometimes criticised by some of its proponents. For example, Tuhiwai-Smith (2012) believes that some indigenous scholars hold the viewpoint that the pervasive use of the term postcolonial is a means through which the hegemonic control of non-indigenous scholars can be re-affirmed and re-established. She premises this on the belief that some articulations of postcolonialism are constructed, 'in ways which can still leave out indigenous peoples, our ways of knowing and our current concerns' (Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012, p.25). That may be why principals' and teachers' experiences and perspectives (their ways of knowing) are central to gaining an understanding of the implementation of school inspection in primary schools in SVG. However, it is an irrefutable fact that, 'local issues cannot be understood without reference to the global context' (Crossley & Holmes, 2001, p.396).

Other issues in postcolonial theory also add to its fluidity as a concept. One of these relates to the deconstructive view premised on a distrust of Western humanism; and the more constructive element of it that is concerned with creating perspectives that are counter to colonial hegemony and which focus on issues of social justice (Tikly & Bond, 2013). However, despite the seemingly mercurial nature of postcolonialism, I find it applicable to my research as it 'assert[s] forms of knowledge not previously considered relevant to research' (Louisy, 2004, p.287). This research is being conducted on an issue that relates to globalisation in education.

The widespread use of the term globalisation presents another issue within postcolonial perspectives that must be confronted. I agree with Rizvi et al., (2006) that the present representation of globalisation must be analysed from a historical rather than its contemporary conception because, 'unless this is done, many of the

neo-liberal ideas that have become hegemonic in recent years will continue to appear as a natural and inevitable response to the steering logics of economic globalization' (p. 255). Moreover, globalisation is thought of as, 'extend[ing] the earlier logics of empire, trade and political domination in many parts of the world' (Appadurai, 2000, p.3). A discussion of globalisation must consider neo-colonialism, which is, 'what happened after the beginning of the dismantling of colonialism' (Spivak, 1991, p.220). It operates through 'interactions between the dominant and dominated states-cultural, economic, political, military- security and social' (Kieh Jr, 2012, p.167). However, globalisation as a concept is a contested term (Tikly, 2001). A definition of globalisation which resonates with me comes from Al' Abri:

> a process that makes the world a small village through time and space compression with new technologies an important facilitator of this interconnectivity. This process is marked by speedy, free movement of people, services, capital, goods, ideas and knowledge across borders (Al'Abri, 2011, p.493).

This modern conception of globalisation came about through the rapid developments in Information and Communications Technology (ICT). However, modern globalisation is an affront to those who consider globalisation as having been in existence for a very long time (Giddens, 2003).

It is undeniable that globalisation has significant political, social, economic, and cultural consequences for all nations. For instance, the impact and centrality of globalisation in education policymaking is a well-established fact (Al'Abri, 2011; Tikly, 1999). In a study of globalisation in developing countries Al'Abri (2011, p.493) asserts that, 'education policy making nowadays is formed and implemented in a global context'. I articulated this view in chapter one in my outline of education policy making in the OECS and by extension SVG. While it is accepted that education policy making in developed countries is influenced by globalisation, it is also asserted that developing countries are more affected by it through organisations like UNESCO, the World Bank, UNICEF, and UN development programmes (Al'Abri, 2011; Psacheropoulous, 2006). The "assistance" developing countries obtain for education does not come without the proverbial "he who pays the piper calls the tune" mantra, as they impose

conditionalities for their "assistance" to education in developing countries (Lavia, 2007; Bonal, 2002). These countries are often unable to refuse these conditionalities, as they need the "assistance" to ensure their citizens are adequately educated to compete in the global market place and contribute to national development (Lavia, 2012; Jules, 2008; Louisy, 2004).

Globalisation in education may not be all negative for small states like those in the Caribbean. Louisy (2001), at the turn of this century, explored the place of the Caribbean in a globalised world. She comprehensively discussed the challenges the Caribbean faced in the throes of globalisation. The small size of the region being the greatest challenge she pointed out, and the attendant issues of economic and social development that relate to it. In order to combat some of the challenges of globalisation the Caribbean, she indicates, has turned to regionalism, global alliances, and functional co-operation. Louisy (2001) highlighted networking in education as an area where the Caribbean has co-operated most in the era of globalisation through the various regional institutions for education. She articulated that there are opportunities for the Caribbean to contribute, through globalisation, to comparative education. This, in her perspective, will allow the issues of the region to get on the forefront of global policymaking agendas. However, more than a decade on since Louisy's publication, the Caribbean appears no closer to the aspiration that she espoused for its role in comparative education. This does not mean, though, that the region should not continue to strive to make its contribution to the field of comparative education.

The 1990 World Bank UNESCO sponsored conference in Jomtien Thailand, which resulted in the universal education policy known as Education for All (EFA) (Robertson et al., 2007) influences education in SVG. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) also have an influence on SVG'S education. Crossley (2010, p.425) has argued, 'where small states have engaged with EFA and the MDG agendas their own development priorities have often been overlooked'. A useful suggestion that can mitigate this experience of small states, like SVG with the EFA and MDGs, is for post-2015 targets and formulations of international entities to consider the 1990s experiences of the disjuncture between their priorities and those of small states (Brock & Crossley, 2013). This may help to reduce

international policy narratives controlling how teachers in developing countries experience schooling (Lavia, 2007) as is the case with SI in primary schools in SVG.

2.5. Conclusion

In this chapter, I sought to give an overview of the establishment and historical development of primary education in SVG. I believe that an in-depth understanding of SI in Vincentian primary schools necessitates a deconstruction of the history of primary education in the country. I showed how the response of the colonial authorities to a critical issue like the recruitment and training of teachers impeded primary education. This will provide a foundation for understanding issues that related to the culture of teaching and learning in current context of SI in Vincentian primary schools. It will also be relevant to understanding other aspects of the study. I also presented a discussion of postcolonial perspectives as a theoretical framework through which the study can be analysed. While this chapter explored the historical context of the case SI in primary schools in SVG; the next chapter constructs a discussion of the relevant literature that relate to it.

CHAPTER THREE: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF SI AND RELATED LITERATURE

3.1. Introduction

SI is by no means a new concept in education (London, 2004). The consensus is that it began in England during the 1830s (Baxter, 2014; Clarke & Ozga, 2011). The church there sanctioned inspectors and a number of them were men of the cloth (Shaw et al., 2003). Historically, SI in England was the remit of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMIs) and local education authorities (LEAs) (Mc Laughlin, 2001). Over in France, SI began around 1802 when the French government set out laws for inspection, and by 1840, they established a three level inspectorate (Xiaolin et al., 2006). While it began in Canada in the 1840s up until 1967 when it was abolished (Milewski, 2012). The European powers transferred SI to their other colonies around the world (Ochuba, 2009; London, 2004). In chapter one I pointed out that, it began in SVG in the late nineteenth century. In the early years, there were no written guidelines on how to conduct SI. Instead, there was a reliance on the experience and knowledge of the inspectors or a *connoisseurship* model (MacBeath, 2006).

This chapter presents a review of the literature that is relevant to the four research questions which I outlined in chapter one. It begins with an analysis of some of the definitions, and purposes of SI. Then I review perceptions and experiences of SI, discuss teaching and learning, leadership and management, and consider the implementation of SI recommendations. Finally, I deal with the enactment of SI in one international context and in Small States and Territories (SSTs).

3.2. Definitions of SI

There are some variations in the definitions of SI. One useful definition of it comes from Janssens (2007 cited in Janssens and van Amelsvoort 2008):

> [A] process of periodic, targeted scrutiny carried out to provide independent verification, and report on whether the quality of school is meeting national and local performance standards, legislative and professional requirements, and the needs of students and parents (pp.15-16).

The above definition of SI construes it as outside assessment by persons not connected to the school. It is thorough and emphasises particular areas to find out the educational state of the institutions in order to provide feedback to stakeholders. Another definition conceptualises SI in a somewhat similar manner:

> The process of assessing the quality and/or performance of institutions, services, programmes projects by those (inspectors) who are directly involved in them and who are usually specifically appointed to fulfil these responsibilities. Inspection involves visits made by inspectors individually or in teams, to observe the institutions, services etc. concerned while they are actually functioning (that is, in real time). The common outcome of an inspection is a written report of the inspector's findings (Wilcox, 2000, pp.15-16).

In this conception of SI, the focus is on quality. Similar to the earlier definition, inspections may be done in groups or by one person who observes while schools are in their day-to-day operation. In SVG, the study setting, SI is conceived as, 'assessment of the standards attained by students in our primary and secondary schools at key points in their education and to report on how well they perform or improve, as they progress through their school and learning life' (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.3). The focus here is accountability for the quality of student learning.

Additionally, in the literature there are different synonyms to describe SI: supervision services, supervision, appraisal, external inspection, evaluation, and external evaluation. To avoid confusion, I use SI to mean all of these synonyms except appraisal. In SVG appraisal means how teachers perform their jobs in relation to punctuality, attendance, lesson planning, and dress, not external evaluation.

3.3. The Purposes of SI

In this section, I present a brief overview of the general purposes of SI and subsequently focus on the two central purposes, which are school improvement and accountability. Using the term evaluation to mean external evaluation or SI and school self-evaluation (SSE), MacBeath (1999) articulates a number of purposes of evaluation. To begin, evaluation has a political agenda that is global and local (school and classroom) at the same time. However, for him, the political

purpose is not the raison d'être of the purposes of evaluation. The accountability purpose of evaluation is giving parents and taxpayers the confidence that their children's future is assured and their money is well spent. The professional development purpose aims at developing pupils. The organisational development purpose entails gathering information and learning from each other's 'collective intelligence' (p.6) as he refers to it. MacBeath further speaks of improving teaching and learning purposes. All of these are similar to the purposes for SI in SVG. However, I do not see them operating in exactly the same way owing to differences in educational history, context, and setting. Despite these different purposes of evaluation, the two main ones perceived by teachers and principals are school improvement and accountability (Chapman, 2001). In the sub-section that follows, I focus on the school improvement purpose.

3.3.1. The School Improvement Purpose

School improvement, as a central purpose of SI, is a concept with which school leaders, policy makers, and teachers have wrestled for decades (Murphy, 2013). In his work, Murphy highlights a number of eras through which school improvement has passed including effective schools, systemic school improvement, and school restructuring inter alia. On the other hand, Hopkins and Reynolds (2001) stress that school improvement has a more recent history, relative to the time in which they were writing. They trace the history of school improvement to the work of Kurt Lewin. Hopkins and Reynolds further argue that it was not until the late 1970s and into the early 1980s that school improvement began to take shape as a distinct field of study.

There is contestation in the literature on how school improvement is defined and perceived. One view considers it as a precise aspect of the concept of educational change, with a focus on teaching and learning and student outcomes (Sun et al., 2007). Another author gives a more expanded definition of school improvement:

> As a distinct approach to educational change that aims to enhance student outcomes as well as strengthening the school's capacity for managing change. It is concerned with raising student achievement through focussing on the teaching–learning process and the conditions that support it (Hopkins, 2001, p.13).

While for Harris (2005, p.5) school improvement is, 'a collective endeavour that is fundamentally concerned with building a professional learning community where teachers and students develop and learn together'. In Hopkins's (2001) and Sun et al's (2007) definitions, a number of commonalities like change, teaching and learning, and student learning are the focus of school improvement. Whereas, Harris (2005) sees it more as a collaborative effort to construct a professional space where both teachers and students grow and learn simultaneously.

One of the purposes of SI is to bring about school improvement as stated earlier. The literature reveals, although sometimes tenuous, a relationship between SI and school improvement (Allen & Burgess, 2012; Dedering & Sabine, 2011; Mc Crone et al., 2009). Hopkins and West (2002) observed improvements in a number of areas: curriculum development, teaching and learning, maintaining the changes to teaching and learning through adjusting organisation and structure. Ehren and Visscher (2008, p.205) in case studies of SI in ten Dutch primary schools assert that, 'arguments between an inspector and the school regarding improvement activities appear to make a difference in promoting school improvement'. However, they claim that it is probably not effective to inspect schools and not have follow-up and oversight of the process. They also assert that the manner, in which the feedback is given, rather than the quantity of feedback, makes the difference in terms of school improvement.

In addition, Whitby (2010), studying what he considers six high performing education systems in different countries, makes the claim that SI leads to school improvement particularly when combined with school self-evaluation. For McNamara and O'Hara (2006), working in the Irish context, SI did have a positive impact on school improvement. Further, Matthews and Sammons (2004) conclude that school inspection findings, 'over different time periods provide important indicators of improvement' (p. 22). There is evidence to support the view that where support is offered to schools by school inspectorates, that SI is more likely to contribute to school improvement (Ehren et al., 2013; OECD, 2013). Ehren et al (2013) stress it is important to offer schools and teachers support to build their competencies to implement feedback from inspection. Whitby (2010, p.17) argues, 'the amount of guidance and support that schools receive in self-evaluation and

external inspection' work in favour of SI positively influencing improvement. In this case both SI and SSE bring about the change. Chapman (2001) believes that support must work in tandem with pressure for it to be effective. While it is contentious that SI results in school improvement, it is not a straightforward linkage as a myriad of factors impinge on how the improvement comes about. In SVG, SI is expected to contribute, 'strongly to school improvement' (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.5).

However, school improvement is difficult for schools facing challenging circumstances where students come from economically and socially deprived backgrounds. Achieving school improvement in these schools is fraught with a multitude of challenges, some of which are beyond the school's capacity to handle (Leithwood et al., 2006). This may be so because there is a known link between low socio-economic status and student achievement (Mujis et al., 2004). Thus, teachers in schools found in low socio-economic environments must work much harder than their counterparts in schools located in better socio-economic conditions in order to achieve school improvement (Mujis et al., 2004).

Schools facing difficult and challenging circumstances, like those in my study, need an approach to school improvement that fits their specific circumstances (Sammons, 2008; Leithwood et al., 2006). The literature consulted recommends that improvement in schools in difficult and challenging circumstances take place from within the school themselves. While external assistance and school-initiated results may bring improvement, they were not nearly as effective as those internal to the schools (Leithwood et al., 2006). The degree to which schools in depressed circumstance can overcome their condition is limited (Sammons, 2008).

Discussing school improvement inevitably brings into the discourse school effectiveness. MacBeath (2004) puts forward the view that the notion of school effectiveness developed during the presidency of Lyndon B. Johnson who commissioned a study that found schools had a significant role to play in altering the life chances of students. Since then, school effectiveness has become concerned with evaluation as well as feedback and reinforcement (Sun et al., 2007). Sun et al. argue that culture and climate play a central role in how effective schools are. Like school improvement, school effectiveness is also a contested notion:

> The performance of the organizational unit called 'school'. The performance of the school can be expressed as the output of the school, which in turn is measured in terms of the average achievement of the pupils at the end of the period of formal schooling (Scheerens, 2000, p.18).

The emphasis of school effectiveness is on how well or not well students perform on tests by the time they have come to the end of their formal period of schooling or of a class.

Over the years, there were efforts made to merge school improvement and school effectiveness work (Wrigley, 2003). For example, a project in the Northern and Southern European countries from 1998-2001 focused on creating a School Effectiveness Improvement (SEI) model in an attempt to create synergies between the two paradigms (Sun et al., 2007). However, the relationship between the two is not without contention. Critics of school effectiveness believe it focuses too much on student performance on tests at the expense of other factors (Botha, 2010; Gorard, 2010). Moreover, Wrigley (2003) feels that school effectiveness is antidemocratic. He therefore advocates not a merger of school effectiveness and school improvement as a means to school development, but rather greater emphasis on equity and social justice as a means of transformation. The SVG, SIS Unit's motto is, 'ensuring accountability, supporting school effectiveness' (Ministry of Education, 2012).This motto presupposes a relationship between accountability and school effectiveness. The sub-section that follows looks at a proposed theory of SI and its relationship to school improvement.

3.3.1.1 Ehren and Visscher's Proposed Theory of SI Effects

In my study, SI and its relationship to school improvement is explored within the context of research question one which concentrates on principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions of SI. Ehren and Visscher (2006) propose a theoretical framework, built on a review of SI literature, to expand on the knowledge that it, 'in a positive way contributes to the quality of schools and education' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.53). Furthermore, they argue that if there is greater understanding on the actual impact of SI then ways to generate 'intended effects' and lessen 'unintended effects' (p. 53) may come about. In this regard, they theorise SI characteristics, factors in and around the school, schools' reactions to

inspection, and effects and side effects are the critical elements of SI leading to school improvement. In reviewing Altrichter's (1999) work of an experimental theory SI model, and Ehren and Visscher's (2006) work on SI, I believe the latter theory of SI effects is most appropriate for assisting with interrogating the findings in the data chapter. This is so because of the theory's applicability to understanding the context of a new SI system that has school improvement as one of its main remits.

School inspection characteristics

Ehren and Visscher (2006) believe that the characteristics (features) of an SI process have an effect on its impact. They argue that if the focus of SI is to achieve school improvement then inspectors are likely to become, 'critical friends' who get to know schools inside-out, providing feedback, and ways through which they can improve. As I pointed out elsewhere, one of the main reasons for the implementation of SI in SVG is to contribute to school improvement. Therefore in this context, inspectorates wanting to bring about change in schools should use equal amounts of, 'direct (giving instruction to schools) and indirect (spurring) pressure' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.54). As will be seen in chapter four, the SI model of SVG has the feature of giving instructions through making recommendations for school improvement. However, it does not have an explicit focus on the indirect element of pressure on schools to improve. Improvement of a school starts with the relationship between the inspectorate and the head teachers. Moreover, the characteristics of an SI process have an effect on its impact through inspectors' relationship with the schools, the way they communicate, and the kind of feedback they offer to schools.

Inspectors' relationship with schools is an important element of Ehren and Visscher's features of school inspection. It begins with mutual trust between inspectors and schools. Thus, inspectors should encourage schools to adopt an approach whereby they acknowledge their strengths and weaknesses and take action regarding inspection recommendations. Inspectors should aim to foster 'reciprocal relationships' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.54) with schools in which they have a voice in the process. This aspect of Ehren and Visscher's work in a SI system that is new, and which is operating within the setting of primary education

in a small island postcolonial space, is useful to interpreting the findings of this study.

A second important element of the SI characteristics is the relationship between inspectors and schools, which Ehren and Visscher theorise, should come about through formal and informal communication with school personnel. Ehren and Visscher speak of the power dimensions, 'the extent to which the inspector gives direction to the interaction process, while the dimension of nearness relates to the emotional distance between the inspector and the other participants in the interaction processes' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.55). A combination of these two elements results in eight different styles of communication, which characterises the way communication takes place between inspectors and school personnel. The following are the eight styles: leading, helping/friendly, understanding, giving space, insecure, dissatisfied, correcting, and firm. If there is a standoff between an inspection team and schools, the power lies with the inspectors. Inspectors come to the SI process with power and authority, which they should not disguise. In trying to build a balanced relationship with schools, inspectors should be unambiguous and transparent regarding the boundaries of the relationship and, who among them, has the last word. Again, operating SI in a postcolonial school setting where, historically, power was in the hands of the authority, like the inspectors, is another important element in interrogating the data findings.

Ehren and Visscher further point out that feedback, a third aspect of SI characteristics, is often times a lopsided affair. I explored the notion of inspection feedback earlier in this review, and since most of it is similar to what Ehren and Visscher espouse in their theory it will not be useful to repeat them here.

In the last feature the SI characteristics, Ehren and Visscher (2006) articulate how SI may be structured to avoid it resulting in negative side effects. They argue for inspectors to use performance indicators in a flexible manner, and not as rigidly stated on paper. School staff should be involved in developing as well as implementing these indicators to feel a sense of ownership. Ehren and Visscher suggest a focus on short-term achievement to match inspectors' expectations may be avoided, but at the expense of long-term goals. Further, a range of performance indicators should be used in order to mitigate against schools engaging in fraud and

misrepresentation. Moreover, they argue for performance indicators to become part of the administration of schools. Having severe penalties may prevent misrepresentation and fraud during SI; whereas developing reciprocity, while at the same time developing a collegial relationship between schools are other means of preventing negative side effects. Inspectors operating a new SI system, such as the one under study here, must be overtly mindful of the side effects that can result from it because of the possibility of re-enacting colonial SI effects and thwarting genuine efforts at school improvement.

Factors in and around the school

In the second major component of Ehren and Visscher's (2006) framework of SI, they explain the impact of SI relates to the attitude of staff regarding change and innovation capacity (school features) as well as pressure to improve, and resources and assistance (external impulses and support).

I will discuss school features (or factors in the school) in relation to the concept of staff attitude to change when I explore the subtopics of teaching and learning, and leadership and management. External impulses and support is another issue where Ehren and Visscher (2006) theorise that only about ten per cent of schools have the internal capacity to create change without external assistance. The remainder tend not to feel the necessity for change unless they receive prodding and supported by an external entity such as a school inspectorate. Ehren and Visscher (2006) argue that a school's locale and other external personnel may contribute to effecting change in it. Additionally, schools must get the resources that are necessary for their improvement. Education policymakers may use Ehren and Visscher's perspective regarding external assistance, as a means to effect change in schools, as their justification for implementing of SI in primary schools in SVG. However, this justification might pale if resources are not forthcoming to support improvement.

Schools' reactions to inspection

The way schools respond to SI depends on its findings. This is the third major component of Ehren and Visscher's SI framework. Schools' reactions to SI relate to whether the school is functioning well or not, its culture, among other factors.

The intended responses of SI include acceptance and genuine improvement actions by schools. The process Ehren and Visscher suggest schools should follow to bring about improvement include: (i) diagnosis, (ii) initiation, mobilisation and adoption (iii) implementation or initial use and (iv) continuation or incorporation and institutionalisation. SI in SVG is at the last stage of their improvement steps since at the time of writing it is approximately three and a half years since its implementation.

Unintended responses from schools occur when there is a mismatch between the goals of the SI body and those of schools. Schools may claim the week of inspection was not their typical week, with insufficient lessons observed and inspectors not being familiar with the context of the particular school. This results in the unintended action of rejection of the findings. Undesirable actions may happen before, during and after the inspection. These actions may be unintentional by schools but may also happen through data manipulation, an unintended response known as misrepresentation. They claim, some schools may even commit illegal actions because of inspection. Myopia is another unintended response that may result from SI in which schools focus on achieving short-term improvement goals rather than long-term ones. Additionally, ossification is one other unintended response and it involves schools following the inspection framework to the letter and ignoring innovation. It would be interesting to see if and how these unintended responses relate to the case of the new SI system in primary schools in SVG.

(Side-) **effects**

Side-) effects are the fourth feature of Ehren and Visscher's framework. For them, SI should bring about intended effects, that is, 'the desired changes that appear as a result of school inspection' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.63). This may include the improvement in student performance and the conditions prior to improved student

performance. I will discuss the negative side effects of SI in detail in a subsequent section of this review. However, an important side effect that is worth mentioning here is performance paradox where schools come to know those aspects of their performance that SI judges, and focus on these at the expense of other needed areas of improvement. This results in a decline of the relationship between their real and reported performance. Thus, weak performances may never be discovered and schools are not put on a path of real improvement. Essentially, this is akin to window dressing.

Matching inspection, school and external impulses

Ehren and Visscher (2006) present an expanded framework of school inspection effects in which they include the components: external impulses and support, features of school inspection, schools' reactions, (side-) effects and schools features. They theorise, that if the intended effects are to be achieved then inspectors ought to modify their approach to inspection to bring it in line with, 'a school's innovation capacity, and to a school's external impulses' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.65). The extent of schools' capacity to change, I contend, relates to their historical development. In chapter two, I outlined the colonial historical development of primary education in SVG. The legacies of this are still very evident in our contemporary primary schools.

Schools that have, 'low innovation capacity and few external impulses' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.66) will benefit from a 'directive approach' (p. 65) where inspectors unambiguously highlight strong and weak areas, the likely contributing factors and causes of these and identify how the schools might approach improvement. Schools in these circumstances may receive pressure from inspectors on the method of change by signing a written agreement that should include development of an improvement plan. However, the pressure should be mutual and reciprocal in nature.

On the contrary, in schools where there are high innovation capacities and strong external impulses it is more appropriate for inspectors to use, 'a more reserved inspection approach' (Ehren & Visscher, 2006, p.67) because they have the capacity to improve from within. Pressure may have unintended negative effects

on these schools and the intended effects may not take place. They may invent reasons for not adhering to suggestions and may later present inspectors with what they want to see, which may be false. It is therefore possible that intended effects of SI will not take place when inspectors adopt a restrained attitude by giving schools with low innovation and little external impulses only strong and weak points. Ehren and Visscher's suggestion here ought to be approached sensitively in SVG as SI is being implemented in a context of marginalisation of teachers' views and within a history of a top-down approach to education policy implementation.

I explored in this section the four components and the respective sub-components of Ehren and Visscher's (2006) theory: SI characteristics, factors in and around the school, schools' reactions to inspection findings, and effects and side effects. This theory adds a critical layer to the conceptual framework of my study. Another important component of SI and its relationship to school improvement is SSE, which I discuss next.

3.3.1.2. School Self-evaluation

School self-evaluation (SSE) is indispensable to school improvement in many countries (O'Brien et al., 2014; Demetriou & Kyriakides, 2012). Although it is widespread in education systems, there is no clear definition of it (Janssens & van Amelsvoort, 2008). One definition sees it as, 'a systematic process, which includes cyclic activities such as goal-setting, planning, evaluation and defines new improvement measures' (Janssens & van Amelsvoort, 2008, p.16). Another definition construes it as a highly structured and organised system of evaluation that operates within schools and focuses on the professional development concerns of teachers (O'Brien et al., 2015). The important aspect of SSE, from these definitions, is that schools do it in a structured manner in order to assess their own performance.

There are different ways in which SSE occurs in relation to SI. In some countries, the school inspectorate designs a pre-structured system of SSE with which schools must comply (Schildkamp et al., 2012; McNamara & O'Hara, 2008). These writers also indicate that the pre-structured system sometimes exists alongside a free or open system in which schools conduct their own SSE without external assistance.

However, Schildkamp et al (2012) state in England SSE is, 'undertaken where the framework is provided by an external agency, including Ofsted' (p. 125). In SVG, the SSE proposed by the SIS Unit is a pre-structured system. Such a system is limited and does not give schools enough latitude in doing their own SSE.

Despite the value of SSE, there are concerns regarding its implementation and use in schools (O'Brien et al., 2015). In the view of Janssens and van Amelsvoort (2008), the absence of a formal definition for SSE can result in confusion and may impede accountability and improvement that in themselves may be a source of contradiction. Some argue that schools do not possess the human resource capacity necessary to engage in SSE (O'Brien et al., 2014; Schildkamp et al., 2012). However, there are those who see SSE as an expression of social justice, democracy and moving authority from the centre to the periphery (Nevo, 2002; Simons, 2002).

O'Brien et al (2015) who researched the implementation of SSE in Centres for Education in Ireland found that there was a high degree of implementation of SSE and that there was a positive attitude towards it. They concluded that in order for there to be successful implementation of SSE, a facilitator-led approach dealing with the practical issues of implementation and a national system of monitoring were critical. Another perspective, Schildkamp et al. (2012) suggests that for SSE to work a positive disposition is required. They add that schools must put in the time, resources, and develop the knowledge and reflective attitude required for SSE. For their part, Karagiorgi et al (2015) advocate for collaboration in which schools have autonomy in deciding what their focus of SSE will be while at the same time receiving outside support in the management and analysis of data. In shedding light on how SSE might be enacted Wong and Li (2010, p.231) assert, 'constructive dialogue between internal and external evaluation needs to be established as a basis for their existence'. O'Brien et al. (2014) believe a *critical friend* or *critical facilitator* outside of the school is necessary to assist with handling some of the negative concerns that tend to affect the implementation of SSE. I agree that SSE is a critical evaluation method that must be used alongside SI. While SSE is part of SVG's SI process, it is not an engrained and systematic part of primary schools' evaluation culture. SI in the local context cannot be

successful without a vibrant bespoke SSE culture. I discussed school improvement as one of two central purposes of SI; the next is accountability.

3.3.1.3 The Accountability Purpose

Accountability is the second important purpose of SI. Generally, in the history of education teachers, and by extension schools, have always been held accountable to the stakeholders in education (Hooge et al., 2012; Darling-Hammond & Ascher, 1991). O' Day (2002) intimates that, from the establishment of the common school, teachers' general appearance, conduct and teaching performance were closely observed. Then it was mainly regulatory or in compliance to existing statutes (Anderson, 2005). Schools were therefore always under the gaze of those who had the power to determine how they functioned and whether they were fulfilling their perceived mandate. The view is, accountability in its modern form has its genesis in the 1980s/1990s (Gilbert, 2012; Milewski, 2012).

A common perception of accountability is of a process that uses the achievement of students to assess the performance of a school (Almerindo, 2014; Figlio & Loeb, 2011). Tests are a quantitative (positivist) way of understanding student achievement. This singular perspective should not be the only way student success is measured. One perception of accountability sees it as, 'a systematic method to assure stakeholder-educators, policymakers, and the public that schools are producing desired results' (Grover, 2014, p.260). While I agree with Grover (2014), I believe that educators and policymakers ought to be mindful that being systematic in accountability does not only mean a reliance on quantitative measures, but also takes into consideration qualitative measures in judging student achievement.

A number of factors may be responsible for the apparent preoccupation with accountability in education. In Hooge et al's (2012) view, findings coming from international entities like Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMMS) have added fillip to the need for accountability in OECD countries. In addition, neo-liberal market agendas as well as decentralisation and/or autonomy in education (Almerindo, 2014) have contributed to the rise in accountability (Aske et al., 2012;

Hooge et al., 2012). These issues while devised in the context of developed countries find their way into developing countries as education policy reforms. The literature sometimes portrays a negative image of accountability in education (Park, 2013; Maile, 2002). However, accountability may have a social justice agenda of participation, empowerment, and a perspective of the democratic ideal (Maile, 2002). This latter perspective of accountability may only be an ideal because those at the receiving end of accountability tend to perceive it as punitive.

Hooge et al. (2012) identify a number of drivers for accountability ranging from legitimation by means of adherence with laws and regulations, to accounting for the quality of education (effectiveness), with value for money (efficiency), leading to an improvement in the quality of education (effectiveness) equity or access. These concepts are part of various education publications in SVG. These documents are philosophically grounded in international education policies like the MDGs and EFA as stated in chapter one. I will explore, in the next section, how those at the receiving end of SI perceive and experience it.

3.4. Experiences and Perceptions of SI

The first research question aims to capture principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions of SI in primary schools in SVG. This section assists with achieving that purpose.

Dean (1995) identified a key finding from a study conducted in fourteen English primary and secondary schools between 1992 and 1993, around the beginning of the Ofsted system of inspection. Firstly, regarding the planning and preparation for inspection, some head teachers and teachers responded positively to being included in the planning process, and knowing from inspectors' explanation the nature of the inspection. Although this was so, there was still some degree of anxiety and worry in schools about being inspected (Dean, 1995). Moreover, according to Dean, teachers and principals raised some concerns about the credibility of inspectors. They were concerned about inspectors' experience and expertise to inspect primary schools in particular. In Dean's study, principals and teachers were of the perception that the inspectors being present in classes appeared to have had

some negative impact on teachers and students. Chapman (2001) also found this to be the case.

Wilcox and Gray (1994) conducted a study of three primary school in three LEA's in England that speak to teachers' and principals' experiences and perceptions of SI. In two of the schools in the study, the participants felt the inspection did not result in new insights. However, some participants felt that the inspection was beneficial to the current and future context of their school. In another school, they had difficulty accepting the fact that a school could have good relations and yet still have unsatisfactory leadership, teaching, and learning. Participants expressed the feeling that the two to five days, allocated to the inspection was inadequate to make a judgment of the school. Teachers expressed a preference for SSE over SI. The experiences and perceptions gathered by Wilcox and Gray (1994) were just about two years after Ofsted came into effect. Comparatively, this is a similar period to my own study.

In another study, Milewski (2012) did an oral history case study of teachers who taught in primary schools in different regions of Ontario, Canada during the 1930 to learn about their experiences with SI at that time. She found that teachers often had advance information about the inspector's impending arrival. This then became a 'potent factor' (Milewski, 2012, p.650) in the teachers' work as the anticipation of the inspector's visit brought fear and anxiety on teachers (Milewski, 2012). She goes on to say that, teachers recalled their experiences of school inspection as surveillance and a disciplinary function of their work. Jeffery and Woods (1996) and Perryman (2006) also see Ofsted inspections as surveillance of teachers. Further, Milewski (2012) elaborates that in the teachers' views the inspectors did not encourage creativity in teaching and ensured that teachers adhered to a prescriptive curriculum. This is in effect ensuring that they are accountable to the inspector and consequently the government, parents and children. Milewski's historical study of teachers' experiences with SI in the 1930s is similar to some experiences in the contemporary context of SI.

Principals too have experienced negative effects of SI (de Wolf & Janssens, 2007; Ouston & Davies, 1998). Ouston and Davies (1998) stressed that head teachers complained that the number of inspections placed pressure on them. In the week

leading up to an inspection, head teachers became nervous about the process (Jeffrey & Woods, 1996). It would appear, however, that a negative or positive effect of SI on head teachers relates to whether they are new or established in the position. Fergusson et al (1999) found that new head teachers did not feel as negatively affected by school inspection as did established head teachers.

SI had similar effects on teachers as it did on principals. Many teachers face stress because of the SI process (Case et al., 2000; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996; Brimblecombe et al., 1995). Case et al (2000) reveal that in spite of receiving favourable inspection reports after observation of their lessons teachers low self-image did not lessen during inspection. Further, inspection often led to absenteeism and illness among teachers (de Wolf & Janssens, 2007; Case et al., 2000). Case et al (2000) also report that there was fatigue among teachers for an extended period following Ofsted. Additionally, many dedicated and motivated teachers displayed nervousness because of school inspection (Fergusson et al., 1999). These features indicate that there are considerable psychological and physiological effects of SI on principals and teachers (Brimblecombe et al., 1995). The physiological effects ranged from stress, sleepless nights, eczema, alcoholism, to a reduction in the quality of family life. Given the tendency for teaching to be female dominated, a study of gender differences of inspection (Brimblecombe et al. 1995) found that female teachers were more likely to experience nervousness because of inspection. These are all negative side effects of inspection that Ehren and Visscher (2006) speak to earlier in their theory of SI effects.

Building on this, de Wolf and Janssens (2007) conducted a study that explored the unintended negative consequences of SI. In their view window dressing was the most known of the intended strategic behaviours in which schools engaged. Window dressing is, 'the creation of proactive and reactive arrangements, which are generated simply and solely to be assessed favourably by the supervisor' (de Wolf & Janssens, 2007, p.382). What happens in window dressing is schools take measures prior to and after inspection to ensure that inspectors give them a positive feedback. Again, Ehren and Visscher (2006) articulate these unintended consequences in their work.

Another term used to speak to the intended strategic behaviour is gaming. Regarding gaming, Chapman (2001, p. 70) claims, 'some teachers play the inspection game and prepare to provide inspectors with what they want to see by changing their practice to conform to the Ofsted orthodoxy but only for inspection week'. I consider gaming to be deception since it only serves a temporary function and benefits teachers and not the long-term teaching and learning process. In adding to this view, teachers sometimes choreographed performances for the Ofsted inspectors (Case et al., 2000). Clearly, this reveals that staging schools take place in an effort to provide a façade for inspectors. Teachers perform for the inspectors giving them what they want to see during the inspection (Perryman, 2009). One of the things my research explores is the critical role teaching and learning, leadership and management play in SI and its achievement of school improvement. In light of this, I discuss, in the upcoming section, the literature in relation to them.

3.5. Teaching and Learning

This section discusses the literature that helps to explore research question two concerning what the findings of the SI process reveal about teaching and learning in primary schools in SVG. Teaching and learning is a wide concept that covers a number of areas inter alia: classroom organisation, differentiation, good structuring of teaching, coordination among teachers, activating students and a shared vision of pedagogy (van Bruggen, 2010).

The teaching method that has become entrenched in schools that have a colonial history is, 'narration (with the teacher as narrator) leads the students to memorize mechanically the narrated content' (Freire, 1996, pp.52-53). This method of teaching turns students into depositories and the teacher into depositors in what Freire (1996) asserts is, 'the banking concept of education' (p.53). This is what Dewey (1938) calls traditional education in which, '…that which is taught is thought of as essentially static. It is taught as a finished product…' (p. 19). This kind of teaching is rigid and inflexible and is teacher-centred because it focuses on:

> the teacher explaining a concept with students listening and then participating as appropriate to practice the idea. Generally, students engage

in additional practice using written workbooks or worksheet exercises to reinforce the concept. (Webb et al., 2014, p.530)

Traditional teaching may have had its genesis in an age that Ganser (2001) called the *pre-professional age*; this was in the pre- 1960s when teaching was more of an apprenticeship system based on observation and practice and training in pedagogical methods was not a priority. Traditional teaching seems entrenched in some teachers' repertoire as O'Grady et al (2014) found in their study among science teachers in the Irish school context. While the teachers were aware and used active learning strategies many were still not convinced of this method of teaching. They identified constraints, for example test preparation and time, as factors that inhibit the use of active teaching methods.

In contrast to traditional teacher-centred teaching Dewey (1938) advocated a progressive or student-centred approach to teaching that engages students in, '…learning through experience, making most of opportunities of present life, acquaintance with a changing world' (pp. 19-20). The student-centred approach is in line with the constructivist approach to teaching (Uibu et al., 2011; Hodges Kulinna & Cothran, 2003). The constructivist approach is one in which students are allowed to construct meaning through their own learning experiences (Ganser, 2001). Also, in line with Dewey's perspective and the constructivist approach is Freire's (1996) view of a consciousness that allows the teacher-student relationship to change to a dialogical one of, 'teacher student with students-teachers' (Freire, 1996, p.61). The teacher and the student are both dependent on each other for learning. However, Schwerdt and Wuppermann (2011) in their study have concluded that traditional teaching is not necessarily as limiting as constructivists believe. Consequently Uibu et al (2011) found that, 'teachers still prefer teaching practices focused on traditional goals' (p. 91).

Instructional goals, the teacher's style of management and his/her experience as well as education and age affect the choice of teaching methods (Uibu & Kikas, 2014; Uibu et al., 2011). In their study of physical education (PE) teachers, Hodges Kulinna and Cothran (2003) cited the Mosston's Spectrum of Teaching Styles, which is a continuum of eleven styles. They concluded that despite using a variety of teaching methods, the teachers used less of the productive (constructivist) style.

The study, in the belief of Hodges, Kulinna and Cothran (2003) while focused on practical skill acquisition, has implications for academic areas as well. This latter perspective is relevant to my study as student achievement in academic subjects is, to some, the hallmark of school improvement in the contemporary discourse of SI operating in primary schools in SVG.

The certification of teachers is a means towards improving teaching and learning and student outcomes. However, Aslam and Kingdom (2011) believe that teacher training and certification, which are the means often used to gauge the quality of teaching and education policy, appear to have no influence on student achievement. In addition, Chingos and Peterson (2011) express the view that, 'teacher classroom performance is correlated neither with the type of certification a teacher has earned nor with acquisition of an advanced degree' (p.449). Furthermore, Kane et al (2008) found that a concentration on the certification of teachers might not be as significant in student achievement as is believed. They state there is, '…little difference in the average academic achievement impacts of certified, uncertified and alternatively certified teachers' (p. 629). It would appear that highly certified teachers do not necessarily result in better student outcomes. In SVG, about 85 per cent of the primary school teachers possess the local two-year teachers' certificate. As stated earlier, a number of primary school teachers and principals now have university degrees and the belief is that this would improve overall performance.

Relating SI to teaching and learning, an Ofsted commissioned study found that SI had some degree of impact on the quality of teaching (Mc Crone et al., 2009). Further, because of school inspection teachers paid closer attention to their lesson planning and other teaching and learning related activities (Wilcox, 2000). School inspection may also act as a conduit for staff development (Matthews & Smith, 1995). Ormston et al (1995) in a survey of teachers on their intention to change their teaching found that one third claimed intention to change. They warned though that, the intention to change is not the same as actual change. Change in the pedagogical practices of teachers is one of the most difficult inspection recommendations to implement in a school (Wilcox, 2000; Londsdale & Parsons, 1998). In this regard, inspection had minimal impact on teachers' practice

(Chapman, 2001a). Putting it bluntly, Case et al (2000) found that school inspection had no effect whatsoever on what teachers did in their classrooms. They add that it had a negative impact on teaching practice in the period following school inspection. Leadership and management like teaching and learning, is indispensable to any SI process.

3.6. Leadership and Management

In this section, I discuss the literature to help illuminate the second research question, which, focuses on leadership and management. Some believe that for organisations, including schools, to be able to adapt to meet the challenges of the changing world in which they exist a good understanding and knowledge of organisational learning and learning organisation theories is important (Sun et al., 2007). More importantly having a good understanding of theory gives leaders at all levels of the education system a basis for creating effective organisational improvements (Evans et al., 2012). School improvement occurs within the context of schools as organisations and for it to be successful school leaders must have a good foundational understanding of theory (Evans et al., 2012). Nevertheless, Evans et al (2012) believe that many school leaders do not make the link between structured school changes and theories of change. This they believe is because they do not have a good grasp of the theoretical bases, which relate to productive school changes. Moreover, they assert, education reform occurs separately from theories of change. They believe if organisational learning is to take place then the organisation must put in place systems that will merge individual and collective learning skills and knowledge that will have major effects on it. These two theoretical frameworks, Evans et al (2012) consider as being critical for school leaders' knowledge base in the context of leading effective change in schools. The perspectives of Evans et al seem to be the case with leadership and management of primary schools in SVG.

There seems to be consensus in the literature that principals and other school leaders do make a substantial difference in schools (Miller, 2012; Fullan, 2007). They do this through the culture they cultivate, whether positive or negative, within the school. Much research exists on different styles of educational

leadership in schools. However, instructional and transformational leadership dominate the literature. To begin, instructional leadership has its history in the 1980s at a time when the effective schools' movement was taking root particularly in the United States (Bush, 2015; Salo et al., 2015; Gumus & Akcaoglu, 2013). The term instructional leadership is a contested one with no specific conception of how to enact it in schools (Castello, 2015). In its early conception it was believed that instructional leadership was the preserve of the school principal who took on sole responsibility for the leadership of a school (Robinson et al., 2008). However, over the decades of its existence the meaning of instructional leadership has evolved to meet challenges to its original focus (Carraway & Young, 2015; Castello, 2015).

Considering the contested nature of instructional leadership, I use a definition that considers it as, 'the process of performing all leadership activities that may affect learning at schools' (Gulcan, 2012, p.627). The workshop the MoE organised for principals and senior teachers to orient them to SI immediately prior to its implementation used the theme "Instructional Leadership Training for Head teachers and Senior Teachers". Thus, the MoE of SVG privileges instructional leadership as the mode of leadership for schools in the context of SI. One can make the conclusion that the MoE links effective leadership to instructional leadership. Others consider effective leadership as having a relationship to school effectiveness (Ngcobo & Tikly, 2010). These authors argue that effective leadership criteria, which often use quantitative measures, are not always appropriate to contexts outside of Western industrialised nations (Ngcobo & Tikly, 2010).

Hallinger (2003) delineates three dimensions of instructional leadership: defining the mission of the school, managing the instructional programme, and promoting positive school-learning climate. In identifying these dimensions of instructional leadership, change is needed in the role of the principal from the traditional managerial/administrator role to a more complex dimension of issues within schools aimed at effecting improvement in student learning (Carraway & Young, 2015; Salo et al., 2015). In this regard, Hallinger and Lee (2014, p.6) contend that , 'over the past two decades a growing body of international research suggests that

instructional leadership from the principal is essential for the improvement of teaching and learning in schools'.

However, instructional leadership has not been without criticism. It is the view of Carraway and Young (2015) that limited time within the school day, lack of prerequisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions of principals to be instructional leaders are impediments to instructional leadership. Castello (2015) points to imprecise conception of the instructional role, principals feeling inadequate and time constraints as limitations to instructional leadership. He goes on to say that, the absence of a general definition of instructional leadership means that a number of educators are not aware of how instructional leadership is exemplified in their schools and how to implement it as a type of leadership.

Another theory of leadership is transformational leadership that emerged to counter the dominance, limitations, and dissatisfaction with instructional leadership (Shatzer et al., 2014; Hallinger, 2003). It was initially proposed by Burns (1978) and emerged as a theory of leadership for use in non-educational contexts (Marks & Printy, 2003). It is a concept:

> [That] focuses on developing the organization's capacity to innovate. Rather than focussing specifically on direct coordination, control, and supervision of curriculum and instruction, transformational leadership seeks to build the organization's capacity to select its purposes and to support development changes, to practices of teaching and learning (Hallinger, 2003, p.330).

The intention of transformational leadership, therefore, is to ensure that teachers and other school leaders develop the personal demeanour that is requisite for achieving the goals set by the school and to build its capacity to effect changes within the organisation. From inception, change was a pivotal feature of transformational leadership. Educational reform initiatives should privilege this leadership style (Alsaeedi & Male, 2013; Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2006), because it engages those within the organisation to ensure the enhancement of that capacity, and it is a model of leadership that is participatory and emancipatory in its philosophy. Moreover, its premise is a bottom-up theory to change (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990). However, instead of instructional or transformational leadership, a number of writers have considered using the strengths of both theories in school

leadership (Shatzer et al., 2014; Marks & Printy, 2003). I believe no singular theory of leadership is adequate for leading change in schools. This is so because, schools comprise of individuals with different personalities, biographies, and backgrounds and they operate in different historical and cultural contexts.

In the discussion, it is important to understand school leadership within the context of the Caribbean where my study is set. Beckford and Lekule (2012) argue for distributed leadership as a model of leadership for Caribbean schools. They acknowledge, like Miller (2013) and others, that leadership is a contested concept, which makes defining it a challenge. Beckford and Lekule (2012) claim distributed leadership is unlike transformational and instructional leadership. To them, 'it provides opportunities for reciprocal influence between leaders and followers. This reciprocity presupposes that each member of an organisation be viewed as assets endowed with skills to be used for the good of the school' (Beckford & Lekule, 2012, p.164). This may be a difficult concept of leadership for many primary school leaders in SVG to embrace because of the top-down historical development of educational leadership. However, I will not dismiss entirely the concept of distributed leadership as I see it as aspirational and having possibilities.

In the perspective of Beckford and Lekule (2012), distributed leadership has the potential for effective leadership in schools. In achieving this, they see tapping into the knowledge and skills of others within a school as a critical element of the theory of distributed leadership. To them, parents, students, and the community have an integral role to play in school leadership. In order to bring about distributed leadership in schools they advocate training, which they acknowledge, many Caribbean principals and vice-principals do not possess in a formal way. In chapter one, I pointed out that most primary school principals in SVG have only had formal training in leadership at the degree level since the start of this century when the ER began. Borden (2002, p.3) in a study of principals in Latin America and the Caribbean found that principals were traditionally seen as, 'transmitters of orders and rules'.

Further, Beckford and Lekule believe, 'principals are often found wanting in many areas of leadership and administration in the Caribbean' (2012, p.170). This is a serious concern for school improvement in the Caribbean. Not surprisingly, they

point to political party affiliation and religion as being critical factors in the appointment of principals in the Caribbean, a perspective with which I am very familiar. To bring about effective leadership in Caribbean schools they suggest a change in attitude and philosophy of leadership and a merger of theory and experience (Beckford & Lekule, 2012). While I accept some of the views espoused by Beckford and Lekule for the adoption of distributed leadership in Caribbean schools, I do not subscribe to a singular named model of leadership for primary schools in SVG. To me, it is too restricting in a setting where formal training in leadership at the primary level is little more than a decade old.

Another work on school leadership in the Caribbean that I find interesting is that of Miller (2013). In citing works from the 1980s, he indicates that historically, educational leadership in the Caribbean was not structured and focused as pointed out above. He claimed that the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), an economic grouping of fifteen Caribbean countries, has since the 1980s, articulated the value and importance of leadership for Caribbean schools. However, Miller questions how much of this new understanding of the need for training in leadership has benefitted school organisations in the Caribbean. From Miller's perspective school leadership in the Caribbean focuses on a style of leadership called academic liberalism that essentially focuses on leaders gaining objective knowledge, akin to the concept of positivism, for managing schools. Its focus is on training leaders to apply theory to leadership. The second aspect of leadership that is emphasised in the Caribbean, according to Miller (2013), is experiential vocationalism, which derives from economic as well as organisational issues. The purpose of leadership, in this conception, is to endow leaders with the skills and knowledge necessary for organisations. The main concern is on developing a 'competent manager,' who has the 'interpersonal and technical competencies required by organisations' (Miller, 2012, p.17). These two styles of leadership are similar in nature. He states that in the Caribbean historical and conceptual factors influence school leadership. Miller (2013) further posits that primary and secondary schools in the Caribbean have a single leader who has virtually all of the power in these schools. From my experience, this is an accurate description of the way in which teachers, students and the community viewed me as a principal. A view I did not relish.

Miller (2013) suggests effective school leadership needs to create a balance between attention to detail and understanding of the larger picture. In a study of school leadership in Trinidad and Tobago Conrad et al (2006) point out that effective leadership in that country, and other Anglophone Caribbean countries, is considered as possessing academic credentials, good moral attributes and where the school is deemed by educational leaders and others in authority to be meeting legal and policy requirements. Miller (2013), like Beckford and Lekule (2012), feels that there should be a distribution of leadership throughout schools. Leadership he argues is about developing the organisational capacity at all levels. Miller's perspective for developing successful leadership in the Caribbean is that there should be synergies between Ministries of Education, universities, and school communities that lift the discourse of the characteristics and features of school leadership. He suggests a critical analysis of present understanding of leadership and an examination of how organisational culture and climate influence schools' and teachers' performance, as one way of building successful school leadership. Miller's analysis and suggestions for school leadership in the Caribbean, to me, is more flexible than the singular approach of distributed leadership proposed by Beckford and Lekule (2012).

With reference to leadership and management as it relates to SI, Ehren & Visscher (2008) in citing other studies asserted that SI effects changes in school leaders that may result in some kind of school improvement. Matthews and Smith (1995) found in a study of quality assurance, with a specific focus on improvement of inspection and improvement by means of inspection, that many of the easy to implement aspects of schools' action plans revealed an 'improvement in management and administration' (p.5). Another study by Mc Crone and others found, the majority of head teachers felt that school inspection had a definite positive effect on improved monitoring and on leadership and management in that they paid attention to the recommendations (Mc Crone et al., 2009). The effects of inspection on leadership and management can work both ways in some schools as Ouston and Davies (1998) have observed. However, they concluded that Ofsted inspection encouraged change where head teachers used it as a means to foster change before and years after the inspection process. Changes in management perspective will often be critical to implementing the recommendations for SI. Equally important is the

implementation of the recommendations that result from the inspection findings, which I will delve into next.

3.7. Implementing SI Recommendations

This section explores issues regarding the implementation of inspection recommendations and challenges to implementing them. These issues will be relevant to the focus of my third research question. To begin, 'implementation consists of the process of putting into practice an idea or program, or set of activities and structures new to the people attempting or expected to change' (Fullan, 2007, p.84). With regards to SI, school leaders and teachers are key to effecting the recommendations of an inspection report to bring about improvement. Fullan (2007) identified three 'interactive factors' (p.87) which affect implementation namely the characteristics of change which entails issues of need, clarity, complexity, and quality/practicality; the local characteristics which relate to district, community, principal and teachers; and external factors that is government and other entities. The extent to which these factors would affect implementation is arguably different in a postcolonial education system such as the one I am researching. This is supported by the view that the Caribbean 'can offer much in terms of an appreciation and understanding of the impact that, historical and cultural forces can have on a people's development and their ability to adapt or embrace change' (Louisy, 2001, p.436). Nonetheless, Fullan's ideas are worthy of serious consideration with modifications for context and setting.

Teaching, learning, leadership, and management are the main areas for which inspectorates make recommendations to bring about improvement in schools. I have dealt with the indispensable role of principals in leading change in schools earlier. I think it is also important to mention the claim of Fullan (2007) that change is difficult when teachers are asked to adapt new ways of teaching and philosophies of education. In the latter case, the belief is, 'unless the basic values of teachers and other employees are reshaped they revert to the routine behaviours once the pressure to change has subsided' (Kowalski, 2003, p.285). Fullan (2007) puts forward the view that factors relating to a single teacher, which Chapman (2001a) supports, are important in implementation. He contends, there are teachers

who are more amenable to change because of their prior teaching experiences and the level at which they are in their career which allows them to want to work towards effective implementation. Between 2008 and 2009 a qualitative case study was done for Ofsted by the National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER) on its Section 5 (S5) SI system. This was then a new system of SI introduced as part of the Education Act of 2005 in England. The study found that recommendations for teaching that were specific, allowed schools to identify definite ways they had changed, whereas recommendations that were more general were difficult to establish (Mc Crone et al., 2009). Therefore, it is important that recommendations for changes in teaching and learning be specific in order for effective implementation and facilitation of change to occur.

Ouston and Davies (1998) in a study of secondary schools in England found that almost three quarters of the schools felt the inspectors' recommendations were useful while some of the recommendations were not implementable. They found that when the recommendations were not in line with the culture of the school they received less priority. In cases where the recommendations mirrored the schools' plans, implementation had greater success. In Ouston and Davies's research, schools that reported good progress in implementation of changes, these changes related to more simplistic issues that were easy to deal with. However, hardly any progress was noted where a large number of recommendations were made for schools that were struggling.

In a primary school case study in England, Dimmer and Metiuk (1998) found that the school's implementation of the SI recommendations related to how they handled the SI report. The relevant stakeholders studied, without haste, the findings of the report and then devised a well thought out action plan delineating those responsible for specific actions. What I find important in this case study was that success came because of collaborative action of all of the relevant stakeholders who had a prominent role in the action plan. Mc Crone et al (2009) and Fullan (2007) also found staff collaboration to be integral to successful implementation. There was acceptance by the staff that the school needed to make changes in its teaching and management culture, which made the implementation of SI recommendations successful. It would seem that preparation of a thorough action

plan, collaborative action, and acceptance of the need to change are essential ingredients in successful implementation of SI recommendations.

Culture is an integral aspect of the process of change and inevitably implementation of SI recommendations. To begin culture is defined as, 'a system of shared values and beliefs that interact with an organization's people, organizational structures and control systems to produce behavioural norms' (Owens, 2004, p.183). Thus, culture may be a facilitator or an impediment to change within an organisation (Kowalski, 2003). Therefore, schools in which a positive culture exists will see change being easier to implement than those in which there is a negative school culture. The view is, that sudden changes tend to result in stress and resistance while those that are gradual tend to be simpler to manage (Nahavandi, 2009). Some of the causes of resistance to change include group causes (group norms and cohesion), organisational causes (culture, structure, poor timing, lack of rewards), and individual causes (fear of the unknown, individual characteristics and previous experience) (Nahavandi, 2009). School improvement is inevitable in educational institutions. However, research has concluded that, 'most efforts at school change fail to improve schools or student learning and many make things worse' (Glickman et al., 2010). Such a view does not offer much hope for SI resulting in school improvement in SVG's primary schools. The next section considers the enactment of SI in different educational context.

3.8. Enacting School Inspection

When I speak of enacting SI in this study, I refer to the guidelines and procedures for conducting SI as set out in inspection handbooks and the process of devising and implementing school inspectorates. In this section, I review the literature on the enactment of SI in Ofsted and in Small States and Territories as a means of comparison to that of my study, which I outline in the subsequent chapter. This aspect of the review is also relevant to the fourth research question of my study.

3.8.1. Ofsted

One of the most prominent school inspectorates in the world is the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) in England from which many countries have adopted their school inspectorates (van Bruggen, 2010). As I stated earlier, a study of the Ofsted model of SI took place prior to the implementation of SI in SVG. It was a "natural" model for local policymakers to consult because of SVG's British colonial history and the contemporary phenomenon of globalisation in education that links education reform policy in developing countries to external assistance and the concomitant conditionalities. However, Ofsted, for all its relevance as a point of reference for other countries' inspectorates, is a highly contested system of school inspection, which inter alia, 'regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages' (Ofsted, 2015, p.2).

In reviewing the Ofsted framework, I consulted the January 2015 handbook. It explains the conduct of an Ofsted inspection by outlining that the inspection process must be conducted through observing records and lessons, giving feedback on lessons, including the head teacher and or senior staff in joint lesson observation and meeting parents, pupils, staff and other stakeholders. The process suggests a democratic one aimed at engendering inclusion. They aim to do this using a range of ways to communicate their findings. For example, after an inspection, schools receive an oral feedback. Later, they receive a draft report for fact checking. Schools receive a grade from a four, which indicates "inadequate", that is, causing concern and may have serious weaknesses, to a grade one, which means "outstanding". Ofsted is responsible for quality assurance of the inspection process and the report provided are published online and address quality of teaching in schools, achievement of pupils, leadership, and management among other areas. While Ofsted appears to conduct a thorough and inclusive system of school inspection, some argue that there is a, 'substantial threat to its continued existence as a credible regulatory body… [For] governing of education in England' (Baxter, 2014, p.34). There are alternative systems of SI that operate in territories which are smaller than England where Ofsted operates, and which have a closer alignment to the SI system which this study is exploring.

3.8.2. Small States and Territories (SSTs)

School inspection operates in many of the world's SSTs (Morrison, 2009) despite the paucity of research about it. SSTs are generally those with populations below 1.5 million (The World Bank, 2014; Crossley & Holmes, 2001). By this measure, SVG with a population of just over 100,000, like many of the other Caribbean islands, is a SST. Morrison (2009) contends that the extent of the operation or existence of school inspection in SSTs is dependent on the economic status of the country.

There is a paucity of research on contemporary SI in the Caribbean, as I mentioned before. In the absence of scholarly articles, I relied on documents from the Ministries of Education in some of the territories. Jamaica operates an independent National Education Inspectorate (NEI), which it set up in 2008 with external funding. It has an accountability and improvement remit and publishes inspection results online. The Jamaican model informed the SVG model of inspection and the wording of its inspection handbook is very similar in many respects to the SVG, SIS Unit's inspection handbook. From my research, some of the other countries in the Anglophone Caribbean have school supervision services that do work similar to an inspectorate. However, the term SI is not pervasive.

Macau, a SST, introduced SI in 1999. It used a broad-based consultative approach with stakeholders in and outside of schools during the implementation process in an effort to allay their fears and engage them in dialogue regarding SI (Morrison, 2009). In effect, unlike SVG, Macau used a bottom-up approach to its implementation of SI. The Cayman Islands also used a bottom-up approach when it established a school inspectorate in 1996 (Morrison, 2009). This speaks to their understanding of the value of a participatory approach to the implementation of education policy in SSTs that in many instances were ex-colonies that have previously experienced a top-down approach to implementing education policy.

Operating school inspection systems in SSTs is fraught with issues and concerns that are specific to the context of these countries. Morrison (2009) highlights some of them: insufficient finance, inexperienced and small numbers of inspectors, work overload, reports not always matching actual school context, and difficulty doing

follow-up visits to assist schools. He further identifies a number of critical factors that affect SI in SSTs: inspectors' professional and personal backgrounds being common knowledge, the effect of negative inspection reports on personal relations, inspectors' familiarity with school contexts, absence of anonymity, informal word-of-mouth contacts, merging of formality and informality and the private and the professional, and cultural and political factors. Morrison (2009) concludes that enacting school inspection in SSTs should take into account: the country's culture, the stage of development of schools, inspectors', as well as schools' preparation for inspection, training and local expertise of inspectors. He suggests a merger of the process of inspection and development as a means to overcome the financial burden of inspection in SSTs. However, I believe that this latter view may not be the best option for all SSTs as peculiarities may warrant a separation of both SI functions. The value of Morrison's (2009) work lies in it being a useful point of departure for further understanding of SI in SSTs as explored in this work.

3.9. Conclusion

In this chapter, I began with the historical background to SI. I followed this up by presenting definitions of it. Then I explored the general purposes of SI, and I discussed in detail its two main purposes being school improvement and accountability. I presented a theoretical framework of SI. The chapter also highlighted the relationship between SSE and SI. I then explored experiences and perception of SI. This chapter also discussed the issue of teaching and learning, leadership and management. It highlighted, too, the concerns and challenges that relate to the implementation of inspection recommendations. Finally, I focused on the enactment of SI by looking at the Ofsted model and the operation of SI in SSTs. This literature review is relevant to the main aim of my research, which is to gain an in-depth understanding of principals' and teachers' experiences and perceptions of SI as a new phenomenon in primary schools in SVG. It is also important to interpreting and analysing the data from my four research questions. Chapter 4, which follows, will extend the discussion on the enactment of SI, which I started in this chapter, by exploring the SI model of SVG.

CHAPTER 4: THE SI MODEL OF ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES

4.1. Introduction

In chapter, one I highlighted that SVG established a SIS Unit in 2012 on the exigency of globalisation, which prompted local political and education policy action in this regard. I ended chapter three with a discussion of SI in England and in SSTs. Since SI in SVG is the focus of my case study, it is important to interrogate the model of inspection to create an in-depth understanding of the case (Stake, 2003). It is also relevant to the analysis and discussion of the findings. In this regard, this chapter presents the legal basis for SI, the roles and responsibilities of SIS Unit, the guidelines for conducting SI, inspection indicators, quality indicators, key features and levels, and the inspection process.

4.2. The Legal Basis for SI

The SVG Education Act of 2006 makes provision for the inspection of schools. However, it does not make explicit reference to the SIS Unit. The following section of the Act outlines the legal foundation for the SIS Unit:

> The Minister [of Education], the Chief Education Officer, an education officer, a public officer authorised in writing by the Chief Education Officer, or any other person authorised in writing by the Minister may at the times and in the manner prescribed by regulations, visit or inspect public schools, assisted private schools and private schools (Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, 2006, p.55).

The Act further outlines the range of activities in which individuals who visit the school should engage. They range from the need to give assistance and guidance to the teachers employed at the school in order to promote the good administration and effectiveness of the school; to providing advice to the principal of the school on matters relating to the welfare and development of students. It also includes providing a report on the school to the Minister, the board of management, if any, or, in the case of a private school, the proprietor (Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, 2006). These three aspects of the Education Act, in part, form the basis of the SIS Unit's handbook. The next section outlines the role and responsibilities of SI in SVG.

4.3. The Roles and Responsibilities of the SIS Unit

The SIS Unit is a department within the MoE. It is headed by a Senior Education Officer (SEO) or (lead inspector) and three other inspectors. The SEO reports inspection findings to the CEO who presents them to the Minister of Education who in turn reports to parliament on the state of education in SVG. The centralised structure of the inspectorate fits into the established colonial remnant of centralised education management (Dalin, 2005). The only handbook published since the establishment of the SIS Unit sets out its roles and responsibilities:

> The mandate of the SIS Unit is to make an assessment of the standards attained by the students in our primary and secondary schools at key points in their education and to report on how well they perform or improve, as they progress through their school and learning life. The SIS Unit is also charged with the responsibility to make recommendations to support improvement in the quality of the provision and outcomes for all learners. The SIS Unit is also expected to provide follow up aimed at ensuring that measures are put in place by the relevant MoE personnel for support of the inspected schools based on the recommendations that were made (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.3).

This suggests that the roles and responsibilities of the SIS Unit are for accountability and school improvement. These roles and responsibilities fit the legal basis of SI outlined above. Additionally, one of the focuses of the SIS Unit is to improve student achievement: by raising the quality of teaching, through measuring the quality of students' responses, and by identifying the extent to which the students have access to the curriculum. From a teacher perspective, it also includes the quality of leadership and management of the learning environment in the school or learning institution, and the quality of the relationship engendered by the leadership team with stakeholders in the education process (Ministry of Education, 2012). In SVG, there is no specific cycle of years for carrying out inspections in schools; they occur at the request of the CEO and/or the Minster of Education. This is similar to the Jamaican inspectorate but is different to Ofsted where there is a specific cycle of years for conducting inspections in schools.

The SIS Unit's vision is, 'ensuring accountability for high levels of student outcomes while supporting school effectiveness' (Ministry of Education, 2012,

p.4). Also evident in the vision are accountability and school improvement, which have a link to school effectiveness. The handbook outlines the mission and core objectives of the SIS Unit, and they are directly linked to the roles and responsibilities identified earlier.

4.4. Guidelines for Conducting SI

This section examines the guidelines for conducting SI in SVG. These guidelines are couched within the core values of, 'integrity, honesty, objectivity and transparency' (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.5) and are meant to guide how inspectors function. It outlines the inspection principles: a peer reviewed system which is quality assured by the SEO, inspection designed to strongly bring about school improvement, the needs of learners being placed first, involvement of a variety of stakeholders in SI, inspection being based on strong evidence, inspection being transparent and offering on-going feedback, and reporting findings in unambiguous language.

The SIS Unit offers support and monitoring to assist schools in improvement, in cases where they exhibit severe weaknesses. SSE is also an aspect of SI in SVG. One other significant aspect of SI is it aspires to do inspections 'with schools,' rather than 'to schools' (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.6). This view is aspirational at best within the context of a historically centralised system of education. The handbook also details a code of conduct for inspectors to adhere to when conducting inspections.

4.5. Inspection Indicators

There are seven inspection indicators which relate to eight key questions regarding the quality of education and performance of each school. These questions on the one hand relate to teacher/manager factors including the effectiveness of the school's leadership, effective use of human and material resources by schools to generate improved student performance. These factors also refer to the use of the curriculum and enhancement programmes to meet students' needs, and the manner in which school meet the safety, security, health, and wellbeing of students. On the other hand, the outcome of the preceding questions are measured and include the

effectiveness of teaching in engendering student learning and achievement, the performance of students on national and regional tests and assessments, and the progress of students in relation to their starting points, and the personal and social development of students (Ministry of Education, 2012).

Inspectors make their judgement of schools using a five-point rating scale: level one is "exceptional" a high quality of performance; level two "good" expected level for every school in SVG, level three "satisfactory" the minimum level of acceptability, level four is "unsatisfactory" not yet reaching the level for schools and level five "failing". There are other descriptors, in addition, to the five-point rating scale which attempt to gauge the frequency of the assessed factor, for example : all- 100% - 95%, Almost All 90% - 94 %, to some- fewer than half (Ministry of Education, 2012). There is a close alignment between these indicators and those in the Jamaican model of SI. As indicated in chapter three, the Ofsted model of SI also has a set of inspection indicators that it uses to judge the quality of schools.

4.6. SI Quality Indicators, Key Features and Levels

The SIS Unit's handbook outlines eight quality indicators. I will focus on just the two that directly relate to research question two which deal with teaching and learning and leadership and management. There are four key features under teaching and learning: teachers' knowledge of their subject and how best to teach, use of the curriculum, teachers' understanding of how students learn best in their subjects, and teacher reflection on their teaching (Ministry of Education, 2012). The key features of leadership and management: leadership qualities, vision direction and guidance, culture and ethos, instructional leadership, impact on standards and progress, development of relationship with staff, accountability and school information, reporting and document management system (Ministry of Education, 2012). SSE and improvement planning are also components of leadership and management. The handbook provides a description of each of the key features under the five-point rating scale mentioned earlier. Inspectors use these indicators to make a judgement of the quality of learning and the effectiveness of leadership and management in primary schools in SVG.

4.7. The Inspection Process

The inspection process begins with approximately six weeks' advance notice to schools of the inspection. The notice is by means of telephone or other electronic means, and later a letter follows detailing the documents that should be available for the preliminary inspection visit. Each school should conduct a parent and student questionnaire and the data furnished to the SIS Unit. Following this, the SIS Unit makes a preliminary visit to the school to explain to the staff the process of inspection and to respond to their questions and concerns. The lead inspector uses the data collected in the preliminary visit to prepare pre-inspection briefings ahead of the actual inspection.

During the actual inspection, inspectors undertake a number of activities. For example, they observe students' test results, review students' records of progress, observe lessons and the management process, perform interviews with students and check samples of students' work. They also hold discussions with staff, in particularly the senior management staff and teachers may get feedback after their lessons are observed. The information collected during an inspection becomes the record of inspection judgement, which inspectors use to do the oral feedback. This feedback usually occurs on the last day of the inspection. The oral feedback is normally delivered to the principal and the senior management team (SMT). Subsequently, the inspectors use the record of inspection judgement to prepare the written report. Following receipt of the written report, schools must prepare an action plan for submission to the CEO and the SEO within two months of receiving it. Apart from the regular inspections, there are also thematic inspections. The SIS Unit does not publish inspection findings, as is the case with Ofsted and the NEI of Jamaica.

4.8. Conclusion

In this chapter, I described the legal basis for the SI model of SVG. I then reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the SIS Unit. I then explored the guidelines that are set out for conducting SI, the inspection indicators, key features and levels. The chapter ended with a look at the inspection process. My research was a case study of SI in primary schools in SVG, therefore, this chapter explored the nature of the

case (Stake, 2003) to add further clarity to it. Next, in chapter five, I highlight the methodology and methods I used to obtain the data for the case study.

CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

5.1. Introduction

Chapter five explains and justifies the means through which I produced the research findings that form the basis of the knowledge that I propose. It also links the literature review in chapter three to the findings in chapter six. I begin with the research methodology and methods and move to the researcher positionality, and the choice of research strategy. Then I look at interview, documents, and observations as research methods. Following this, I outline the fieldwork, selection of the sample sites and participants, the data collection process, and approaches to data analysis. The ethical issues, limitations of my methodology and methods, the research diary and conclusion follow in that order. I investigated these research questions:

1. How is SI in four primary schools in SVG experienced and perceived by principals and teachers?

2. What do the results of the SI process indicate about teaching and learning, leadership and management in primary schools in SVG?

3. To what extent have the inspection recommendations for teaching and learning, leadership and management been implemented, and what are the challenges to implementing them in the individual primary schools?

4. How, from the perspectives of principals and teachers, should SI be enacted in primary schools in SVG?

5.2. Research Methodology and Methods

My research utilised qualitative research methodology because it ideally matches the constructivist-interpretive paradigm (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). As well, it is suitable for collecting the data I needed to answer my research questions. In addition, it aligns with my epistemological and ontological views discussed in the next section. Moreover, it allowed me to conduct my research in the natural setting (schools) of the principals and teachers and accommodated different methods of

credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). A qualitative methodology allowed me to explore the various perspectives of the participants to present a complex and in-depth understanding of their views (Agee, 2002). However, there is no single definition of qualitative research (Stake, 2010; Bryman, 2008). For me, 'qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible' (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p.8). The principals, teachers, and I were the observers located in the world of a case of SI in primary schools in SVG. Using a range of interpretive lenses, I was able to shed light on this world as perceived by them.

5.3. Researcher Positionality- Reflexivity

In chapter, one I discussed the experiences and issues in my personal and professional background that led to my study of SI. One other aspect of my professional experience is worth recalling here. In partial completion of my two years of teacher training from 1986-1988, I completed a small-scale research on the teaching of two methods of reading comprehension. I used a form two class as a control group and another as an experimental group. I vividly recall a lecturer telling us that there was no place for emotionalism in reporting the research. She said the acknowledgement section was the "rightful" place for emotionalism. We were mandated to write using the third person voice by referring to ourselves as the "the researcher" and the students in the research as "the subjects". This was the beginning of my indoctrination into positivism as a research paradigm.

Positivism is a research paradigm that privileges objectivity in research. It is associated with the natural sciences where researchers do research in laboratories often with inanimate objects. The positivist view is, 'an epistemological position that advocates the application of the methods of the natural sciences to the study of social reality and beyond' (Bryman, 2008, p.697). Positivism emerged as the dominant perspective for conducting research both in the natural and social sciences. However, a counter perspective of doing research in the social sciences is interpretivist or an interpretive paradigm in which, 'social reality can only be understood by understanding the subjective meanings of individuals' (Carr &

Kemmis, 1986, p.86). This research paradigm holds that, 'there are no objective observations only observations socially situated in the worlds of- and between-the observer and the observed' (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p.31). Therefore, interpretivism espouses the view that there is no such thing as value-neutral research as positivists are wont to assert. In fact, 'values are so vital an ingredient in educational research that their elimination is impossible save by eliminating the research enterprise itself' (Carr, 1998, p.88). Since we cannot get rid of values in educational research, or any kind of research for that matter, then it is safe to say values will always be a part of research.

In line with a constructivist-interpretive paradigm, I take the epistemological position that the construction of knowledge takes place by those who are engaged in the phenomenon and not by an "objective" external figure (Bryman, 2008). In tandem with my interpretive position, I value the ontological view that social reality is constructed out of multiple realities and there is no single objective reality (Bryman, 2008). Instead, there are multiple subjective realities regarding SI in primary schools in SVG. In this respect, the principals and teachers, as well as myself as researcher constructed knowledge of SI out of our myriad of understandings of this phenomenon. I also believe the constructivist-interpretive paradigm is the most appropriate to conducting research within the postcolonial setting of SVG, a small state, where local perspectives have historically been marginalised in research. This is essential to conducting contemporary educational research in the comparative and global context of these minuscule nations (Brock & Crossley, 2013).

5. 4. Choice of Research Strategy

I selected a research approach that is in line with my philosophical position, research methodology, and topic, cultural and historical context. I therefore felt that a case study was the best approach to researching the introduction of SI in primary schools in SVG. However, it is not always easy to define a case study approach as researchers in the field proffer different perspectives of what it means (Rule et al., 2011; Tight, 2010; Crossley & Vulliamy, 1984). Here is one definition of a case study:

> An approach that uses in-depth investigation of one or more examples of a current social phenomenon, utilizing a variety of sources of data. A 'case' can be an individual person, an event, or a social activity, group, organization or institution (Jupp, 2006, p.20).

Stake (2003, p. 136) simply defines case study as 'both a process of inquiry about the case and the product of that inquiry'. My case was SI in primary schools in SVG. To study the main elements of it, I selected four primary schools which were inspected between May 2013 and February 2014 in order to gain, 'an in-depth description of the phenomenon from the perspective of the people involved' (Yilmaz, 2013, p.312). Stake (2003) placed case studies into three categories: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. The one that aligns best with this study is the intrinsic type because I wanted to gain a, 'better understanding of this particular case' (Stake, 2003, p.136). I also have an interest in its uniqueness (Stake, 2010). This is so because; principals and teachers in primary schools in SVG have never experienced SI. Therefore, I felt that gaining an in-depth understanding of the case was essential to creating knowledge that may inform education policy making on SI in SVG.

In saying the latter, I recognise there are criticisms of case study findings not being generalizable (Dzakiria, 2012; Bassey, 2001). These criticisms generally relate to issues of how representative the case is, the findings being applicable to the specific case, and generalising from the instance of one case (Denscombe , 2003). Significantly, these criticisms arise out of comparison to the paradigm of positivism, which is associated with quantitative research in which generalisations are sought (Dzakiria, 2012). My research does not seek to generalise in the quantitative sense but instead seeks to provide relatability which is, 'an approach to transforming research knowledge into a form which can readily enter the professional discourse through which educators, researchers, practitioners "may" enhance their craft knowledge of teaching and so improve the learning of their learners' (Dzakiria, 2012, pp.56-57). Therefore, I make the claim that my study of SI in primary schools in SVG may be relatable to other government primary schools in the country based on their similar historical and cultural context of development. It may also be relatable to the OECS, and possibly Anglophone Caribbean, where primary education has a more or less similar historical

development to that of SVG. It should also have relatability for local and international policymakers and researchers interested in the field of SI.

5.5. Interviews as a Research Method

Interviews were the main research method that I used to gather data in order to construct and propose knowledge on SI in primary schools in SVG. In addition, my study privileges the views of principals and teachers as the main participants. Therefore, interviews were critical to achieving this. Interviews were also appropriate to the cultural context of education in SVG, as teachers are often eager to share their views on education reform issues in informal gatherings. Therefore, I believed they would have been willing to talk about their experiences and perceptions of SI.

The two principal terms used to define interviews in qualitative research are 'unstructured' and 'semi-structured', which the term 'qualitative interview' (Bryman, 2008, p.436) sometimes encompasses. I used a semi-structured interview format in which I had a, 'list of issues to be addressed and questions to be answered' (Denscombe , 2003, p.167). However, the participants had the 'leeway in how to reply' (Bryman, 2008, p.438). I remained flexible in the process and did not always follow the questions in the order in which they were set out on paper. Additionally, questions which were not in the interview schedule were asked (Bryman, 2008) based on responses from the participants. I opted to use one-on-one semi-structured interviews that allowed me to meet the principals and teachers at times convenient to them. This kind of interview was easy to arrange, the opinions in the interview came from a single teacher, and it was easy to control (Denscombe , 2003). Moreover, I felt more comfortable using it as a beginning researcher (See appendices three and four for the interview schedules).

5.6. Documents as a Research Method

Documents have the advantage of being easy to access, inexpensive, cost effective, and permanent, that is, others can check them (Denscombe , 2003). However, there are limitations to using documents for example in terms of the credibility of the source. Additionally, secondary documents that were produced for other purposes

and not for the research being undertaken and social contribution , namely the views of the producers of the document not being objective but instead subjectively projected (Denscombe , 2003). I used documents to supplement the other research methods and in answering the research questions. The archival documents were the principal means used to gather the data to construct chapter two on the historical development of primary education in SVG. The SIS Unit's handbook was integral to constructing chapter four on the SI model of SVG. I spent many hours at the National Library and Documentation Centre reviewing many tattered and dinged pages. This was a time consuming effort, as I could not photocopy many of the documents. This exercise was useful to constructing chapter two that forms part of the historical background to the case.

5.7. Observations as a Research Method

Observations were used as a research method to create dependability and confirmability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008) of the two main data gathering sources. However observations are not always easy, are not without trouble, and they consume a lot of time (Robson, 2002). I used observations to confirm the interviews as there are sometimes, 'discrepancies between what people say that they have done, or will do, and what they actually did or will do' (Robson, 2002, p.310). Observations include participant *observation* in which, 'the observer becomes a part of and a participant in the situation being observed' (Gay et al., 2009, p.366) and *nonparticipant* observation in which, 'the observer is not directly involved in the situation being observed' (Gay et al., 2009, p.366). I utilised the latter form of observation because it suited my research paradigm.

Since my study, involved observing lessons, I used a simple observational protocol adapted from Creswell (2012). It included pre-instructional activities, a description of classroom activities, and post-instructional activities to observe the lessons. When collecting the field notes I did not construct a specific observation protocol. I used the perspective of Stake (2010, p. 91) that a, 'fixed instrument is sometimes constraining'. He suggests that the main things the researcher should focus on is being aware of what is happening, seeing it, hearing it and making sense of it (Stake, 2010). However, I kept in mind the themes of leadership and management,

teaching and learning, school setting, classroom organisation and school routines. Despite not using a fixed instrument, I ensured that the minimal time between observation and transcribing notes was kept. I did this to ensure the integrity of the observation and to capture, adequately, the context of the observations.

5.8. Field Work

In this section, I explain the fieldwork in which I engaged prior to the collection of data. I do this in view of the perspective that, 'painstaking, detailed descriptions and explanations of the design and conduct of studies are required not only for our own use but for future generations of qualitative researchers' (Janesick, 2003, p.60). It will deal with the interview schedule, piloting, sampling, sample sites, and participants.

Interview Schedule

In preparing the interview schedule I formulated, 'the interview questions or topics in such a way that they will help [me] to answer [my] research questions' (Bryman, 2008, p.242). Initially, I prepared the same set of questions for principals and teachers. However, after I piloted the interview I realised that not all of the questions were applicable to both sets of participants. Therefore, I devised two different interview schedules with some of the questions being generic. I included a general question at the end: *Do you have any other comments to make regarding school inspection?* So that participants could respond to anything, I did not ask but which they wanted to express about SI.

Piloting

Gay et al (2009) recommends doing a small-scale pilot of a study before, to eliminate possible problems before the actual research begins. Therefore, for the pilot, I used a rural primary school to pilot my questions. I explained to the principal the purpose of my research; not being well that afternoon, he directed me to the "deputy principal" who readily agreed to be interviewed and tape recorded after hearing about my research. After this interview, she took me to a teacher who also agreed to be part of the pilot interview. I made notes during both interviews. I

transcribed only one of the interviews that same evening since the other was inaudible.

Piloting the interview provided me with the opportunity to become au fait with my new recorder. As stated by Bryman (2008, p.247), 'piloting an interview schedule can provide interviewers with some experience in using it and can infuse them with a greater sense of confidence'. This was exactly the case with my pilot interview schedule. I was able to make minor adjustments to some of the interview questions based on the feedback received. The pilot also yielded responses like, 'the school was beaten down by the inspectors' and 'teachers felt like they were not doing anything at the school'. These responses allowed me to clarify some of the uncertainties I had, at that time, about using postcolonial theory as a theoretical framework in my study.

Sampling

I used purposive sampling which, 'allows the researcher to select those participants who will provide the richest information, those who manifest the characteristics of most interest to the researcher' (Best & Khan, 2006, p.19). Qualitative research uses purposive sampling in which interviews are a common means of data collection (Bryman, 2008). I chose a sample size that, 'was enough to be selected economically-in terms of… availability and expense in both time and money' (Best & Khan, 2006, p.19). Time and money were critical to me as a working and self-financed student. Using the perspective of sample sizes of thirty being large and those below that as small (Best & Khan, 2006), I elected to use twelve participants which included the four principals and two teachers from each of the four schools. I felt this number would give me the data that would reach saturation point. I had eleven main participants since one of the teachers withdrew before the research began.

Selecting Schools and Participants

Using the perspective outline above about sampling, I went about selecting the schools. I contacted the Senior Education Officer (SEO) of the SIS Unit to obtain a list of the inspected primary schools. I used the MoE's *Statistical Digest 2013* to

choose a school from the windward and leeward area and two from the town. I wanted to represent these geographic settings because in SVG educators often speak of "town", "windward", "Grenadines" and "leeward" schools. I therefore selected one school from the windward, one from the leeward area and two from the town. I also considered the schools' student population. I created the following categories to cater to the unique perspectives of the experience of SI in schools of varying sizes: below 200 small, 200-299 medium, 300-499 fairly large, and 500 and above large. In June 2014, I visited the four selected schools to request their participation in the research. The principals agreed.

5.9. Sample Sites and Participants

This section describes the schools and the participants. I am aware that it is virtually impossible to obtain and maintain anonymity (Sikes, 2006) particularly in small states (Crossley & Holmes, 2001). However, I decided to use pseudonyms for the schools, principals, and teachers because; I consider it a suitable technique to tell the story of the case. Six of the eleven participants turned out to be males. All of the teachers, except one, had over ten years of teaching experience. In three of the schools, at least one participant was a member of the senior management team (SMT).

Chatoyer Primary

Chatoyer Primary (CP), established in 1960, is located in one of the densely populated working class hillside villages, just on the outskirts of the town. The school serves students of lower socio-economic backgrounds who come from the neighbouring hillside villages, which rise steeply into the lush green mountains above. It operates in an original single storey L shaped structure and a newer two storey L shaped building with individual classrooms. The population of CP is 379 students- 185 females and 194 males. There are twenty-three (23) teachers – nineteen certified and four uncertified. Four of them have bachelor's degrees. Mrs Lauriston, the principal, and teachers Mr Carmichael and Mrs Perry were my participants.

Mrs Lauriston is a 52-year-old who has been a principal for seven years. Immediately preceding her appointment as principal of CP, she spent one year as the deputy principal of a secondary school. She did not attend the St. Vincent Teacher's College, as is the norm for teachers in SVG. She pursued all of her qualifications up to the master's degree level through distance education. She was one of the principals trained in SI by the consultants who designed the SI model for SVG.

Mr Carmichael is in his thirties and is one of three male teachers at CP. He has been a teacher for twelve years. Ten of those years have been at CP. He started teaching at primary school after completing Sixth Form where he studied Literatures in English, French, and Spanish at Advanced Levels. He later attended the St. Vincent Teacher's College. Mr Carmichael is engaged in a number of the school's extra-curricular activities.

Mrs Perry, 35, is a Kindergarten teacher and has been teaching at CP for the last two years having graduated in 2012 from the Division of Teacher Education (DTE) (formerly St. Vincent Teacher's College). Before attending DTE, she taught at a private pre-school for fifteen years.

Cato Memorial Primary

The Church of England established Cato Memorial Primary (CMP) around 1895. It is part located at the southern end of the capital close to a slum dwelling area amidst businesses and close to a bus terminus. It serves children of the working class. Since 1992, CMP has been operating out of two separate buildings owing to an increase in its population. In 2012, a fire at a nearby business establishment caused damage to the main building and it was relocated to a nearby abandoned glove factory building. I did my observations in this section. CMP has 540 students, 284 males and 256 females, 352 are in the main block. There are thirty-five teachers: thirty-two certified and three uncertified. Nine have bachelor's degrees and one a master's degree.

Mr Kranston has been a principal for the past five years, having spent thirty-five years as a primary school teacher. He is 52 years old and graduated from the St.

Vincent Teacher's College. He has a bachelor's degree in educational management. He began his teaching career in 1977 as a fifteen-year-old pupil-teacher.

Mr Conliff is 44 years old and has been a teacher for twenty-five years. Six of which have been at CMP. He received training at the St. Vincent Teacher's College in primary education. He holds a bachelor's degree in mathematics education. He teaches mathematics to the grade fives, and he is not engaged in any of the school's extra-curricular activities.

Mrs Proudfoot is 33 years old and has been a teacher for eleven years; four of those years have been at CMP. She attended the DTE where she obtained an associate degree in primary teacher education. She also holds a bachelor's degree in educational administration and a master's degree in adult and continuing education. She teaches Language Arts to grades five and six. She acts as the "deputy principal" at the main block when the principal is absent, is grade head for the grade four classes, is a member of the senior management team (SMT), and assists with planning fundraising and other activities.

Joshua Primary

Joshua Primary (JP) started around the mid-1900s by the Church of England. It is situated on a hill, nestled among houses, in a rural town about an hour's drive from the capital. There are two separate original buildings built, one slightly above the other, in an L shape. Chalkboards separate the classrooms in these buildings. A third two-storey building accommodates the upper classes and administrative offices. The school has a population of 214 students, 124 males, and 90 females. There are fifteen teachers at JP, fourteen certified, and one uncertified. Seven of them have bachelor's degrees.

Mr Baxter is the head of JP and has been there for five years. He is 47 years old and attended the St. Vincent Teacher's College, and he has a bachelor's degree in educational management. He was a member of one of the teams that received training in SI by the consultants who designed the inspection system for SVG.

Miss Bronte is 49 years old and has been a teacher at JP for twenty-four of her thirty-one years of teaching. She attended the St. Vincent Teacher's College, and she has a bachelor's degree in Leadership and Management. She teaches grade five Language Arts and music. She is the "deputy principal" and supervises the scheme and record and lesson plans for the grade three teachers, and she is part of the SMT. She visited England on an exchange visit to two primary schools there. She had a return visits from a teacher of one of the English primary schools.

Mrs Rothman, 59, has been a teacher for thirty-eight years. She attended teacher's college in Jamaica, her country of birth, where she began her teaching career. She migrated to SVG in 1987. She has been a teacher in SVG for twenty-seven years. Mrs Rothman has been at JP for eleven years. She teaches grades three social studies and music. She is also the school's literacy co-ordinator, and she is a member of the school's SMT. She has a bachelor's degree in theology and guidance and counselling.

Mulzac Primary

The Wesleyans established MP though the date of its establishment could not be verified. The school moved to its present L shaped single storey deteriorating building in 1958. It is located on the windward side of the island and is surrounded by small farm holdings. It has a population of 73 students, 36 males, and 37 females. It is an open plan school (colonial classroom organisation) with classes divided by chalkboards. Students and teachers see and hear each other in the respective classes. There are eight teachers, six certified, and two uncertified. Two teachers have bachelor's degrees.

Mr Hilton has been principal of MP for two years. He is 52 years old and was a teacher for thirty-two years at another school. He earned a bachelor's degree in leadership and management in 2008. He completed his teacher training at the St. Vincent Teacher's College.

Mr Enville was 52 years old and had been a teacher for thirty-two years. He obtained his teacher training from the St. Vincent Teacher's College and was at MP for twenty-six years. He taught all of the subjects to grade five. He was

pursuing a bachelor's degree in social studies and was in his second year. Mr Enville was a member of the SMT and an executive member of the Teachers' Union.

In January 2015, I returned to do follow-up data collection at MP. Mr Enville arrived at school at about 8:35 and greeted me at the office where I sat waiting. I needed to do a follow-up interview with him to clarify some issues in the transcribed data. The bell rang and he went to his class. About half an hour later, the acting principal came to the office to inform me that Mr Enville was not feeling well. He was experiencing profuse sweating and chest pains. They took him to a nearby health clinic and later to the main hospital. Later, I got information that he was in the intensive care unit. He went to Trinidad and Tobago for further medical treatment. When he returned to SVG, he was readmitted to hospital. Sadly, he passed away in July 2015. Obviously, Mr Enville's passing was a limitation to my study.

5.10. The Data Collection Process

In this section, I look at negotiating access to the participants, conducting the interviews and associated processes, the recording and storage of data, the transcription of the data and their verification, and give an account of and challenges related to the data collection.

It is important to negotiate access to "gatekeepers" who are individuals, 'with the formal or informal authority to control access to a site' (Neuman, 2003, p.372). Therefore, when I decided on the four schools I wanted to be part of my research, I sought verbal agreement from the principals in June 2014. However, to gain access to the schools I had to first gain the permission of the Chief Education Officer (CEO) in the MoE. I wrote to her in August 2014, (see appendix two), and received permission the said month. She wrote to the principals indicating I had permission to research in the schools. Gaining access to the teachers, I had to go through the principals as the "gatekeepers". I went back to the schools and explained the purpose of my research to them and they recommended two teachers who they felt would, 'manifest the characteristics of most interest to the research' (Best & Khan, 2006, p.19). The principals took me to the door of the teachers'

classes, and I explained my research and obtained their verbal consent. I left the participant consent forms and the research information sheets with them to read at their convenience, as I did not want to disrupt their classes by having them read and sign the forms. I gave them a time when I would return to collect the completed consent forms. The option of refusing to participate in the research after reading the information letter and consent form was open to the teachers. In fact, one teacher who initially volunteered to participate called to withdraw from the research before I had returned to collect the forms.

I did my main interviews between September 24th, 2014 and November 21st, 2014. During the interviews, I first explained my research to the participants. I also outlined my obligations to maintaining the ethical guidelines of the University of Sheffield. However, in doing so, I was mindful that ethical guidelines are not cast in stone and may have to be modified to suit the culture of small states (Moosa, 2013). I began the interviews with the question: *What are your responsibilities as a principal/teacher?* I did this to set the participants at ease before moving to the substantive interview questions (Fetterman, 2010). However, there were many times when I had to veer from the list, to get further clarification, based on the responses of the interviewees (Bryman, 2008). I took notes during the interviews.

In doing the interviews, I had to utilise whatever space was available to me. Ten of the eleven interviews took place at the schools. I interviewed three of the principals in their offices. The CMP principal interview took place in the music room because of the location of the office, and the principal not wanting to be disturbed by staff and others. One of the CMP teachers agreed to do the interview after school in a secured room at the National Library. I interviewed the other teacher within school time in the music room. At JP, I did the interviews in the teachers' classrooms, as there was no vacant room available to do them. The teachers stopped teaching their classes and I sat at the desk and conducted the interview while they kept an eye on their class. One of the interviews at JP was cut short because it had started before morning recess, and I had a few remaining questions to continue after the break. The participant completed the few remaining questions by email. I interviewed one of the teachers at CP in the school's library and the other in the computer room. At MP, I interviewed the teacher in his classroom.

I also had to gain access to the other participants or *respected others*. My research proposal included interviewing school inspectors, principals, and teachers. However, I changed this because I felt the principals and teachers were the ones who my study should privilege. Nevertheless, I kept in mind the perspective that 'what first appears as a subjective account of happenings-when triangulated and reasoned through by respected others-can become a trusted part of the report' (Stake, 2010, p.65). Later after discussions with my supervisor, I took her advice to interview school inspectors and other educators engaged with SI. I gained access to the two *respected others* in the SIS Unit through verbal contact and email correspondence. These interviews happened at the SIS Unit's office and were tape-recorded. I gained access to four other teachers when I visited the schools. I wrote notes after these brief talks with them. Two other participants, my friends who assisted when the secondary school inspections began, I asked them to write their views on SI and send their responses by email. I felt it would have been awkward doing a sit down interview with them. I gained access to a retired principal at a primary schools' public speaking competition that we were both judging. I interviewed her at her home. I contacted the principal of a primary school that had an inspection in late January 2015 by telephone, and he agreed to an interview in early February 2015. I interviewed him at the National Library. I also did an email interview with a colleague who works at National Education Inspectorate (NEI) in Jamaica. I followed up some of the interviews with emails.

In qualitative research data, recording and storage are important issues for researcher to consider (Stake, 2010). I bought a recorder that could connect as a data storage device to my computer. When I learnt how to transfer the data from the recorder to my laptop, I did so for back up and safety. I stored the data on my computer, which has a password, in my briefcase, and at times, I locked them in my desk at work.

The transcription of the data took place within a day and approximately a week after the interviews. I manually transcribed the interviews into notebooks. After the manual transcription, I typed the interviews using Microsoft Word. I saved them in folders for each of the schools. While it was a tedious process writing then typing the interviews, it allowed me to get intimate with the data very early in the process.

Unfortunately, after transcribing all of the data the recorder stopped working. Therefore, I manually recorded follow-up interviews.

Data verification, or member checking, which is returning the data to the participants for their correction and comment (Stake, 2010) is an important ethical component of research. When I had transcribed the interview for the first principal, I took the notebook for data verification and few minor amendments were made on the first few pages. The participant seemed disinterested in the process. In fact, the participant had expressed earlier that having recently studied with a UK university, they found many of the ethical concerns to be unnecessary. I promised the other participants to return the interviews to them for verification, but they also did not exude any sense of enthusiasm when I mentioned this. According to Stake (2010), this response to member checking from the participants is common. Therefore, I did not continue data verification based on my interpretation of the participants' attitude towards it.

Collecting the data had moments of satisfaction and moments of disappointment. I went to CP on October 6th, 2014 to find out from the principal when she would be available to do the interview. She immediately consented to do it. She closed the office and told the secretary she did not want to be disturbed. I was ecstatic to have received such a response. I thanked her profusely for this. I showed up at MP unannounced because I did not get a response from the principal to my email as to when I could interview him. He was very willing to put his work on hold although I did not make prior arrangements. For this, I was very thankful. In collecting the archival data, the staff at the National Archives was extremely helpful in retrieving the documents. They went out of their way to ensure that I was comfortable and often came to ask if I needed anything more. The SEO of the SIS Unit was also extremely receptive to all of my requests, and he responded promptly to my emails for information and clarifications.

The moments of satisfaction in the data collection were met with disappointments as should be expected in data collection (Janesick, 2003). The first hurdle I faced was when one of the participants who agreed to participate called to say she would no longer participate. I thanked her and wished her the best. I faced an enormous challenge with getting response to my emails. Three of the principals never

responded to my emails. I had to journey to the schools to get information that I could easily have received by email. One participant was subtly uncooperative or a "freeze out" i.e. a participant who, 'express[es] an uncooperative attitude or an overt unwillingness to participate' (Neuman, 2003, p.376). He seemed to be avoiding me when I made requests at the school as to when he would be available for the interview. The interview finally happened, but it was only about fifteen minutes in length. This was much shorter than the others that lasted forty-five minutes to an hour.

5.11. Approach to Data Analysis

In this section, I outline how I went about analysing the data. Creswell (2012) suggests data analysis begin with the collection of data. To do this, I relied on the work of Creswell (2012) and Bryman (2008) on data coding as well as my own intuition. I began, as Creswell (2012) suggests, with codes to find the themes. Bryman (2008) indicates that some people see codes as more or less themes, but he differentiates codes from themes. I considered them the same. I also spoke with a colleague to find out how she did the data analysis for her recent M.Phil./Ph.D. study. She used a matrix in Microsoft Word and the "review track changes" button to insert the themes. I found a YouTube video that demonstrated exactly what she explained.

Armed with the above knowledge, I began coding in relation to the research questions. I used Microsoft Word to create a matrix with two columns and as many rows as would hold the data. The column to the left was larger than the one to the right. I copied the data, from the Microsoft Word files and pasted them into the rows to the left. I summarised the data using the rows to the right. I used the "Review" button in Microsoft Word, along with "track Changes" button to create balloons in which I placed the emerging codes/themes. I started with about twenty-one codes in my journal: atmosphere during oral feedback, impact of inspection on teaching and learning, perception of inspection, and benefits of inspection etc. I constantly reviewed the themes until I had them whittled down to the ones I eventually used in my study.

Next, I created theme matrices in Microsoft Word adapted from Bryman (2008). At the top of each matrix, I placed the name of each school and the general theme. I inserted sub-themes in the columns and rows I created. Then I copied the summarised data from the original data matrix and pasted them into the appropriate sub-themes rows/columns in the theme matrix. To ensure that what I had copied and pasted could be found in the original data matrix, I labelled each row with a code that represented each participant. For example, I used "T" for teacher and "P" for principal. I had assigned each principal and teacher a number that I placed after the letter identifying the participant. The number of the columns, where the data were located in the original matrix, was place before the letter identifying the participant. For example, "2T2" represented the data for teacher two data in column two. I copied and pasted these codes into the theme matrices when I transferred the data from the original matrices. The theme matrices were printed to make it easier to do further interpretation and analysis. When I completed the findings and discussion chapters, I copied the critical topic sentences from the former and placed them in a theme matrix for cross checking the discussion chapter. The process of data analysis was a complex, time consuming, and taxing one. In between it, I wrote a draft of chapter two to break from the tedium of data analysis.

5.12. The Ethical Issues

Pursuing doctoral studies in a postcolonial setting in which research may be considered, 'as a set of ideas, practices and privileges that were embedded in imperial expansionism and colonization and institutionalized in academic disciplines, schools, curricula, universities and power' (Tuhiwai-Smith, 2012, p.x) made me sensitive as to how I went about my research. Knowing that research conjures negative feelings associated with colonialism was critical to me as a beginning postcolonial researcher.

In preparation for my study of SI in primary schools in SVG, I first had to adhere to the guidelines for conducting research as mandated by the University of Sheffield. I therefore made application 001280 on the prescribed ethical form on July 12th, 2014. I completed the requisite sections and attached the supporting

documents: Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form. My application was approved on July 23rd, 2014 (see appendix one) with the recommendation that I should prepare a separate Participant Information Sheet for principals and teachers. This I did.

I also considered my position as an insider researcher: being a past teacher, principal, currently a teacher educator, the husband of a primary school principal and a native Vincentian. Consequently, I had to anticipate ethical issues that may arise from start to finish of the research process (Floyd & Arthur, 2012). In addition, I was in an advantageous position of having a great deal of prior knowledge about the context and setting I was researching (Unluer, 2012). The insider or outsider research dichotomy is not cast in stone as researchers are, 'neither complete observers nor complete participants but often working in that 'third space' in between' (McNess et al., 2015, p.311). I was mainly a non-participant observer. However, by virtue of my professional background, outlined at the beginning of this paragraph, I was a participant observer for a few brief moments during the research.

The issue of power relations between the participants and me was also uppermost in my mind (Mercer, 2007). This is so because as a teacher education lecturer and doctoral student, I would be considered as having superior academic qualifications to my participants, a higher "status", and more "knowledge". Therefore, from the outset I considered my participants as my co-researchers on a journey of creating knowledge on SI in primary schools in SVG. From a postcolonial perspective, I ensured that I did not 'other' my participants in any way (Sikes & Potts, 2008).

I outlined earlier how I went about accessing the participants, selecting the schools, and gaining permission for my research. When I went to the schools, I let the participants know that they could refuse to participate at any time without repercussions. One principal suggested a teacher who I refused on the ground that some weeks before, she had declared in national newspapers interest in being a candidate in national elections for the political party that implemented SI. I know the divisive nature of national politics, and felt I would not have been comfortable interviewing that person.

When I did the interviews, I ensured that the participants understood everything about my research. I reminded the participants of my research topic and the University of Sheffield's ethical guidelines. I did this before every interview by reviewing the Participant Information Sheet and ensuring participants signed and dated the Consent Forms. I sought the permission of the participants to tape record them. In two instances participants refused and I did not cajole them. Instead, I showed them that my recorder was turned off and so too my smart phone. I attempted, as much as possible, to ensure the participants and I were as comfortable as the interview surroundings would allow. One *respected other* was not initially comfortable with being recorded and seemed hesitant to speak. I assured her of the confidentiality of the interview, and she then became more comfortable.

During data analysis and working through the findings, I also had to consider ethical issues. In an island of 150 square miles (366 sq. km) I was cognisant that, 'anonymity and confidentiality can be difficult or impossible to secure and maintain' (Sikes, 2006, p.111), as I stated earlier. However, I had to ensure that the prior knowledge I had about primary schools in SVG did not cloud my interpretation of the data. While I could not guarantee anonymity of the participants and their schools in writing up the research, I tried to ensure that comments that may harm my participants' careers were not included in the study (Sikes, 2006). Finally, I was careful to adhere to proper referencing guidelines to ensure that I did not plagiarise anyone's work.

During a visit to CMP, I witnessed children being punished by a teacher using corporal punishment. I did not intervene because corporal punishment is legal in schools in SVG through the Education Act of 2006. However, on a subsequent visit to the school, I met the principal with a belt on his desk and I used this opportune moment to ask him about the use of corporal punishment at CMP.

5.13. Limitations of the Study's Methodology and Methods

My study utilised a constructivist-interpretive methodology. This means that my own interpretations may have affected the way in which I interpreted the data. This is so because I was the principal research instrument in the data gathering process

(Bryman, 2008). Therefore, the findings and the resulting knowledge are my own interpretations. They are not exclusive/rigid/fixed and so may be interpreted differently by others. However, I made every attempt to ensure that I support the knowledge claims through *credibility, transferability dependability* and *confirmability* during data gathering and analysis (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008).

I used a case study approach that used only four schools. This research strategy often does not produce generalizable results (Denscombe , 2003). However, my intention was not to produce generalizable results but to gain an in-depth understanding of the topic. I see my results as having *relatability* (Dzakiria, 2012) instead of generalisations of the findings of SI in primary schools in SVG.

Finally, I noted that member checking was not done as is advocated owing to my interpretation of participants' response to the suggestions of doing it, and the lacklustre interest of another when I took the data for member checking. This is something that is relatively common (Stake, 2010). Having not completed total member checking with participants may have an effect on the quality trustworthiness of the findings. However, I made this decision based on my interpretation of the cultural context of my study. Moreover, I believe that overall my methodology and methods are sufficiently rigorous and trustworthy to counter any weaknesses that may result from not having fully completed member checking.

5.14. Research Diary

I kept a research diary (journal) as a means of recording my experiences, thoughts, doubts, fears, and reflections on the research process. Keeping a journal is one of the things that Wright Mills (1959) suggested is critical in the process of becoming an *intellectual craftsman*. As I mentioned in chapter one, I knew from my second research assignment in part one of the Ed.D programme that I wanted to research SI. However, I was not exactly sure from what angle I wanted to research this issue. Using the research diary was my outlet to record, 'speculations, puzzlements and ponderings' (Stake, 2010, p.101) regarding the approach I should take in studying SI in primary schools in SVG. For example, the methodology and methods of my study were not clear to me at the beginning stages of the research,

and so I recorded my puzzlements as they came to mind. The philosophical and practical aspects of the research were also concerns with which I struggled. For instance, how I would use postcolonial theory in my study and whether case study was the best approach to adopt. In the early stages the focus of the topic changed many times and, expectedly, the research questions. Having to note these changes often brought feelings of uncertainty to my mind. However, writing these thoughts down allowed me to mull over them and make decisions as I moved along the research journey.

When the fieldwork began in earnest my experiences, thoughts, concerns, puzzlements, speculations, and reflections intensified. I recorded my observations and interactions with principals and teachers each time I visited a schools. I made notes as I analysed the data and devised the various themes and codes that were emerging. In addition, different iterations of the research questions continued to emerge. These records were important when I needed to remember, verify, clarify, and provide context as the thesis took shape. This happened up until its very end. I also kept an electronic journal, Pebblepad, as part of the university's doctoral requirements in tandem with the manual research diary. It served a somewhat similar purpose as the latter. I uploaded drafts of different components of my thesis to it, as a work in progress, to authenticate the research process and final product as my own effort.

5.15. Conclusion

In this chapter, I restated the research questions as they are the foundation upon which I gathered the data to construct the knowledge for the study. I outlined the critical elements to doing this: the research methodology, methods and qualitative interpretive case study strategy. Since this strategy privileges values in research, I made clear my research biases by stating my positionality and reflexivity; and then detailed case study as my research approach. To match my research paradigm, I stated my methods as interviews, documents, and observations. I then explained how I put the research methods into effect by explaining the process of preparing to do the fieldwork. Then I outlined how I selected the sample sites and the participants who formed part of the research. I stated the next critical components

of doing any research: collecting the data and analysing them. Ethics are the cornerstone of all research, and in particular qualitative research, and so the chapter outlined the ethical issues relating to my study. Since the methodology and methods used in any study have limitations, I outlined these and ended with a statement of how I used my research diary. This chapter was the cornerstone to obtaining the data, which I needed to make the knowledge claims that I will outline in the subsequent chapters.

CHAPTER SIX: PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

6.1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of a qualitative case study of SI in primary schools in SVG. It gives prominence to the voices of the principals and teachers by presenting a selection of appropriate quotes from the data, which are interspersed with my interpretations. For this reason, I omit references to the literature until the next chapter. In the previous chapter, I mentioned that I analysed the data using a code/theme method adapted from Creswell (2012) and Bryman (2008) as well as my intuition. I link the themes to the findings when I discuss the latter under each research question.

In order to maintain the particularity of each of the schools as the mini-cases of SI (Stake, 2003), I present their data separately. However, their experiences of SI are very similar in many instances, so I summarised the data under the heading that immediately follows to avoid needless repetition and discuss differences where appropriate.

The chapter begins with a description of the participants' experiences of SI and then moves to their perceptions of SI, teaching and learning, leadership and management, implementation of recommendations and challenges, and perspectives on enacting SI. After this, I present the findings for the *respected others*. It concludes with a summary of the findings.

6.2. Experiences of SI

This section addresses, in part, research question one: *How is SI in four primary schools in SVG experienced and perceived by principals and teachers?* It presents, in detail, the experiences before and during SI and then briefly presents some experiences after SI, which I will deal with in detail in a subsequent section.

6.2.1. Before the SI Process

All of the principals received notification of the impending inspection of their school from the SIS Unit. Their notifications ranged from about a week to

approximately six weeks. The latter period is in line with the SIS Unit's regulations for notification of an inspection visit. However Mr Hilton, of MP, expressed that, 'having read the handbook we were not given sufficient time to prepare for the inspection'. He received about a week's notice. Mr Hilton drew to the attention of the SEO this deviation from the inspection regulation and he offered an apology. The notification of the inspection visits was through email, telephone, and sometimes supplemented by regular mail. It outlined what documents were required for the inspection: the log book, class registers, lesson plans, scheme of work, timetables for each teacher, financial records, the school's handbook, rule book, scheme and record book, and students' and teachers' handbook. All of these experiences are in keeping with the SI handbook and are mechanisms of accountability.

Experiences of the participants regarding completion of a school self-evaluation (SSE) prior to inspection revealed mixed responses. Mrs Lauriston said, 'at that time we were doing our school development plan, [so] it was easy just to use that to get the information needed for the self-evaluation' (Principal, CP). Mr Kranston, the principal of CMP, said his school did not do a SSE. However, Mrs Proudfoot, a teacher at CMP, did not agree with him:

> We were given sheets from the workshop which we had to evaluate teachers' performance, observe them while they [were] teaching, look at students' work. I did for a few teachers and I think the headteacher did it as well. [I don't know] if you're going to refer to that as self-evaluation (Teacher, CMP).

Regarding this discrepancy in the views of Mr Kranston and Mrs Proudfoot of CMP, I asked the former in a follow-up interview about it and he was adamant that the school did not do a SSE prior to SI. Mr Baxter, JP's principal, claimed they did not do a SSE as a formal document but the staff discussed it. His experience was different to his teacher Miss Bronte who mentioned that JP did an SSE using forms from the SIS Unit. Another view expressed was, 'Even though we didn't do a self-evaluation there was a discussion among teachers, [at] staff meeting similar to what you would do in a self-evaluation' (Mr Hilton, Principal, MP). I checked these differing experiences of SSE with the SEO of the SIS Unit and he confirmed that all schools did a SSE using prescribed data forms supplied by the Unit. It

appears that there are different interpretations of what SSE means in the context of SI.

None of the four schools administered the parent and student questionnaires. The SIS handbook states that schools should administer the questionnaires instead the inspectors did this during the preliminary visit. This is yet another deviation from the SI process.

A team of inspectors usually visits the schools to conduct the preliminary visits. In the case of MP, a small school of seventy-three students, one inspector visited. During the visits they spoke with teachers and informed them about the process of school inspection in an effort to, 'put them at ease' (Mrs Lauriston, Principal CP). Additionally, they collected the documents requested when they made the notification calls. From the principals' and teachers' experiences, they did not find the preliminary visits to cause any disruption to the schools, nor did it have any effect on staff. Moreover, the schools did not make any special arrangements for the visits.

On the contrary, in the week immediately preceding the inspection there was an atmosphere of expectancy among some teachers. Mr Kranston said to his teachers, '[I] don't want us to put on any different show be what we are' (Principal CMP). However, he added, 'one or two teachers the week leading up [were] putting up more charts. Teachers come and they busy signing [their time of arrival]. It was a kind of frenzy. The Thursday, Friday before people looking to put up their charts'. Adding to this Mrs Proudfoot said, 'when the teachers knew [the inspectors] were coming they were busy organising, getting charts ready' (CMP). A similar atmosphere existed at JP, 'some teachers went the extra mile. You know some teachers will do extra. If you know someone is coming in and you are told you will be prepared mentally or otherwise' (Miss Bronte, Teacher).

The preliminary visits before SI did not adversely affect the running of schools and their staff. However, there were some negative unintended consequences in the week leading up to SI.

6.2.2. During the SI Process

After the preliminary visits, the actual inspections took place shortly after. The SEO and the three other inspectors inspected CMP. In addition, two staff members of the Curriculum Unit were co-opted to assist with inspecting mathematics and literacy at CMP. The four inspectors inspected the other schools. Mr Kranston relates part of his experiences of the inspection at CMP:

> The morning they were on the outside of the compound in the yard observing the students, how parents bring their children, how the children behaved, and even before school commenced [they were] "roundsing" within the building to see what's going on generally… During the regular teaching sessions they [were] moving about going to classes, observing lessons, looking at the various documents- the registers, lessons plan books, diary. They looked at the teachers' attendance register and things like that. They interviewed parents; they interviewed students (Principal).

Mr Baxter of JP tells an almost similar story to Mr Kranston about part of his experiences of the inspection. However, JP's inspection had an incident of note. It was initially scheduled to last three days, but Mr Baxter informed the inspectors that three days were inadequate to make an informed judgement of JP. Therefore, the inspectors acquiesced and extended it to five days. This is how Mrs Lauriston described some of her experiences of the inspection at CP:

> They did a lot of monitoring of the classrooms. Each teacher had a least two visits. They spent four days, and couldn't come on the Friday because there was an important meeting at the MoE. They interviewed parents, teachers and principal, students, all the stakeholders (Principal).

Mr Hilton of MP related an almost similar story concerning part of his experiences of SI as his colleague principals. The teachers gave generally similar experiences of SI as the principals.

All of the teachers: Ms Bronte, Perry, Rothman and Messrs Enville, Conliff and Carmichael as well as the principals: Mrs Lauriston, and Messrs Kranston, Baxter and Hilton said the inspectors gave feedback after observing teachers' lessons. Only Mrs Proudfoot claimed, 'the problem the teachers had is that they did not give them feedback' (Teacher, CMP). In a subsequent interview with Mr Kranston, principal of CMP, he maintained his earlier position that teachers received

feedback after the inspectors observed their lessons. The experiences described, here indicate that principals and teachers experienced SI as a means of accountability.

There were almost diametrically opposing experiences of principals and teachers regarding the impact of SI on teachers. According to Mrs Lauriston, 'I don't think it mattered to the teachers' (CP). Mr Kranston said, 'it was not an atmosphere of fear; the majority of teachers continued to function' (Principal, CMP). To Mr Baxter, 'a few teachers were excited that they were here to see what they were doing, but we didn't, if I should say, we didn't put on any special display. We had our normal teaching (Principal, JP). His comment 'we didn't put on any special display' is a reference to window dressing that is sometimes a feature of SI. In the perspective of his other colleague:

> The atmosphere wasn't one that brought about change in the sense of the actual running of the school, [and] the way the children behaved. What was actually added in terms of the atmosphere is that children were involved with interview with the inspectors. No fear. (Mr Hilton MP).

The four principals did not claim any adverse effect of SI on them. Only the *respected other* principal reported adverse effects of SI.

However, the teachers' views of the impact of SI on their colleagues were generally opposite to the principals. The SI process negatively affected only one participant, Mrs Perry:

> I was frightened at the beginning, but then after their facial expression said a lot. So at that point, in time I was settled because I had my normal lesson plan, [as] I was accustomed to teach (Teacher, CP).

It was expressed, 'some teachers were nervous' (Mrs Proudfoot, CMP). She added, 'teachers were a bit resentful of criticism of their work, when lessons and diaries and exercise books were checked.' Her colleague Mr Conliff said, 'teachers were on their best behaviour'. I had a brief casual conversation with a teacher at CMP who commented, 'I heard some teachers saying "they nah wary" [are they not tired?]'. The teachers who said in English Creole "they nah wary" were referring to the inspectors' continued presence in the school. In essence, the teachers of that school felt the inspectors were an annoyance. Miss Bronte of JP said, 'I guess some

teachers would have ensured that things went smoothly'. To Mr Enville, 'there was a bit of nervousness or tension among some teachers… teachers start[ed] to scamper for [teaching] aids' (Teacher MP). I spoke with a *respected other* teacher who said, 'at the end the inspectors found so many faults. I found their comments were unfair about the school after having spent only a little time in our school. I literally cried' (Respected Other, MP).

However, a few teachers reported no negative impact of SI. Mr Carmichael expressed, 'I [do not] mind people come and look at me. So it wasn't intimidating' (Teacher, CP). Mrs Rothman, a teacher at JP, did not think there were any negative effects of SI on teachers. Overall, though, SI had negative unintended consequences for many teachers despite the principals' claim to the contrary.

Participants' experiences reveal that SI affected students in some of the schools. Mrs Lauriston, principal of CP, explained 'the children "show" themselves. It was our worst week'. Mr Carmichael and Mrs Perry also described the "unusual" behaviour of the CMP students. Mr Carmichael claimed his class was, 'a bit more apprehensive… a little more well-behaved than usual', he added because 'I had asked them to be on their best behaviour'. Mr Kranston painted a somewhat different picture. He said that the children did not react differently than they normally would. Nevertheless, he acknowledged there was, 'a little bit of toning down here and there' (Principal, CMP). Mrs Proudfoot's story is, 'the kids were more alert, very conscious of the environment with strangers in the school, a bit tense. They were warned, but they were attentive' (CMP). It was apparent that schools rehearsed their students on how to behave during the SI process, which is also a form of window dressing.

The teachers and principals were in total agreement that the inspectors were professional during the SI process. Mrs Lauriston expressed it this way, '"Roger" [the SEO] is my personal friend. I taught with "Mrs Matelot". I was her boss at "Northern Secondary" - but I had no interaction with them personally when they were here' (Principal, CP). Mrs Perry supported this view by saying, 'even though they knew some teachers there was still professionalism in carrying out the inspection' (Teacher, CP). According to Mr Baxter, 'I think they were professional in their approach to the inspection' (Principal, JP). Mr Kranston also believed,

'they were cordial, they were friendly, they were professional' (Principal, CMP). The inspection handbook articulates clearly how inspectors must conduct themselves during SI.

Not all of the schools experienced the oral feedback in the same way. For example, CP did not receive feedback immediately because of an emergency meeting the team had to attend at the MoE. It took place one week later with the principals and SMT. The principal described the meeting this way, 'I felt comfortable everybody [was] relaxed. We knew we were doing well. We questioned a lot of what they had to say' (Mrs Lauriston). CMP's oral feedback occurred on the last day. It included the principal and the SMT and was described as, 'frank, but at the same time in being frank they didn't put it over with the big stick' (Mr Kranston, Principal). Mr Kranston's experience of the oral feedback was not like Mrs Proudfoot who exclaimed, 'oh my goodness they were so disappointed!' She went on to say, 'the head teacher felt a bit disappointed you can see it in his face'. She explained there was a verbal confrontation between the teacher-in-charge of the infant section of CMP and the counsellor during the feedback. Like CMP, the oral feedback for MP took place on the last day of the inspection:

> One or two teachers were a bit – they were not too open to responses or to ideas that were given by the inspectors. Instead, it was more of a defence as against being more receptive to the ideas (Mr Hilton, Principal).

Oral feedback was also given to the eight teachers of MP immediately after it was done with the SMT. However, no oral feedback was done at JP following the inspection and Mr Baxter expressed, 'I particularly disliked there wasn't any oral feedback immediately after the inspection. I was really disappointed' (Principal). The SEO confirmed that JP received no oral:

> This is unusual because we have done an oral session at all of the schools. We did not want any verbal confrontation concerning the report. So we thought that in the interest of peace and quiet it was just better to give a written rather than an oral report… I think that the leadership of the school is sort of a controversial figure. It was kind of difficult to forecast how the leadership would have reacted to a negative report (SEO, SIS Unit).

The SEO explained after this experience at JP irrespective of the situation the oral feedback was done following an inspection. The principal's personality was the reason JP received no feedback. This same principal felt three days were inadequate to conduct an inspection and the inspector changed it to a week to suit him. Thus, a principal's personality appears to be a factor in how both the inspectors and the inspected experience SI.

6.2.3. After the SI Process

I will deal in more detail with the experiences relating to after SI in the section under implementation of recommendations and challenges. All of the schools received a report some months following their inspection. It recommended that they develop and present to the SIS Unit an action plan within two months of receiving the SI report. Except for MP, none of the schools completed their action plans within the stipulated two-month period. In fact, CMP submitted its plan just before I did the interview with the principal in October 2014, and it was inspected in May 2013. MP prepared a four-page draft action plan, which entailed eight areas under the topic of strategy/activity. It specified the individuals responsible for them. However, it listed no success indicators. With respect to re-inspection, only CMP received an unannounced re-inspection visit. The inspectors found no difference in the school following the earlier inspection. In some schools, the inspectors returned after the inspection to speak to the teachers after the inspection while in others they did not.

It is important to note that none of the schools had a personal copy of the SIS Unit's handbook for inspection.

6.3. Perceptions of SI

The first research question sought to evaluate principals' and teachers' perceptions of SI. Here, I continue to present the findings which I began above in response to research question one. The focus will be on the perceptions of SI. It begins with a presentation of the data from CP, followed by CMP, JP, and MP. My intention in presenting the data separately is to highlight the particularity of the perceptions of each school's principal and teachers.

6.3.1. Chatoyer Primary

In exploring the perceptions of the principal Mrs Lauriston and teachers Mrs Perry and Carmichael, the data revealed that they perceived SI as accountability. Mrs Lauriston's agrees with the implementation of SI in SVG:

> We need it. I did the training, and I went to four schools. We were out for a month, and we did four schools. Our group, it was awful. They need to be inspected every day. None of the four schools we did passed. They failed really badly (Principal).

This view refers to her participation in the simulation exercises of SI with the consultants prior to its implementation. Her teacher, Mr Carmichael, is also in agreement with the implementation of SI in SVG:

> It help[s] the Ministry of Education in terms of equity in teaching and learning to see what some schools are doing on a general normal basis, compared to others so that they could probably compare performances on the National Test.

There was also the perception that SI had the potential to facilitate school improvement. Mr Lauriston defines improvement as, 'look[ing] at what they find- their findings and to do better than what the inspectors [saw] …' (Principal). To her improvement can come in this way, 'they send you some recommendations if you work on them then you could have school improvement'. Nevertheless, she believes the recommendations for CP were, 'no real recommendations that we could work on'. From her perspective, the school was already doing most, if not all, of the things the inspectors recommended. Mr Carmichael shared a similar belief on how SI could lead to school improvement when he said, 'the recommendations that they make if the schools take them on board there will be improvement somewhere' (Teacher).

Mr Carmichael and Mrs Lauriston are both of the perception that SI can lead to window dressing in schools. Mr Carmichael constructed his perception hypothetically:

> The fact that we know they are coming we might put on a good show for that week so that what they observed the school get a high rating, but that's not a reflection of what normally happens. So they will say they just need a

little help. But then in essence we might have a lot of faults that were not seen because we were putting our best foot forward just for that week (Teacher).

Mrs Lauriston gave an actual example to show how SI resulted in window dressing:

> Some teachers put on a show, even though most of them were just relaxed. One teacher in particular who was praised very highly for the best lessons I know she was putting on a show... I thought they should be more experienced to know that. When they went to her, she told them she wasn't well and come back tomorrow, so she put on a show for them the next day. She took the children outside and had games with them. She did math games, and usually she doesn't do that. She saw another teacher doing that [during inspection] and was impressed with that (Principal).

Although this was the first time the teachers were experiencing SI, one of them quickly identified how to window dress for the inspectors. Moreover, Mr Carmichael's view shows he understands how SI can make for window dressing in schools.

Mrs Perry and Mr Carmichael, her teacher colleague, both agreed that the inspection report was fair and/or accurate with Mrs Perry characterising it as, 'very accurate'. However, their principal, Mrs Lauriston, said they were 'very unfair'. The inspectors rated her well as a school leader and so she felt that the behaviour of the children and some other comments by the inspectors made the report the way she saw it. She maintained this perception in a follow-up interview.

6.3.2. Cato Memorial Primary

Mr Kranston, Mrs Proudfoot, and Mr Conliff similar to Mrs Lauriston, Mrs Perry, and Mr Carmichael of CP, see SI as accountability. Mr Kranston expressed his perspective of SI:

> It helps you to do it in a more methodical way and you are able to get [a] better response. The inspection helps us to look in and see we can do this too. We don't have to wait for the team to come in we can do it on our own (Principal).

In the penultimate sentences of Mr Kranston's assertion, he hints at SSE. Mrs Proudfoot also expressed her perception of SI:

> Some teachers generally, if school inspectors are not there they do what they want. They don't want to teach once inspectors are there is teaching, there is catering, most cases I should say not all, for the low level and the high level. There is differentiation (Teacher).

She characterises SI as kind of surveillance of teachers. Mr Conliff believes, 'school inspection was done to CMP because of the school's performance in CEE. The school was targeted' (Teacher). Mr Conliff's view sees SI as accountability in relation to the school's poor CEE test performance.

The participants supported the implementation of SI in SVG with Mr Kranston saying, 'It is a good thing. You have to start somewhere. The implementation process we may not all agree with it. I think it is something that we need' (Principal). Questioned further about the implementation process he pointed out, 'some people perceived it, you know is almost like they sending spies in the schools'. On the contrary, he said, 'I see it as how we can build on the weaknesses and even on the strengths'. He believes SI should have been the norm in school culture in SVG. Mr Conliff sees SI as, 'help[ing] all schools in SVG to realise where [they] are'. While Mrs Proudfoot's claims, 'it's a good thing, I think it should be done more'.

Regarding the SI report, Mr Kranston said '[for] the greater part I would think it was fair'. However, Mrs Proudfoot said, 'it wasn't too fair to an extent'. She neither saw nor read the inspection report. She explained being part of the oral feedback, she did not read the report. She believes, though, that the findings were accurate particularly regarding the SDP and teacher absenteeism.

Mr Kranston explained how he sees school improvement:

> The bottom line of school improvement is that there is a better relationship within the school. But the more important thing there should be improvement in the teaching and the learning at the school (Principal).

He believes SI can lead to school improvement. Mrs Proudfoot sees school improvement as improving teaching and learning and students, 'applying what they learn in school to real life'. She believes that SI will lead to improvement through inspectors returning to schools in unannounced inspections, 'not knowing when they are going to come teachers are going to work towards that [improvement]'.

Mr Conliff conceives of school improvement in much the same way as Mrs Proudfoot. However, he believes 'school inspection should be for novice teachers' and not for experienced teachers as him.

6.3.3. Joshua Primary

Like the two principals above, Mr Baxter understands SI as performing a role of accountability in primary schools in SVG:

> It lends a stronger voice to my voice because, I've been saying to teachers these are the areas in which you need to improve. You have inspectors coming in and say the same thing so my voice is strengthened. I think that it give us insights as to what we can do to improve school effectiveness (Mr Baxter).

He sees SI an independent referent being critical to supporting his role of accountability and school improvement. He perceives it as assisting the school in bringing about school effectiveness, which he sees as bringing about school improvement. Miss Bronte uses the term accountability in giving her perception of SI, 'it makes you accountable to the ministry, to the parents' (Teacher). Mrs Rothman characterises accountability more in line with SSE she said, 'it gives you a guideline, as an organisation if you [are] not accustomed to evaluating yourself you will not know exactly where you are' (Teacher).

Mr Baxter, Mrs Rothman and Mrs Bronte like their other counterparts support SI. For the principal, 'it could be a very, very useful exercise, providing it is conducted in the way it should be and the inspectors themselves are very objective in their approach' (Mr Baxter). There is the possibility that SI could have unintended negative effects if not conducted with impartiality Mr Baxter seems to suggest. This is Mrs Rothman's perspective:

> I think it's a good idea because I've been around and I've seen a lot. I know sometimes things are not as they ought to be. If it is done in the right way without biases it can be a good thing (Teacher).

Like Mr Baxter, she enters the caveat of inspection only being beneficial in the context of objectivity. While Miss Bronte supports school inspection, she is of the opinion, like Mr Kranston principal of CMP that the implementation was not done properly:

We needed prior discussion on school inspection. There needed to be a formal discussion. At least somebody from the inspection team should have come. Inspection was just dropped on schools' laps (Teacher).

Her views are in relation to the top-down manner in which school inspection was implemented in SVG. She went on to add, 'many of us feel that the schools in the first round were schools under the ministry binoculars, schools that were not doing well at the CEE and national tests' (Teacher). She thinks SI was surveillance of schools that were not performing well in the CEE. This is accountability and is quite similar to a perspective shared earlier by Mr Conliff of CMP.

Like their other counterparts, the participants of JP were of the perception that SI can contribute to school improvement. Mr Baxter articulated his view about it:

> They say school improvement what I like to talk about is improving school effectiveness. In other words we can always improve our school. There can be a number of right ways of doing things so we want to improve on school effectiveness to improve what we do (Principal).

His perception is that when schools are effective then school improvement results from this. Mrs Rothman's view of school inspection leading to school improvement is crafted this way, 'look at the things they say in the inspection report, you analyse them. If somebody finds fault sit down and do self-reflection (Teacher). In Miss Bronte's belief, 'improvement should be the aim of school inspection' (Teacher).

The participants were in general agreement with the findings of the SI report:

> Apart from one issue I think the report was really a true reflection of what happens right. Because from where I sit as principal a lot of the things that we sat at staff meetings and planned and say we would implement some teachers didn't move to implement some of those things we spoke about and it was reflected when the inspectors came (Mr Baxter, Principal).

His assessment of issues in the school was borne out in the inspection report. However, his comments indicate inept leadership as non-implementation of plans, falls squarely on his shoulders as the school leader. Miss Bronte felt the report was: 'fair but in other instances we had problems… when the staff saw the report a lot

of the members were very upset. Others said some of the things in it are true' (Teacher).

Mr Baxter and Miss Bronte believe that SI has negative aspects too, 'teachers can think in a case where the inspectors were subjective, they can feel a bit discouraged; it can portray an untrue negative image about the school' (Mr Baxter, Principal). Miss Bronte also expressed her feelings about the negative consequences of SI:

> Some teachers got feedback and there was a difference between the feedback and what was in the report. It was daunting honestly. Each heading was unsatisfactory. People's spirits were crushed and they voiced it when we had the staff meeting (Teacher).

The SI report had negative unintended consequences on teachers at JP.

6.3.4. Mulzac Primary

Mr Hilton, as is the case above with his colleague principals, in expressing his views on SI suggests it is a means of holding him and his teachers accountable:

> It would have given rise for us to do, not that we were not doing it, but serious introspection. Because some of the things they were right there in front of us but we were not seeing them…. I must say that inspection, beyond a shadow of a doubt, would have really done a lot to us. Also it helps with supervision even classroom management (Principal).

The external view of SI gave the school a perspective it did not have before SI. The accountability role is helping with 'supervision' and 'classroom management' as Mr Hilton said. Mr Enville also considered school inspection as accountability.

Mr Hilton articulated his support for the implementation of SI by saying, 'I think it is necessary. But still I believe that there are more things that are needed to be put in place'. In his view, adequate measures were not put in place before the introduction of SI. Two earlier participants, Miss Bronte and Mr Kranston of CMP, also questioned the manner in which SVG implemented SI. Mr Enville also considered the implementation of SI as valuable but, as a former executive member of the local teachers' trade union he said, 'you know couple of years ago they wanted to implement this teacher appraisal system this could be a way of

implementing that system', he further believed it could lead to 'pay according to work'. His perception is one of SI as a means of making teachers accountable through inspection as appraisal.

Mr Hilton has some minor reservations regarding the accuracy and fairness of the inspection findings when he said, 'I would not say it wasn't very accurate… I must say that we agree to some of the findings. I think I prefer to put it down to being fair as against good' (Principal). Mr Enville was also in general agreement with the accuracy and fairness of the inspection findings, 'it was a fair assessment except there are some instances where you can create an argument' (Teacher).

Both Messrs Hilton and Enville believe that school inspection may lead to school improvement. The former expressed his view of what is school improvement:

> When you talk about school improvement you're actually talking about the, improvement in lesson delivery, another is the actual enhancement of the teaching learning process, [and] leadership, management and supervision (Mr Hilton).

Mr Enville also had a general similar understanding of school improvement but saw it as relating more to differentiated teaching to cater to all students. Mr Hilton believes school improvement will occur if it, 'is on-going, then it will lead to improvement, and not where you come and inspect and that's it' (Principal). On the other hand, Mr Enville said, 'because your weaknesses are pointed out you should be able to correct them'.

6.4. Teaching and Learning

This section primarily uses data from the SI reports supplemented with observations and a small amount of the interviews to respond to research question two: *What do the results of the SI process indicate about teaching and learning, leadership and management in primary schools in SVG?* First, I focus on teaching and learning. The purpose of this question was to find out what SI, which has an improvement agenda, indicates about teaching and learning which is a critical to improvement in schools. The themes of traditional (teacher-centred) teaching and accountability were evident in the data. I begin with data from CP, followed by CMP, and then JP and MP respectively.

6.4.1. Chatoyer Primary

According to the SI report, teaching and learning is largely traditional (teacher centred) at CP with some degree of student-centred teaching:

> Many lessons are taught on a whole class basis showing inadequate adaptation of the curriculum to provide additional support to effectively meet the individual needs of students (Inspection Report, 2014).

A whole class approach indicates the traditional method of teaching is prevalent as the report claims "many lesson" being taught like that.

In Mrs Perry's Kindergarten class I witnessed a student-centred lesson in which she taught geometry. She integrated other subjects from the curriculum during the lesson. I also observed a science lesson on the circulatory system in Mr Carmichael's grade five class. It included some elements of student-centred teaching. However, he often resorted to the teacher-centred method of telling.

The report used CEE and the National Test at grades two and four, as measures of accountability, to indicate the quality of student learning:

> The school's performance in the Common Entrance Examinations [CEE] has been consistently above the national average. These results were higher than the national pass rates… In fact, the school obtained pass rates of 55.56, 60 and 65.25 per cent respectively (Inspection Report, 2014).

The SI report commented, 'the overall quality of teaching and learning at the school is satisfactory,' and 'many teachers plan their lessons, but a few did not have any lesson plans'. Both Mrs Perry and Mr Carmichael had plans for the lessons I observed and for the preceding weeks. However, Mr Carmichael indicated that he did not have lesson plans when the inspectors observed his teaching. Lesson planning is a means of holding teachers accountable for the quality of teaching and learning at the school.

From my observations, I include in traditional teaching those routines like prayers, singing of religious songs at the start of school. Prayers are also said at the end of the morning session and at the start and end of the afternoon session. These form part of the culture of teaching and learning. Moreover, the teachers held centre

stage during prayers and students either carried out their respective commands or faced upbraiding when they erred during prayers. Another, significant aspect of traditional teaching which I observed is the use of corporal punishment. I did not witness its use on students, but I saw the belt on the principal's desk on at least two occasions. SI is introduced into the culture of primary schools where many aspects of inherited traditional teaching are entrenched.

6.4.2. Cato Memorial Primary

Unlike CP above, the inspection report indicates that, 'the quality of teaching and learning throughout the school is unsatisfactory' or Level 4:

> Quality not yet at the level acceptable for schools in SVG- schools are expected to take urgent measures to improve the quality of any aspect of their performance or provision that is judged at this level. (Inspection Report, 2013)

In addition, teacher accountability was inadequate on lesson planning:

> Many lesson plans are not dated and the curriculum is absent in some instances. Some teachers do not plan in a detailed manner, and there is considerable evidence of poor lesson plan structure. In some cases plans are presented for a week and not for a specific lesson (Inspection Report, 2013)

Earlier, Mrs Proudfoot, a teacher, indicated that many teachers did not have lesson plans when the school was re-inspected. There was evidently no change in this culture following the school's inspection.

Similar to CP, but more pervasive at CMP, is teaching being teacher-centred or traditional:

> In most cases the lessons are teacher-centred and students are not sufficiently involved in lessons that foster inquiry and problem solving skills. (Inspection Report, 2013)

Mr Kranston believes teachers, 'walk over the surface and [are] not engaging the children… we [are] still filling the empty vessels from the fountain of knowledge'. His analogy of, 'filling the empty vessels' is akin to Paulo Freire's banking concept of education. Mrs Proudfoot claimed, 'some teachers don't want to teach they just put work on the board'. While I did not observe any of Mrs Proudfoot's

and Mr Conliff's lessons, where I often sat during observations allowed me to view two grade three classes in the open hall section of the school. I was able to see the teachers and some of the students, as there was separation of the classes by freestanding chalkboards. In most instances, the teachers were at their desks and students copied work from the board while the teachers intermittently issued commands. I also made an observational note:

> In the nearby classroom I could discern that the teacher is doing Language Arts from the questions she is asking. While she asks a few questions she is doing a lot of telling.

As in CP, part of traditional teaching and learning is prayers and singing as described earlier. The traditional teaching also entails corporal punishment as part of the architecture of teaching and learning. On occasion, I observed students receiving corporal punishment from a teacher for apparently not doing their homework.

Similar to CP, National tests were used as the measure of accountability for student learning. The results showed the school is performing below national standards in these examinations.

6.4.3. Joshua Primary

Teaching and learning, like at CP and CMP, is mainly teacher-centred at JP. However, the inspectors were of the opinion that some of the teachers at the school did engage in a student-centred approach to teaching. However, in the main, the teaching is teacher-centred:

> In some cases, teaching methods are less than satisfactory as there is a lot of 'chalk and talk'. Many lessons are teacher-centred and do not cater to the need of students (Inspection Report, 2104).

I observed two diametrically opposing methods of teaching. One in Miss Bronte's class in which she taught Language Arts to her grade four class that was the epitome of a student-centred lesson. On the contrary, Mrs Rothman had no plan for her lesson and lectured throughout to her grade three class of thirty-six students. To Miss Bronte, 'the teaching methods are too old-fashioned in some instance too

much chalk and talk and lecture method'. Ironically Mr Baxter felt, 'teachers' general lesson delivery was good even before inspection' (Principal).

The CEE as a measure of accountability for student learning shows that JP is not adequately meeting the learning needs of its students. In addition, the report perceives the performance in National Tests as unsatisfactory.

The routine for the start of teaching and learning is as described above for CP and CMP. Although corporal punishment was never used in my presence it is also a means of traditional teaching at JP. One day, I stopped to question a teacher who was taking her Kindergarten class to an almond tree at the northern end of the yard, as I spoke to her she held a belt in her hand. On another occasion, I heard Mr Baxter scolding a class to which he said, 'I am trying hard not to use the strap don't make me have to go for it' (Principal). On every occasion that I visited Mrs Rothman's class, she had a belt either on her shoulder or on her desk. On the occasion that I observed her lesson, she almost used it on a student who, in obvious fear, found a way to explain what he was doing and so averted being flogged. The inspection report pointed out, 'many students are concerned about the flogging that is administered when they fail to do homework or when they misbehave'. Students, rightfully, have negative attitudes towards corporal punishment.

6.4.4. Mulzac Primary

MP, like CMP and JP, was considered as having ineffective teaching methods, which is related to traditional teaching:

> A few teachers employ various methodologies to deliver the content…However, some teaching does not reflect an understanding of the varying abilities of students and deliberate approach to teach them… lesson plans and delivery processes are teacher-centred…Most teachers rely heavily on the lecture and discussion methods even when they are not appropriate for the lesson (Inspection Report, 2014).

I observed a lesson from Mr Enville that was largely teacher-centred. He apologised for not having his lesson plan, scheme, and record book, which he indicated had been forgotten at home. I did not inform him that I was coming to the school to visit that day because I wanted to get the authentic view of his teaching, and not one that he specifically designed for my visit. Ironically, Mr Enville

framed his philosophy of teaching and learning at MP in a way that showed he understood the value of student-centred teaching:

> There is still too much chalk and talk. There are times when the chalk and talk could be useful, but you have to get the children involved in the chalk and talk. Sometimes we ask one question and that's it we start to tell (Teacher).

Mr Hilton's belief is that teachers at MP need to 'create more situations where children would express themselves freely' (Principal). This is also an indication that traditional teaching is prevalent at the school. He agreed with the findings of the inspectors on the way teaching and learning was occurring in the kindergarten class.

The report used CEE to account for student learning:

> In 2011, the school had a pass rate of 45.45 per cent… the performance was within an acceptable range. During the last two years there has been a marked decline in student output at Common Entrance. The school declined to 38.1 per cent in 2012 and experienced further decline in 2013 to 26.67 per cent.

With only seventy-three students, the school is performing well below the expected standards.

Teaching and learning also includes the use of corporal punishment. However, I did not observe any instance of its use, but the belt was often present on the principal's desk during my visits to the school.

6.5. Leadership and Management

Here, I present the data for each of the four schools to understand what the SI process indicates about leadership and management, which, like teaching and learning, is critical to SI and its school improvement purpose.

6.5.1. Chatoyer Primary

Mrs Lauriston has been principal of CP since 2006, she gets assistance from a SMT of five teachers. Although deputy principals are not part of the official management structure of primary schools in SVG, she "appointed" one of her

experienced teachers to perform the role of "deputy principal". She also gave her an office space to carry out her duties. The inspection report indicates that there is an effective management structure in place at CP. It rated leadership and management as Level 2 or "Good" which is the expected level of every school in SVG:

> The leadership of the school is firm and decisive and receives support from the Senior Management Team. The principal has put systems in place to motivate and supervise the staff. The staff works well together with clear lines of responsibility and they respond positively to initiatives. Almost all of the teachers speak highly of the principal and commend her for doing a good job… (Inspection Report, 2014).

However, Mrs Lauriston felt that leadership and management should have been rated as Level 1 or "exceptional" because there were hardly any flaws found by the inspectors. For Mrs Perry, 'if there is a decision to be made… she don't make it on her own she comes to the teachers and discuss' (Teacher). Also agreeing that leadership of CP is effective Mr Carmichael claims, 'we generally have a good rapport between staff and management team' (Teacher). I observed the effectiveness of leadership and management in the way the principal and the staff interact with each other and in her interactions with me as I gathered data.

Part of the role of leadership and management according to the inspection handbook is doing SSE, and this is part of the culture of CP:

> The school constantly assesses its performance and evaluates strategies for improvement. Teachers use outcomes of self-evaluation to plan and take action promptly to make the necessary improvements… The teaching staff is assessed through lesson observations and the use of an appraisal instrument to determine their strengths and weaknesses… (Inspection Report, 2014).

This is another perspective of SSE that is emerging here from the SI report. Earlier I pointed out the discrepancy in the principal's understanding of SSE prior to SI. The articulation of SSE in the SI report above seems more in line with what the principals perceive SSE to be, that is, a school assessing its own performance without external prompting. The other perspective is completion of forms from the SSE unit prior to the preliminary inspection visit. Therefore, the SIS Unit has two conceptions or complementary notions of SSE.

In Mrs Lauriston perception leadership and management has an accountability purpose:

> We have to be instructional leaders and managers. My role mainly is to ensure the school is run properly in accordance with whatever the Ministry of Education has set out for us… my time is taken up with monitoring the teachers and the curriculum.

Her reference to, 'monitoring teachers and the curriculum' is a classic example of the accountability role of school leaders. She also expresses a view of leadership that speaks of management theory when she makes mention of principals being, 'instructional leaders'. It is no wonder she received a "good" rating as leader from the inspectors and teachers.

6.5.2. Cato Memorial Primary

There is a SMT of five persons at CMP. In addition, there are year heads, and because the school is housed in two campuses that are not in sight of each other, there is a teacher-in-charge of the lower grade campus. Unlike CP, the report judged leadership and management as "Unsatisfactory":

> While the leadership of the school is approachable and communicates well with teachers and students, systems of accountability are not well established to hold teachers responsible for the impact they are having on teaching and learning through the school. There is a distribution of leadership tasks through the teacher-in-charge of the annex and through the SMT (Inspection Report, 2013).

Mr Kranston agrees to some extent with the perspective of the report on the need for him to be more assertive as the principal:

> I agree with it. But I'll give you my take on it. I don't believe if you talk to teachers 2, 3, 4 times you should be going back 5, 6, 7 times. I think some people are downright stubborn (emphasises here) and fixed in their ways and in some cases some of us are lazy. It may be harsh but I'm being honest… But I think I should have been more assertive.

Mr Kranston indicates that teachers at CMP are not willing to change and this is a problem at the school. The report in essence indicates he is ineffective as a school leader. It is no wonder then that there is no culture of SSE existing at CMP as the inspection report pointed out, 'there are no visible instruments for school self-

evaluation. School planning is carried out on an informal basis… (Inspection Report, 2013).

However, Mr Kranston is of the belief that SI has caused him to be reflective as a principal, 'it helps you do more introspection, serious introspection and self-evaluation, I think it has benefitted me'. However, he believes 'you [a teacher] may think Mr Kranston is on my case you may give a biased view of what's going on'. This may give a biased perspective of management.

6.5.3. Joshua Primary

The SI report indicates that JP like CMP has "unsatisfactory" or ineffective leadership by stating, 'the leadership of the school needs to be more firm in holding all teachers accountable for the performance of students' (Inspection Report, 2014). Mr Baxter, however, was evasive in speaking to the specific aspects of leadership and management:

> People think that the leadership need to be more firm. More firm… Teachers think that, if I set a deadline and say this is due by Monday stick to Monday don't lean over [for] people because of their problems and difficulties (Principal).

In relation to the unsatisfactory leadership Mrs Rothman expressed a view that supports this, 'one of the things I know that had broken down was the SMT wasn't operating at the time of the inspection. Everything fell down' (Teacher). Miss Bronte was reluctant to speak about what the report said about leadership. Later, she mentioned that she was encouraged to apply for principal of JP but did not, because of the stress of the job. I observed that the staff and Miss Bronte have a good relationship. She is very professional and meticulous. I also found that Mr Baxter had a good rapport with teachers that at times was rather informal. He was pleasant and approachable during my interactions with him, but it was difficult to get him to respond to emails and reach him by telephone.

SSE and improvement planning, in the belief of the inspectors, was unsatisfactory:

> Monitoring and analysis of the school's performance need to be further developed as the principal has discontinued the regular system of formal

lesson observation that had been initiated previously. (Inspection Report, 2014).

SSE as expressed in the report is a means of accountability for which the principal has responsibility.

6.5.4. Mulzac Primary

As for CMP and JP, the SI report indicated leadership and management of MP is "unsatisfactory":

> The current principal of the school is new… He is enthusiastic about the challenges of running the school and is open to innovative ideas….The leadership however needs to ensure that teachers remain focused on the vision of school by holding the staff accountable for completing schemes of work, improving teaching methods and the management of student behaviour during lessons.

The language of accountability in relation to leadership and management is evident in the report. In fact, Mr Hilton described his own role in accountability terms:

> I ensure that the lesson plans the content are really in line with the curriculum because that is very, very important. As part supervising teachers you must monitor the curriculum.

Mr Hilton has shown that he is willing to work on improving MP. The SEO felt he was the most receptive of the four principals during the inspection process.

In the inspection findings, indicated that SSE at MP is "unsatisfactory" like at CMP and JP.

6.6. Implementation of SI Recommendations

This section presents the findings to respond to research question three: *To what extent have inspection recommendations for teaching and learning, leadership and management been implemented, and what are the challenges to implementing them in the individual primary schools?*

6.6.1. Chatoyer Primary

The inspection report made recommendations for improving teaching and learning, leadership and management at CP. Mr Carmichael expressed a perspective that brings out an aspect of the implementation process:

> There is now greater pressure, let me say for lack of a better word, on teachers to make their lesson plans, not only to make them but to include ICT and to get them done on time. We were always told but since the inspection, they have been more forceful in getting teachers to do their plans (Teacher).

The school strengthened teaching and learning in the kindergarten class where the report found one of the teachers was weak, 'we [are] closely monitoring her with another teacher there' (Mrs Lauriston, Principal). There are now more frequent visits to individual teacher's classes, and the management team is now doing more checks of teachers. Mr Carmichael stated, 'we're making a greater effort to use more ICT; we're using more games, making learning more child-centred' (Teacher). These are all means of making teachers accountable.

Chatoyer Primary implemented the recommendation to grant time off to teachers on Friday at 2:30 to plan for teaching. Mrs Lauriston expressed the challenge faced since its implementation:

> [The] first week two teachers left at 2:30 with the children. Last week I was here 2:30 and the same two teachers said "*Miss bye eh*". So I called them back and one of them said "*Miss I was here since 7:30. The 2:30 is for the teachers who are late*" and I said no it's for planning and he still left. The other one said she planned earlier so she was leaving. At my brief staff meeting I told them what is the purpose of the 2:30. If they [are not] planning…we're going back to the 3 o'clock. I didn't see that this was necessary but they told the teachers that (Principal).

Mr Lauriston did not agree with the inspectors' recommendation for the time off for planning. One other issue the inspection found was the inadequate use of ICT in the teaching and learning process. However, 'although the ICT committee is working hard they are still meeting some resistance' Mrs Lauriston stated. The system of supervision of teachers has also faced resistance:

> The attitude of some teachers is that they do not want to be supervised - who is so and so to be supervising them. All of them have the same qualifications. (Mrs Lauriston, Principal)

Teachers of similar level qualifications do not want their peers to supervise them. A perception of resistance to implementing the SI recommendations relates to teachers' attitude:

> Some persons I know are not very open to criticism and I know some teachers feel that they already overworked and with the inspection team making certain recommendations and administration trying to instil it some teachers might feel they giving me work [to] do or they [aren't] paying me for all this (Mr Carmichael, Teacher).

From Mrs Lauriston's perspective, there is no significant change in her leadership style since inspection. However, the teachers claim there are now frequent management meetings, increased class visits, sharing of information' and management's attempts to solve or intercede in parent issues by referring them to the counsellor.

6.6.2. Cato Memorial Primary

In respect to teaching and learning, the report recommended that teachers use more ICT in their teaching in the hope that it will enhance learning. There is now greater use of ICT especially by a particular teacher. Mr Kranston stated, 'other teachers are using it both here at this block and at the annex. It is being used more frequently' (Principal). However, he did say some teachers are still not using it as much as they ought to. He pointed out that the school's physical environment does not always facilitate the effective use of the projector.

Another recommendation that the report suggested was that teachers cater to the needs of the varying abilities in their classes. The school has taken measures to improve this, according to Mr Kranston, through the appointment of a literacy coordinator at the main block. The literacy co-ordinator conducted a workshop for teachers and someone from the MoE came in to do a workshop.

The inspectors also recommended that teachers needed to make use of the recommended curriculum. According to Mr Kranston, they are now planning lessons more in line with curriculum. He explained they are now taking the

children outdoors more in their teaching particularly in science. They have had field trips and teachers are making more charts to use in their teaching. However, Mrs Proudfoot claims, 'a few teachers still remain the same; they [are] still not putting in as much effort in their teaching as they should' (Teacher).

The school changed the way it organises its grade level meetings. It implemented a parent day at the beginning of the second and third term to give teachers an opportunity to meet with parents to discuss their children's performance.

The main challenges to implementing some of the recommendations appear to relate to teachers' attitude and experience. In Mr Kranston's view, the increase in qualifications among teachers is acting as barrier to implementing recommendations relating to teaching and learning at CMP:

> I would have observed the more educated we become a bit more selfish and at the same time we become more guarded, or in other words I have it too way you playing. You go and tell a teacher how to approach something, they may not say it to you, but it comes back to you- you playing you know.

The English Creole expressions 'I have it too way you playing,' and 'you playing you know' used by Mr Kranston above mean that teachers are not willing to accept ideas for their teaching from their peers who have similar qualifications. Mrs Proudfoot's comment, though it relates to the inspectors, can be linked to the view expressed immediately above by Mr Kranston:

> Seeing people who come to inspect who don't have their masters coming to inspect me they just have their bachelors. I know what I am doing; they can't correct anything in my lesson. I have my masters.

While Mrs Proudfoot holds this view she, ironically, mentioned teachers' refusal to follow her suggestions for improving their teaching. The experience of teachers may also be a hindrance to implementing the recommendations:

> Accepting of the guidance is more there with the newer members. I am now into this thing maybe I could do this, I could do that. I'm here for 10, 15 years I've been doing this, well they could say what they want- resistance (Mr Kranston).

Mr Conliff holds a bachelor's degree in mathematics, and he has been a teacher for twenty-five years. He does not believe the inspectors should ask him to produce a lesson plan. This is part of resistance to change, and the feeling that with years of experience and professional training that certain teachers should not plan for teaching.

Another challenge the school faces in implementing the inspection recommendations is what appears to be the absence of the culture of a community of learners. Mr Kranston's perspective is, 'in some cases sometimes we do not have the cohesiveness as a staff as we need and that is one that would hinder school improvement'. I noted an observation in relation Mr Kranston's view:

> One or two teachers are talking to each other. However, generally they do not form groups at lunchtime and laugh and talk with each other as I have observed at the other schools.

The report recommended that leadership and management makes more regular and consistent supervision of teachers and the creation of an effective supervision roster. In this regard, the principal and the teacher-in-charge at the annex have been making more visits to classes, 'although we not necessarily going with the paper, you sit in you see how people are delivering' Mr Kranston mentioned. This is done also by the SMT and the grade heads who check lesson plans and observe lessons. However, for the second term there was no assessment of teachers Mr Kranston stated. Mr Conliff mentioned, 'the principal coming around more regular'. However, the school has no supervision roster to ensure systematic supervision and observation of teachers' lessons.

The report is of the view that the school needs to develop a culture of SSE through developing a system of internal appraisal of teachers, which it should use to decide on the areas of focus for professional development. According to Mr Kranston, this has not been done but he added that, 'through observations and feedback teachers are guided as to ways in which they can improve their lesson delivery' (Principal). The report also recommended that a system be devised for the entire school and for individual teachers. However, 'there has not been any discussion on this- there has been no implementation' Mr Kranston mentioned.

CMP did not have a stated philosophy during the inspection process. Therefore, it was recommended that a vision and mission statement be created and be accessible to all stakeholders by being prominently displayed in strategic positions around the school. While a mission statement was developed, I did not see any on my visits to the school.

There appears to be issues within the SMT that may be a challenge to implementing recommendations for school improvement. Mr Kranston said 'sometimes people come and you sit down there and you feel frustrated in a management team meeting'. Both Mr Kranston and Mrs Proudfoot are of the belief that members of the SMT having their own classes makes it challenging for them to leave their classes to observe and supervise other teachers' lessons.

6.6.3. Joshua Primary

The inspection report recommended that teachers at JP needed to be held more accountable for student learning. To do this they suggested devolution of responsibility to the SMT who should ensure that teachers are, 'accountable for defects in their planning' (Inspection report, 2014). The school did not implement this recommendation to any significant extent as Mr Baxter stated roles remained the same since the SI. He said this recommendation in SI report was included in the action plan. Later he said they are doing some of the monitoring, and the SMT is now holding teachers accountable for their planning. Mrs Bronte said there is now a, 'timetable for the management team to do their monitoring of the curriculum' (Teacher).

In the view of the inspectors, the school should ensure that there is a revised assessment policy and the SMT needs to, 'ensure that teachers provide regular written reports on student performance' to students as well as their parents. This recommendation was not implemented.

The inspectors recommended that leadership and management organise workshops for teachers in literacy. The school obtained a Peace Corp volunteer to assist with literacy. Miss Bronte said, 'We have started some developmental sessions we have

asked MoE officers to do sessions in composition' (Teacher). Again, there was partial implementation of this recommendation.

The inspectors were of the perception that the school should place some of teachers in the two upper grades in the middle grades. However, Mr Baxter is of the view that, 'the teaching in this section [middle grades] was accurate', and so the teachers were not moved. However, both Mrs Rothman and Miss Bronte confirmed the shifting around of a few other teachers.

The inspectors advised the school to, 'provide help to students in the form of additional tutoring and establishment of a homework group' (Inspection Report, 2014). There was limited implementation of this recommendation by the school. Referring to the homework club, Mr Baxter said it was not done because, 'parents who volunteered their services did not follow through on their promise'. There are other areas of focus regarding teaching and Mr Baxter said that one of the plans decided upon was, 'greater planning among teachers…not that we didn't use to- it will increase' he added.

In implementing, the recommendations of the inspection report at JP there are a number of challenges in doing so. These seem to relate more to teachers' resistance to change and parental attitude. Mr Baxter feels this way about it:

> Teachers are unwilling to change and adapt. They are resistant to change. They have a problem with anything that increases their workload and accountability. They like to stay in their comfort zone (Principal).

A similar view is expressed by Miss Bronte who states that 'sometimes you want to introduce something new and depending on how teachers look at it could impede school improvement' (Teacher). Another perspective is, 'at school when everybody doesn't co-operate thing don't get done' (Mrs Rothman, Teacher). This view expresses the absence of a community of learners at JP.

Other issues that are likely to hinder the implementation of recommendations relate to parents' involvement in the life of the school. All of the participants expressed this view as a serious impediment to teaching and learning at JP. It was felt, 'one reasons for this is party politics (ULP/NDP). It's a reality about politics' (Mr

Baxter, Principal). Another point cited by Miss Bronte is, 'lack of resources from the MoE stand point'. The school has little control over these issues.

6.6.4. Mulzac Primary

The inspectors recommended that there be emphasis on the use of ICT in the teaching and learning process at MP in order to improve the delivery of lessons. The school has developed a community of learners in order to deal with the use of ICT among staff with one competent teacher assisting the others.

The report mentioned the need for teachers to improve, 'their teaching methodology,' so as to 'develop more student-centred and student-friendly classrooms' (Inspection Report, 2014). Teachers are now given time off at 2:30 on Fridays to plan lessons. However, from observations teaching is still teacher-centred.

There are low levels of literacy among students at MP. To improve on this, the inspectors suggested the setting up of classroom libraries and learning centres, the appointment of a literacy co-ordinator, and a structured system of reading. Mr Hilton said that there was not yet any structured system of reading, as the school is understaffed and the literacy coordinator has her class to teach.

An aspect of the teaching and learning at MP that the inspectors recommended to bring about school improvement is the assessment of students at the school. In this respect both Mr Hilton and Enville referred to the change in assessment policy at the school. Parents now receive a monthly progress reports on their children and formative assessment takes place at the end of teaching a particular concept.

There was no structured system of teacher supervision at MP. Therefore, the inspectors recommended, 'a structured programme of teacher supervision to evaluate the performance of each class teacher on an on-going basis' (Inspection Report, 2014) be put into effect. This was not fully implemented.

The school's system of self-evaluation was ineffective in bringing about the kind of improvement needed at MP. In the inspectors' perspective, management should devise 'a self-evaluation form for teachers to assess their own performance in key

areas of teaching and classroom management'. This should be buttressed with, 'more formal evaluations and feedback to teachers by members of the Senior Management Team' it went on to say. Only partial implementation occurred in this regard.

The inspectors suggested that management plan a series of 'in-house workshops' in order to give teachers the skills they require to implement the curricula. Again, only partial implementation took place. The MoE has offered assistance to management regarding assisting teachers in this regard.

However, Mr Hilton feels that the issue of 'open plan classes…with serious competition from teachers' voices' (Principal) and the punctuality of teachers are issues that are likely to impede the implementation of the recommendations for teaching and learning at MP. He added the absence of a research culture among teachers is also an impediment to implementing the recommendations. Mr Enville identified resistance to change as a challenge to the implementation of the inspectors' recommendations:

> When you [are] accustomed to doing things and the time has come for you to change even though you recognise the need for the change, it's like a stress to let go and accept the change (Teacher).

The next section deals with enacting SI in the context of primary schools in SVG.

6.7. Perspectives on Enacting SI

Research question four refers to *How, from the perspectives of principals and teachers, should SI be enacted in primary schools in SVG?* The interview data responds to this question.

6.7.1. Chatoyer Primary

In enacting SI in SVG, the small size of the country makes for easy access to the inspectors. In addition, personal and professional knowledge of the inspectors is well known. In relation to the professional experience of the inspectors Mrs Lauriston said, 'Miss Z she is not experienced enough' to be a school inspector. This view regarding one of the inspectors' lack of experience to inspect schools

can have an effect on how much of the inspectors' recommendation are accepted by schools.

With only four full-time staff, the SIS Unit's capacity is limited. The inspection report took three months to be prepared. CP was not re-inspected during the data collection period; neither did it receive any assistance in implementing the recommendations of the inspection report. Mrs Perry believes that the small size SIS Unit staff visiting so many schools may result in inspectors not being, 'open-minded [again] to receive a new set of information', as there may be information overload.

Mrs Lauriston, Mrs Perry, and Mr Carmichael made suggestions on how the school inspection process may be enacted differently in SVG. To Mrs Lauriston, the inspectors need to be mindful in the inspection process to, 'use their experience more to detect all these shows that could take place' by teachers. She further expressed her view on how SI should be enacted:

> One week is not enough time to make a proper analysis of a school. They could space it our over a 3 week period, 3 days this week, 2 days next week 1 week or something like that. I suggest that they do not do any inspection in the third term. If there is any inspection in the third term it should be to re-inspect (Principal).

Mrs Perry and Mr Carmichael also believe that one week is insufficient to make a thorough judgement of a school. In Mrs Perry's view they should, 'hire more retired personnel to assist, and pay them for that session going back into the classroom after you have trained them' (Teacher).

Mr Carmichael believes that the inspectors need to be circumspect in the way they conduct the inspection so as not to make the main stakeholders, 'feel threatened in any way or side-lined in any way'. He believes the SIS Unit is understaffed:

> More manpower or [be] reorganised in such a way that maybe the management of the schools itself could help them in the inspection process or whatever. Something so that we can get more regular feedback (Teacher)

His suggestion, like Mrs Perry's, relates to the small size of the SIS Unit staff.

6.7.2. Cato Memorial Primary

Like CP, CMP had easy access to the inspection personnel. Mr Kranston pointed out, 'I have had a number of conversations with Mr "Johnson" the head of the SIS Unit. Once you ask for assistance they are forthcoming' (Principal).

However, there was no direct assistance in implementing the recommendations:

> Where are the people? The resourceful people if you finding fault who should be there assisting us to make sure that we reach to that certain point that you want us to reach. I'm not seeing it. We haven't seen them for a while (Mrs Proudfoot, Teacher).

Her comments relate to the absence of assistance from the SIS Unit in implementing the recommendations for improvement. They also suggest the SIS Unit does not have the necessary qualified staff to assist schools with implementing the recommendations for school improvement at CMP. It is an indirect suggestion that the more and better-qualified staff are needed in the SIS Unit to assist schools with implementing the recommendations of inspection.

 Regarding suggestions for the inspection process, Mr Kranston believes that, 'it must be something come in two days this week and next week expect me back. [I am] coming two days a week. [I] think that may give a better picture ([Principal). He also believes the feedback will be more effective, 'If the whole staff is there you get more out of people because there is officialdom'. He suggests here that teachers will respond differently to the MoE presenting the findings to all teachers than if he presents them. Mr Conliff thinks inspectors should not, 'inspect and not tell teachers what you saw, teachers should be notified after inspection'.

6.7.3. Joshua Primary

The SIS Unit was not easily accessible for JP. Mr Baxter claimed, 'I have made efforts they are always out,' he added 'we need them to look at our documents to find out if we are going right and I'm very disappointed also in that regard' (Principal). The other participants also confirmed that the school received no assistance since the inspection.

Participants made suggestions on how the SI process should operate. Mr Baxter's view mirrors that of other participants on the length of the inspections:

> Should be conducted over a longer period of time, I don't think an inspection team can really capture school within a week… what I can suggest is for example we can come back a random two days- in a two three weeks down the road (Principal).

Miss Bronte felt, 'in terms of the report I think the staff should have had a say. The team should meet with us as a group'. This view is similar to that expressed by Mr Kranston of CMP. Mrs Rothman suggested, 'somehow some way if you have best practices it should be highlighted on a national basis. Schools not doing well should pull up their socks' (Teacher). The metaphor, 'pull up their socks' when put against the view that best practices should be highlighted nationally seems to suggest that there should be publication of inspection results.

6.7.4. Mulzac Primary

Access to the inspectors has not been a challenge for MP. In fact, Mr Hilton said a five-member team of individuals including some inspectors visited the school and held a staff development session. Mr Enville mentioned, 'I don't think that the school was so badly off that they had to come in. They intend to come back'. His use of 'come in' may be a reference to schools that are in the failing category. Mulzac Primary is very close to that category in the inspectors' perspective.

In making suggestions for change Mr Hilton, like other participants, believes, 'the duration was too short, to take one week to say well teachers this or whatever. I think that period was really too short' (Principal). He also suggested that there should, 'be on-going collaboration' in the inspection process. He went on to say, 'for example, you [should] have more teachers being a part of this whole process. They should also have principals be a part of the whole school inspection' (Principal). This suggests active stakeholder involvement in the SI process.

In the upcoming section I present the findings of the respected others regarding SI.

6.8. Findings from the Respected Others

In order to gain further understanding of the case regarding SI in primary schools in SVG, I sought out the experiences and perceptions of some *respected others* (Stake, 2010). I now share the data from the one-on-one semi-structured interviews and email interviews in order of the four research questions that I explored in my study.

6.8.1. Experiences of SI

The experiences of the inspection process were similar in a number of ways and different in other instances for each of the *respected others*. The inspection process for the *respected other* principal was generally similar to that described earlier by his colleague. The SEO described part of his experiences of the SI process:

> As we travel from school to school we notice a different sort of reaction. I think that many of the principals welcome school inspection. They have said on many occasions they look forward to the school inspection that they think it's a worthwhile exercise. I'm not sure if this is because they want to keep their teachers in check or it's a way of assisting them with their leadership task.

The SEO's description suggests the principals see SI as helping them with their accountability role in the schools. The female inspector, the MoE personnel, and the DTE lecture described parts of their experiences in terms of how the process took place. The Deputy Chief Inspector (DCI) of Jamaica expressed her experiences of SI:

> The principal and staff were open to the process and very cooperative. They responded promptly to the requests for documents, and interviews were organised as per request… many Principals welcome the reports and are using them to inform their School Improvement Plan (SIP) and Action Plans and in many instances to back many of the concerns that they themselves would have raised (DCI, Jamaica).

The evidence of SI performing accountability and school improvement functions is evident in the Jamaican context as is the case in SVG where the model of inspection mirrors many aspects of the Jamaican model.

6.8.2. Perceptions of SI

The SEO expressed his perspective of SI in terms of the role of a school inspectorate:

> [An] inspection unit looks at a school, studies it in-depth, and makes recommendations, with the intention that those in a position who can make the changes would apply the changes in the interest of improving the delivery of education in the country.

The phrase "those in a position" refers to the MoE and the schools. The DTE lecturer perceives inspection as 'impacting teaching and learning at the school level' and indicates that it should result in 'improved effectiveness'. He uses the term effectiveness and not improvement, as does Mr Baxter of JP.

While the respected others believe that SI is important they also claim it has negative unintended consequences – as did many of the main participants. The respected other principal revealed, 'some people were tense; one member of staff took sick after the second day of inspection. As principal I found it stressful too'. He went on to explain that inspection is like 'intimidation, investigation as if you do something wrong'. He suggests that SI is like surveillance. The SEO expressed a point that supports the principal's view of the negative effects of inspection:

> From what I have observed school inspection is a stressful period for many of the stakeholders who work in the schools… occasionally, we have seen that when we announce an inspection that some teachers take sick leave at the time.

In the perception of the DCI of the NEI of Jamaica principals had, 'some difficulty in receiving the weaknesses of the school' (DCI, Jamaica). The MoE official believed 'administrators and teachers prepare for and perform for inspectors. It is easily seen… everything is done basically to impress'. This is window dressing. Both the female inspector and the SEO mentioned that they have heard negative feedback about the inspection process but only through second hand knowledge. This supports a need for my study of SI.

6.8.3. Teaching, Learning, Leadership and Management

First, I address the issues of teaching and learning and then leadership and management. Most of the respected others found that many teachers do not plan for teaching and learning:

> Some teachers prepare but others run around and prepare plans when they hear that inspectors are coming. This is evident from the [lesson plan] books- some lesson plan books are new when they are checked or they have gaps in the lessons. You also know what they are doing based on the students' responses (Female, Inspector).

The respected other principal held the same view as the female inspector. Her colleague said, 'a number of teachers at the personal and the school level do not engage in lesson planning in a focused and detailed way' (SEO). In the experience of the DTE lecturer, 'none of the teachers I observed had lesson plans. The students' math text books served as lesson plan, stimulus, and assessment'. The SEO claimed, 'we find a lot of teachers use the lecture method of teaching and this predominates in almost all the subject areas'. These experiences support the views from the inspection report that teaching and learning is traditional or teacher-centred.

It is believed that the quality of leadership and management in the school varies:

> There are some principals who are quite aware of what they are doing and others who need further training in leadership and management. There are some who have made a good diagnosis of their school and they can tell you exactly how the schools are functioning. Some of their observations coincide with the inspection findings (SEO).

The female inspector believed, 'There needs to be instructional leadership'. This is how Mrs Lauriston of MP sees her role as a principal. Similarly, in the Jamaican context the inspector there pointed out that principals there received training in instructional leadership.

6.8.4. Perspectives on Enacting SI

The entire group of local *respected others* noted the limited capacity of the SIS Unit. The female inspector said, 'the SIS Unit is limited. There are only four of us. There needs to be proper follow-up by the unit. This cannot be done because of the

limited staff'. Some of the others also noted the issue of follow-up in relation to human resource capacity of the Unit. The inspectors' career experience was highlighted, 'the Unit needs more personnel, with the requisite experience. Many outsiders grumble at the composition of the personnel – the lack of professional authority to judge or advise them' (MoE). Mrs Lauriston also shared this view earlier. The respected other principal asserted, 'some of the assessors lacked basic knowledge of the laws (regulations) that govern schools'. This is a serious claim on the quality of the some of the inspectors.

Besides the human resource capacity, the SEO raised the issue of financing the inspection process:

> Funding is an issue because the school inspection team has not been able to carry out inspection in the Grenadines due to lack of funding. And so in a way it restricts the geographical area that could be covered if there is no funding.

Finance is also a factor for SI in Jamaica.

The respected others made a number of suggestions for how SI may be enacted. The female inspector suggested a change in current nomenclature by replacing 'inspection' with 'improvement'. To her inspection carries negative connotations. She also suggested, 'better organisation of the unit, that is, the curriculum unit where the SIS Unit is located' so the staff could assist with school inspection. The SEO also gave his perspective on the enacting SI in SVG:

> A follow up survey with the schools to ask them what are their feelings about school inspections, what are their views about school inspection?; What can be done to improve the process, what can be done to make the process clearer? Right now there is no way of us knowing this unless it is through anecdote. I think if we do this in a more focused and scientific way of knowing precisely how people feel about SI.

Additionally he suggested, 'there should be two separate inspection teams one for secondary and one for primary schools'. The principal shared his view as well:

> There needs to be more awareness of the benefits of school inspection… It needs to be made more school friendly and not be seen as police man doing investigation on something.

For the DTE lecturer, 'it seems necessary that there be a structure in place which can provide schools with the capacity to implement the recommendations as identified by the team. The MoE personnel suggests that there should be a team for inspection and one for dealing with recommendations, 'you cannot prescribe and dispense. The doctor prescribes and the pharmacist dispenses' he figuratively asserts.

6.9. Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to present the findings from the interviews, documents, and observations to respond to the four research questions the study investigated. Regarding research question one, participants generally experienced the SI process as accountability and school improvement. They feel SI could lead to school improvement. However, some expressed dissatisfaction regarding the manner of its implementation. Some participants relate experiences and perceptions that indicate negative unintended consequences of SI. There are divergent perspectives on the meaning of SSE.

In terms of research question two teaching in the schools is primarily traditional (teacher-centred) and learning is not meeting national standards in three of them. Leadership and management is ineffective in most of the schools. They are all operating in challenging circumstances, but CP is performing above national standards.

In relation to research question three, the schools implemented the relatively simple recommendations. There were challenges to implementing the recommendations that required change in attitude of principals and teachers and school culture.

Regarding research question four, the study shows that in enacting SI in primary schools in SVG there was easy access to the inspectors, although the capacity of the SIS Unit is limited. Participants advised that there be an increase in the number of days for inspection and in the regularity of visits. Further it was felt that teachers and principals be a more integral part of the inspection process. Another suggestion supports this where they argue for verbal feedback to all teachers after inspection.

In terms of the capacity of the team, it was believed that retired teachers/principals be trained to do inspections. This increase in staff might fulfil another suggestion which was that more and better-qualified staff be made available for the SIS Unit. Suggestions also came from the respected others.

In chapter seven, I will discuss and synthesise the findings presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION

7.1. Introduction

This chapter synthesises the findings from chapter six through a discussion which brings together the literature review in chapter three and relevant aspects of the preceding chapters. The intention is to arrive at a critical understanding of the four research questions of the study and provide an in-depth account of the case under study. It begins with a synthesis of the experiences of SI.

7.2. Experiences of SI

The study's main findings show that the inspectors generally conformed to the guidelines in the handbook for SI in SVG concerning pre-inspection activities. However, they did not follow this in every respect. One principal voiced his concern to the SEO about not receiving sufficient notice of his school's inspection in keeping with the inspection guidelines. In Ehren and Visscher (2006) theory of SI characteristics, the inspectors' communication style is critical of SI resulting in school improvement. The communication style, Ehren and Visscher stress, is one that must build on reciprocity between the inspectors and the school. In building that reciprocity, the principal did not feel that he had to accept the inspectors' deviation from policy without having his voice heard about it. From a postcolonial perspective, principals and teachers must build a reciprocal relationship with inspectors in what is now the implementation stage of SI. This is critical as they were shunted to the periphery of the SI discourse in the initiation phase. It is important that this be done to develop trust in the SI process of SVG. Interactions and feedback from principals and teachers about issues and concerns regarding the SI process will enable inspectors to gain knowledge that may help to enhance the SI process.

In another deviation from the inspection guidelines, the inspectors did not allow the schools to distribute and collect the data from the SIS Unit's parent and student questionnaires prior to the preliminary visit. They did these themselves during the preliminary visit. In my view, letting schools complete some aspects of the SI process can build their confidence in the process of reciprocity and trust (Ehren &

Visscher, 2006). In addition, I see it fitting the postcolonial perspective of ensuring that the process includes, 'practices *of* and *for* social justice' (Bristol, 2012, p.21) by ensuring inclusiveness in the inspection process. Moreover, as pointed out by Dean (1995) head teachers and teachers in their study of English schools responded positively to being part of the preparation for inspection. The SI process in SVG is top-down in nature, and as Ehren and Visscher note, inspectors have to be mindful of the power relations in the inspection process. Inspectors already have the advantage in the inspection process, and they should avoid further marginalising principals and teachers in the conduct of this process. I believe if the schools gather the data themselves from the parent and student questionnaires it would help to build a culture of school self-evaluation (SSE) which is lacking in three of the schools.

The findings also indicate that the preliminary visit of the inspectors to the schools did not have any noted adverse effects on teachers, principals, students, and the school in general. One of the purposes of the preliminary visit in the SI model of SVG is to provide information to schools on what SI entails. In the literature, SI affects teachers from the time they receive notification of an inspection (Brimblecombe et al., 1995). In SVG, teachers not being au fait with the SI process and not being informed of the preliminary visit may have contributed to the lack of an adverse impact of SI during that visit. It may also be because it was not the real inspection.

Ehren and Visscher (2006) theorise that one of the features of SI should be to engender acceptance as a way of achieving its intended effects. The intended effects are improving student performance and preventing unintended responses. In the literature, teachers responded well to receiving information about the SI process (Dean, 1995). The inspectors may have also used their power relations well (Ehren and Visscher, 2006) in their communication style with the principals and teacher during the preliminary visit. This may have averted any adverse effects of this aspect. One way in this might have been done is through the use of styles of communication from the right of Ehren and Visscher's eight style communication circle: the leading style – in which clear explanations were given, the helping/friendly style – which includes being reasonable and caring, and the

understanding style – being prepared to explain again. These styles help to foster positive relationships between inspectors and schools and avoid negative unintended responses of SI.

Feedback is an important aspect of the feature of SI (Ehren & Visscher, 2006). All of the principals and teachers, except for one teacher, said they received feedback after lesson observations. During SI, giving oral feedback after lessons observations was useful to teachers' professional development in a Dutch study (Dobbelaer et al., 2013). This was also the case in other study contexts. In fact, it is felt that feedback should be a mandatory aspect of SI (Chapman, 2001). However, Ehren (2013) noted, in a comprehensive study of SI in six European countries, that feedback was not generally given after observing lessons during SI, except for one country. I am of the view that feedback should be mandatory in SI in SVG, as this will help to give direction to schools in achieving the intended goal of school improvement. In Ehren and Visscher's (2006) theory, feedback is often a one-sided affair in favour of the inspectors. However, if the *together* styles of communication from the right of Ehren and Visscher's proposed eight aspects of the communication is used reciprocity and trust between inspectors and inspected can be achieved by giving feedback on lessons during SI. However, as I noted in the literature review, the manner in which inspectors give the feedback is more likely to result in acceptance than the quantity and timing of the feedback.

As mentioned in the findings chapter JP received no oral feedback upon completion of the inspection. One of the features of SI that Ehren and Visscher (2006) refer to is the nature of feedback. They suggest that the way inspectors communicate in the inspection process is critical. Ehren and Visscher speak of the power dimension in communication and suggest that inspectors not disguise their authority and declare up front who has the last word in the inspection process. It was, however, the opposite at JP instead of the inspectors having the last word, the principal did. Given his personality, they were hesitant to do the oral feedback on the last day for fear of how he would react to the negative findings. The literature is replete with examples of feedback being integral to SI leading to improvement (Schildkamp & Visscher, 2010). However, it is also found, 'there is endless scope for confrontation if the feedback is not handled with tact and diplomacy' (Bennett

& Kavanagh, 1996, p.20) following an inspection. Inspectors, while having to be mindful of the need for social justice to be apparent in the contemporary context of SI in SVG, must ensure that they do not cower to principals with strong personalities who can sway the process to the suit them.

My findings indicate that there were negative experiences during the SI process. This concurs with the literature. Significantly, while all of the principals in the four main schools used in the study said there were no negative consequences of SI on teachers, the teachers felt the opposite way. In research by Jeffrey and Woods (1996) and Perryman (2006), teachers perceived SI as surveillance of teachers, and it resulted in negative unintended consequences on them. Brimblecombe (1995) speaks of the psychological effects of SI on teachers. SI results in window dressing de Wolf and Janssens (2007) and gaming Chapman (2001). Ehren and Visscher (2006) include (side-) effects (negative unintended consequences) as critical elements in their theory of SI. Some of the unintended consequences they highlight are similar to some cited above. They identify ways to prevent (side-) effects if SI is to bring about school improvement like using performance indicators in a flexible way. However, one Ofsted study revealed that 'teachers use stress as an excuse for poor performance' (Anonymous, 2012).

Negative experiences of SI were also part of colonial SI (London, 2004). In a recent study of SI, Milewski (2012) pointed out that the experiences of fear and anxiety among other negative consequences of SI were present among teachers in Ontario, Canada during the 1930s. It is important that SIS Unit of SVG find ways to mitigate these negative side effects of SI. A postcolonial education system must have social justice at its core to ensure new education policies, like SI, are collaborative and do not produce unintended negative consequences. It is critical that as the process of SI becomes the norm in primary schools in SVG that efforts be made to build a system that makes teachers and principals feel a sense of community and ownership. In this way, it might be possible to eliminate the negative effects of the SI process.

The principals in the four schools in my study reported no negative side effects of SI, as I pointed out in the findings. Only the respected other principal acknowledged negative effects on him. The lack of negative unintended

consequences of SI on at least two of the principals may have been because of their participation in the simulated SI exercises conducted by the consultants who developed the SVG school inspection model. Thus, they had experience of what it was like to be in the role of an inspector. It may also be related to the level of experiences of the inspectors as all but the lead inspector, had equal or less experience than the principals. Academic qualifications may also account for this, as all of the principal have either bachelor or master's degrees in educational management because of the ER. In fact, one principal felt that one of the persons on the team was not experienced enough to be an inspector. It was the perception of one of the respected others that, a number of educators feel this way about some of the inspectors. However, the literature indicates that SI does have negative effects on principals (Fergusson et al., 1999; Ouston & Davies, 1998; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996). In order to prevent negative side effects of SI, Ehren and Visscher (2006) advocate an inclusive process that involves principals, teachers and inspectors. In the next section I continue to discuss research question one by looking at the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding SI.

7.3. Perceptions of SI

The findings indicate that all of the participants believe that SI has the potential to contribute to school improvement in primary schools in SVG. These positions correspond with research which claim school inspection leads to school improvement (Dedering & Sabine, 2011; Ehren & Visscher, 2008). In most cases the participants see SI as improvement in student performance which they implicitly link to teaching and learning, as it is perceived in the literature (Sun et al., 2007). One principal saw SI leading to school improvement through 'improving school effectiveness'. School effectiveness, however, is a contested notion (Scheerens, 2000), as pointed out in the literature review. Some believe that effectiveness may be instituted by governments through SI (Botha, 2010). Furthermore, criticisms in the literature about school effectiveness claim it is often limited to just a focus on student performance on tests (Botha, 2010; Gorard, 2010). Limiting school effectiveness to just test scores, in my view, seems counterproductive in the complex business of education. One principal sees SI as limited to just the four walls of school and not by what is done otherwise outside of

it like sports day and walks with children in their natural environment. His view hints at those non-academic aspects of the school that tests do not capture. SI does not necessarily capture these, as it uses quantitative measures, primarily tests, to gauge school performance. These non-academic features, I believe, should have just as important a say in the SI process of SVG as determinants of school improvement. It can capture a deeper context of schools, their culture, and history.

In the findings I highlighted there was a major difference among participants of what SSE means prior to an inspection. I extend Ehren and Visscher's theory of communication styles to the initiation and implementation phases of SI. Evidently, in the communication process by the inspectors, the majority of principals and teachers did not fully understand what SSE meant in terms of the documents that had to be completed before the preliminary inspection process began. This variation in perceptions of what SSE means is not unusual since in many European countries no formal definition of SSE exists (Janssens & van Amelsvoort, 2008). The principals' perceptions of SSE seem to be more in line with its definitions as, 'a systematic process, which includes cyclic activities such as goal-setting, planning, evaluation and defines new improvement measures' (Janssens & van Amelsvoort, 2008, p.16). This is also one of the definitions that the SIS Unit has of SSE.

However, while principals seem to articulate an understanding of SSE as indicated by Janssens and van Amelsvoort (2008) they, except for one of them, do not engage in SSE in a formal way. In the Irish context, O'Brien et al (2015) found that SSE is an indispensable component of SI. The literature reveals SSE as having an accountability and school improvement purpose (Schildkamp et al., 2012). I believe that SSE must play a central role in SI, if the latter is to be successful in SVG. However, that role must extend beyond the mere compliance with completing documents supplied by the SIS Unit; it should get to the heart of SSE as I discussed in the literature review. It must take place in a formal way and become part of the culture of all primary schools. Moreover, it is important to link SSE to social justice (Nevo, 2002; Simons, 2002) and aspirations that are part of a postcolonial education agenda for SVG.

Findings indicate that one of the principals did not see the recommendations in the inspection report being useful. The school was already doing most of the things recommended, was aware of its strengths and weaknesses, and had a satisfactory inspection report. Ehren and Visscher (2006) believe that schools' response to SI recommendations, and to inspection as a whole, is a factor that is critical to change and improvement. They assert that schools' response to the findings relate to how they feel about the findings. They advocate that recommendations match schools' culture and practices. The recommendations that the principal found, 'useless' already matched its existing culture and practices. In this case, no change will take place in that institution. Thus, schools that are performing well must feel that the recommendations they get from the SIS Unit should take them beyond their current positions. In the literature, Northern Ireland is developing a polycentric model of inspection to move schools stuck at good, after inspection, to better (O Hara et al., 2015). The belief is, where schools use feedback to do their development plans that this results in school improvement (Schildkamp & Visscher, 2010). It means therefore that the SIS Unit must get schools to engage in meaningful development planning. The SIS Unit must also understand that schools that are performing at a satisfactory level cannot be asked to do the same things that they are already doing well. It must challenge them in the recommendations to surpass their current performance.

While all of the participants were in favour of the implementation of SI in primary schools in SVG, some expressed concern with the top-down manner of its implementation. It was felt that 'inspection was just dropped on our laps' and 'more things needed to be put in place'. All of these responses refer to one aspect of the research problem in chapter one. Given that none of the schools had a personal copy of the SI handbook supports the principals' point of things not being in place for the implementation of SI in SVG primary schools. While this stage has passed, it sends an important message to local policymakers that principals and teachers feel marginalised when they are not meaningfully engaged in the initiation and implementation phases of education reform in SVG. Therefore, it is important that as education in SVG continues to be impacted by the ubiquitous globalisation in education, that the local element and voice must be given prominence if there is to be greater acceptance of policy implementation. Crossley (2010), as well as

others, articulates this view. This is critical in a postcolonial education space that continues to bear the scars and legacies of our encounter with colonialism. Inclusion of local educators in decision making that affects their lives and careers must be one of the hallmarks of true independence and freedom from the colonial traps that continue to ensnare them.

One participant's perception is that follow-up unannounced inspections may be a factor that could contribute to school improvement. Of the four schools in the study, only one was re-inspected, but the inspectors found no discernible change there since the previous inspection. The literature supports the position that support and follow-up by inspectors are critical to school inspection leading to school improvement (Ehren et al., 2013; OECD, 2013). Ehren and Visscher (2006) advocate that for improvement to occur inspectors need to change their approach so that it works in tandem with, 'a school's innovation capacity, and to a school's external impulses' (p.65). From the findings, one can deduce that the re-inspected school had a low innovation capacity and, therefore, could not achieve improvement on its own. This is where the external impulses, like the SI Unit, come in to help it to achieve improvement. It is theorised that only about ten per cent of schools can improve without the assistance of an external impulse like SI (Ehren and Visscher, 2006). If the SIS Unit cannot assist schools with their improvement because it lacks the human resource capacity, then one may assume that improvement will not occur in schools in SVG. Increased capacity at the SIS Unit to assist schools with their improvement planning must first take place before school improvement can happen.

The findings indicate that the four schools are operating in challenging circumstances as the majority of their students come from low socio-economic backgrounds. Mujis et al (2004) asserted that there is a link between low socio-economic status and student achievement. However, one of the schools, CP, does not fit this norm. The performance of CP indicates that schools facing challenging circumstances can still provide a good quality of education to students in SVG. However, Sammons (2008) acknowledges that school improvement is a difficult proposition in schools facing difficult and challenging circumstances (Sammons, 2008). While external assistance in the form of inspection may bring about

improvement those, 'internal-to-the school' tend to result in greater improvement (Leithwood et al., 2006). This view of Leithwood is pointing towards the need for the use of SSE alongside SI.

7.4. Teaching and Learning

In this section, I discuss the findings to research question two, which relate to teaching and learning. The results of the research highlight that teaching in primary schools in SVG is largely teacher-centred (traditional). The prevalence of traditional methods of teaching is not surprising in the context of the historical development of primary education in SVG. In chapter two, I pointed out only a handful of teachers went to one of the larger British West Indian islands for training. For over one hundred years, the British did not establish any proper teaching training institution in SVG. They set up pupil teacher centres to train the "better" students from the upper classes of the primary schools to become teachers. The abolition of these centres came after SVG became independent. It has been only fifty-one years since the establishment of a proper institution for the training of teachers in SVG. Therefore, the teacher-centred method of teaching was the only option to which an untrained teacher could resort.

However it is viewed as a method in which, 'teachers are not engaging the children…we are still filling the empty vessels from the fountain of knowledge' (Mr Kranston, Principal CMP). This views echo that of Freire (1996) who speaks of the banking concept of education in which teachers fill students who are metaphoric vessels with knowledge. O'Grady et al (2014) found that although teachers are exposed to student-centred approaches to teaching, many still resorted to the traditional methods, which suit the context of the accountability that is driven by teaching to the test. I believe that a student-centred approach to teaching will bring about meaningful learning in primary schools in SVG. It is more likely to bring about the school improvement that the SIS Units hopes school inspection will achieve. However, this approach to teaching has to fight against the poltergeist of traditional methods of teaching that have been entrenched in our education since the nineteenth century.

There is evidence to show that primary schools in SVG have between 75 and 95 per cent trained teachers (that is, with a minimum of a two year teacher certificate). Yet learning is unsatisfactory in all of the schools except at CP. In each of the four schools in the study, there are teachers who possess university degrees. In the context of the ER where all students go on to secondary school this issue is concerning. The low performance of students runs contrary to the belief by many education stakeholders in SVG and donor agencies who have spent huge sums on teacher training only to see minimal returns. In the Pakistani context , a former British colony, it was found that certification and training had no effect on student performance on tests (Aslam & Kingdom, 2011) In other words, these aspects do not necessarily bring about the level of school improvement that policymakers intend. The significant sums of money spent on teacher training and the low returns by way of student achievement (Ministry of Education, 2012; Gonsalves, 2010), is part of the reason for the introduction of SI in primary schools in SVG.

The findings also highlight that the use of corporal punishment is pervasive in SVG's primary schools. I consider it part of our traditional teaching where some see it as a means of "pedagogy" and discipline (James, 2013). The continued use of corporal punishment in schools may be a lingering effect of our historical experiences and encounter with slavery and colonialism. It is so entrenched that the Education Act 2006, currently permits the use of corporal punishment. The brutality of slavery is often remembered by the barbaric use of the whipping slaves received at the hands of their white masters. Davis et al., (2004) point out that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, corporal punishment was in common use in European homes and schools. Anderson and Payne (1994) in a study conducted in Barbados found that three quarters of Barbadian schools approved of the use of corporal punishment. The continued use of corporal punishment in SVG's primary schools relates to our history and development of primary education that I outlined in chapter two. I believe that corporal punishment ought to be removed from the Education Act of SVG. To have included it in 2006 is part of the remaining negative influence of colonialism on our psyche. SI will never achieve true school improvement unless we banish corporal punishment from our primary schools. This is so because it conditions the mind to fear those in authority.

7.5. Leadership and Management

Here, I will continue to discuss research question two in relation to leadership and management. Except for CP, the findings indicate that leadership and management is ineffective in the three other primary schools. The hope of the ER was that advancing the qualifications of principals in educational management would lead to more effective leadership and management in primary schools. The consequence of this would have been improved student performance, as I noted in the research problem in chapter one. However, it is evident from the findings that it takes more than having a university degree in leadership and management to be an effective school leader. I believe that there is a historical relationship between principal leadership in primary schools in SVG and principal effectiveness. Historically the principal, who up until recently was called the head teacher, was seen more as a manager. His/her role was to ensure that teachers were accountable to regulations, disciplining students, preparing documents, among other administrative managerial roles. Moreover, the current principals' experience of leadership is that of the colonial head teacher. The literature supports these views (Miller, 2012; Beckford & Lekule, 2012; Borden, 2002). While principals in primary schools in SVG would have encountered theories of management in their training, the inherited culture of the head teacher continues to dominate the management of primary schools. Therefore, a change in the style and philosophy of leadership (Miller, 2012; Beckford & Lekule, 2012) must take place if there is to be any school improvement coming out of SI.

In the literature, it is the view that school leaders need to have a firm grounding in theory in order to lead change (Evans et al., 2012). One of the theories of leadership is instructional leadership. The seminars the MoE held to orient principals on the eve of the establishment of the SIS Unit occurred under the theme of instructional leadership. This style of leadership is oriented towards accountability and is a top-down style of leadership. It is, therefore, unsurprising that it is the style of leadership advocated by the MoE in the new culture of SI in primary schools in SVG. This fits the inherited colonial structure of education and education policy implementation. Nevertheless, instructional leadership is a contested term (Castello, 2015). Its original conception saw the principal as having

sole responsibility for leadership (Robinson et al., 2008). Shatzer et al., (2014) believe transformational leadership may solve the deficiencies of instructional leadership. Transformational leadership is built on the philosophy of a bottom-up theory (Hallinger, 2003). In the literature review, I discussed the view of Beckford and Lekule (2012) who proposed distributed leadership as an appropriate theory for effective leadership in Caribbean schools. Additionally, I pointed out that Miller (2013) also believes in a partnership (distributed leadership) approach to leadership in Caribbean schools to ensure effective leadership. However, I believe no singular theory of effective leadership is adequate for primary schools in SVG. It should be a combination of the best elements of the different theories to bring about change in our primary schools.

Effective leadership appears to be a critical factor in schools facing challenging circumstances in SVG. In the findings, I noted all of the schools served children from low socio-economic backgrounds. However, one of the four is making a substantial difference in the quality of education its students receive. The principal gives teachers responsibilities and holds them accountable. She is managing her school in line with ideas suggested in the literature by Fullan (2007) and others quoted earlier. Even though she speaks of instructional leadership, the way she leads the school shows she is inadvertently using ideas from the other theories of leadership like distributed leadership and transformational leadership. Ehren and Visscher (2006) in their theory of school inspection effects believe that the school features, which evidently include effective principal leadership, are critical in SI bringing about school improvement.

7.6. Implementation of SI Recommendations

This section synthesises the findings in relation to research question three regarding the implementation of the SI recommendations and the challenges to doing so. My research reveals schools implemented the straightforward inspection recommendations. However, these changes were not likely to result in any substantial difference to the culture of primary schools in SVG. The literature asserts that school improvement should concentrate on changing the culture and not the structure of the school (Harris, 2005). Culture can be an impediment as

well as a facilitator of change in organisations (Kowalski, 2003). Fullan (2007, p.91) believes, 'simple changes may be easier to carry out, but they may not make much of a difference'. Evidently, the changes implemented since SI are not going to make a substantial difference to student achievement. They are merely superficial and do not get to the heart of the issues to be addressed which are the use of predominantly traditional methods of teaching and ineffective leadership. This is further compounded by little planning and preparation by teachers for teaching. I must admit, though, that the study took place only about seven months after inspection in three of the schools. It may require a longer period to observe discernible and profound changes in teaching and learning as well as leadership and management.

My findings also indicate that teachers' resistance to change and a lack of collaboration among staff are major impediments to implementing the SI recommendations in the schools. School inspection was a sudden change for principals and teachers and sudden change brings resistance and stress while gradual change tends to be simpler (Nahavandi, 2009). Ehren and Visscher (2006) consider feedback, such as the recommendations for implementation, as a critical cog in SI achieving improvement. They suggest that SI reports be unambiguous so that schools can follow them to implement the suggestions. Except for one school that found the suggestions not useful, the others agreed with them. Ehren and Visscher (2006) in their theory speak to school features, that is, those factors in and around the school that are integral to SI recommendations bringing about school improvement.

One of those factors is the school's capacity to implement changes. For them schools that are learning organisations have a greater capacity for bringing about change than those that are not. Ehren and Visscher (2008) emphasise that teachers' attitude is a key element in change. Fullan (2007) and others point to this being the case. A collaborative approach is also a critical factor in achieving change (Mc Crone et al., 2009). In all but one of the schools, there was no evidence of a community of learners, which is an element of a collaborative approach to change. Ehren et al (2005, p.71) add schools sometimes do not, 'perform all the activities that are necessary to improve after or in relation to inspection'. Primary schools in

SVG must perform all of the activities for change for SI to achieve school improvement. This is critical if a dire perspective that most efforts at change fail or tend to make things worse is to be avoided (Glickman et al., 2010).

Of the four schools, only one received a follow-up unannounced visit. The SIS Unit does not have the capacity to assist schools to implement the recommendations as the findings reveal. Morrison (2009) finds that limited human resource capacity is a major issue affecting the operation of SI in SSTs. The improvement that SI seeks for schools in SVG will not happen because the external impulse, which is the SIS Unit, does not have the capacity to help schools lead change following SI. Research on school inspection in Africa finds the absence of structured follow-up, 'is frustrating to teachers, and discredits the supervision system' (De Grauwe, 2009, p.711). This may eventually be the case in SVG if there is no increase in the human resources capacity of the SI Unit to help schools with implementing their recommendations.

Apart from the limited number of staff, the findings show that there is an issue with the ability and experience of the current staff, outside of the SEO (lead inspector) to lead change. The size of SSTs, states Morrison (2009), makes it a challenge for them to find individuals who have the appropriate qualifications to work in the inspectorate. The issue of inspectors' inexperience and lack of training is not only an issue in SSTs, but is also a concern in Nigeria (Ochuba, 2009), as well as in the Sindh province of Pakistan (Jaffer, 2010). However, in SVG there are experienced educators in schools who could be trained in SI. This will help to increase the level of confidence that school leaders and teachers require from the staff of the SIS Unit. Moreover, they will be able to assist schools with the implementation of the inspection recommendations. An immature school inspection system requires experience in years of teaching and seniority, which are important to educators in postcolonial contexts (Bristol, 2012). These contextual issues must be understood by policymakers in SVG and be given due consideration as SI moves into the institutionalisation phase.

7.7. Enacting School Inspection

This section of my discussion will respond to the fourth research question regarding participants' perceptions of the enactment of SI in primary schools in SVG. The findings indicate that financing the operation of the SIS Unit is a challenge. St. Vincent and the Grenadines, though small, is a multi-island developing country, with schools in five Grenadine islands. Travel to these islands is by either boat or plane. In addition to financing travelling, other costs have to be factored in, as inspectors would have to remain on the islands for the duration of the inspection period. Morrison (2009, p.753) believes, 'the extent of the inspection system depends, in part, on cost and, thereby, the financial resources of the state or territory'. Morrison cites the Cayman Island as a SST that is high on the economic ladder hence it could support a comprehensive school inspectorate resembling Ofsted from which it was modelled. However, later evidence shows that the inspectorate in the Cayman Islands was disbanded for a while as a consequence of financial and political related factors (Whittaker, 2014). However, the cost of financing school inspection is not only an issue in SSTs. In the Nigerian context the, 'inadequacy of funds has been a serious constraint to school inspection' (Ochuba, 2009, p.737). Studying school inspection in Western Europe, Australasia, Africa and North America Mc Nab (2004) finds that it is an inherently expensive exercise to conduct. If finance is an issue for school inspection in these parts of the world which have far larger and more developed economies than SVG, then it can be concluded that it will be an expensive exercise in a country of just over one hundred thousand people. The development of a strong culture of SSE in schools might help to reduce cost, as schools will undertake internal inspection with SI being used in cases of consistently underperforming schools.

During the research, participants expressed their views as to how SI should be enacted in primary schools in SVG. It seems not having been given the opportunity to make suggestions about the process prior to its implementation, principals and teachers welcomed the opportunity of this study to do so. Many of the participants felt that the time-frame of one week, or less in some cases, was inadequate for conducting an inspection. The views about not being able to capture the essence of a school in one week suggest that they understand the complexity of schools as

organisations. A school is a complex entity etched in a specific social and cultural context, with a number of connecting parts that impinge on each other (Mc Nab, 2004). Regarding the time frame of the inspection being insufficient, research on inspectorates in eighteen European countries by van Bruggen (2010) found most inspectors spent three or four days in schools. This is in line with the average number of days spent in the schools in my study. Ehren and Visscher (2006) posit that school complaining about not being able to capture the essence of a school in one week or it was not their typical week is an unintended response from schools to SI.

Participants suggested how inspectors could increase the period spent in schools. One principal suggests, 'they could space it out over a three week period, three days this week, two days next week or something like that'. Similar suggestions come from two other principals. These similar points of view illustrate principals believe that inspectors would capture a more authentic school setting by spending a longer period in the schools. However, spending a longer period in schools doing inspection may be a challenge when the small size of the inspectorate is considered. It is true that other qualified individuals like MoE personnel and lecturers from the Division of Teacher Education are co-opted to assist with the inspections; but more often than not, the four inspectors do the bulk of the inspections. According to van Bruggen (2010), all of the eighteen inspectorates he researched in Europe believe it is not possible to do the deep and broad inspections that were characteristic of Ofsted inspections in the early nineties. Therefore, the suggestions by the principals for inspectors to spend more time in schools may not be plausible when all of the factors outlined here are considered.

Further to this, a useful suggestion by one teacher is to; 'hire more retired persons to assist after you have trained them and pay them for that…' is a plausible method of assisting with the limited capacity of the SIS Unit. Another teacher believes, 'the management of the schools itself could help in the inspection process, so that we can get regular feedback'. An additional viewpoint is, 'more teachers being a part of this whole process… they should also have principals be part of the school inspection'. In the latest Ofsted handbook consulted for this research head teachers assist with the observation of lessons and senior staff may be included after

consultation with the principal (Ofsted, 2015). In addition, Baxter (2013) in her research on the Ofsted (2012) framework speaks of the involvement of principals in the actual inspection process that hitherto was not the case. However, Baxter is of the belief that while principals and teachers may accrue professional benefits from engaging in the inspection process there may also be negative unintended consequences for them. Nevertheless, I believe collaboration using principals and teachers is an option that would assist in reducing the demands placed on the small SIS Unit staff. Moreover, collaboration with school staff will be a means of engendering a democratic approach to school SI. This approach fits the perspective of social justice in education within the postcolonial setting of SVG.

Most participants are of the perception that the entire staff of the schools should be a part of the oral feedback after the inspection. One can infer from this that inspectors will give legitimacy to the findings if they present them to the entire staff rather than the principals doing it. I noted in the findings that the SEO was called at the behest of his friend, a principal of one of the schools, to speak to the teachers sometime after the inspection was completed. The entire staff was spoken to at another school. Giving feedback to all teachers in two of the schools and not doing this in the other two can create a sense of bias in a small state where this is not difficult to learn. It does not square with the view of social justice and does not bode well for the image of the fledgling SI Unit. However, in the case of Ofsted, it is not mandatory to give oral feedback to all teaching staff and the literature from other jurisdictions does not suggest that this is the case. I believe all teachers in SVG should get feedback after an inspection. The findings suggest it is possible, seemingly because of the small size of the country.

Three participants suggested that there to be a separation of the dual remit of the SIS Unit doing inspection and assisting schools with implementing its recommendations. In the European study by van Bruggen (2010), thirteen of the eighteen inspectorates researched did not advise teachers and schools. However, they did do some form of informal advising. School inspectorates in large countries tend to separate the inspection from that of development/advice (Morrison, 2009) However, Morrison goes on to suggest that in SSTs it is best to merge the functions of inspection and advice on improvement in order for them to save cost

in running their inspectorial systems. He acknowledges there may be problems in asking the same persons who made recommendations to inspect their own advice. I believe there ought to be separation in SVG using the Education Officers in the curriculum development unit who, hitherto to SI, performed infrequent and unstructured school supervision roles. This should help schools implement the recommendations of SI.

The SIS Unit does not make public the results of SI. In fact, I had to request permission from the CEO to obtain the SI reports from the SEO of the SIS Unit. One of the teachers suggested, indirectly, that this should be the case. One of the external impulses that Ehren and Visscher (2006) give in their theory for improvement is pressure to improve. Publication of SI results is one of the means of improving schools. In fifteen European countries, including Ofsted, results of school SI are published online (van Bruggen, 2010). This is also the case in Jamaica. Publishing results online is part of "naming and shaming" and relates to the concept of support and pressure in school inspection. In SSTs where personal and professional relationships are closely linked, publishing inspection results may result in negative unintended consequences. The suggestion is for SI result to happen in private (Morrison, 2009). In SVG, SI results are not public documents. However, in a small country, and in the age of technology, it would not be difficult to know the contents of the report on a school with negative inspection results. In fact, the performance of these schools is already in the public domain as the results of primary school exams, CPEA, are published in the newspaper and in other education publications. Not publishing the inspection report may not be in keeping with the whole concept of democracy and social justice. However, it is something that must be considered carefully, sensitively and in broad-based consultation, as it can result in unintended negative consequences for schools.

7.8. Conclusion

In this chapter, I discussed the findings from chapter six in relation to the literature reviewed in chapter three as well as other chapters. Principals and teachers experienced and perceived SI school improvement and accountability, as is the case in the literature reviewed in chapter three. In conducting the process, some

inspectors made some modifications to the process. There were negative unintended consequences of the SI for teachers, in the main, as the literature and Ehren and Visscher's (2006) framework attest. All of the principals and teachers agreed with the introduction of SI in SVG and by extension in primary schools. They are unanimous in their perceptions that it could lead to school improvement.

The traditional mode of teacher-centred teaching was dominant in all of the schools. It is a lasting legacy of the history and development of primary education in SVG, which was the focus of chapter two of this study. Leadership and management is ineffective in three of them. The literature points to a history of leadership and management of Caribbean schools not being structured and formal (Beckford & Lekule, 2012). It is characteristic of the inherited hierarchical colonial structure of education.

In implementing the SI recommendations, some of the easy to implement changes were put into effect. However, this does not have any lasting effects on schools (Fullan, 2007). There are impediments, internal and external to the schools, in the implementation of the recommendations.

The enactment of SI in SVG is expensive in light of the multi-island nature of SVG and its SST status. According to Brock and Crossley (2013) providing education in archipelago states presents specific difficulties. There is also the issue of limited human resource capacity of the SIS Unit. Participants proposed a number of meaningful suggestions for enacting SI in SVG.

In chapter eight, the final chapter, I conclude the research and propose recommendations that may improve SI in SVG.

CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1. Introduction

In this study, my aim was to gain an in-depth understanding of SI in primary schools in SVG. I used the approach of a case study to achieve this aim by interrogating the experiences and perceptions of four principals and seven teachers. I also sought out the experiences and perceptions of eleven respected others. Together they helped me construct knowledge on SI. The study also focused on teaching, learning, and leadership and management to show the link between them and SI achieving school improvement. I also wanted to understand the extent to which schools implemented the inspection recommendations and the challenges they experienced in doing so. Finally, I wanted to contribute to a reconceptualization of SI in primary schools in SVG from the perspectives and lived experiences of principals and teachers.

I used a case study approach because I wanted to optimise understanding of the case (Stake, 2003) of SI in the study context. To do this, I used documents and observations as means to support the experiences and perceptions expressed by my participants. This also supported the other aspects of my research outlined in the paragraph above. I wanted to argue that experiences and perceptions of principals and teachers are critical to an in-depth understanding of SI as a new phenomenon in primary schools in SVG.

In this chapter, I begin with the contribution of the study followed by a summation of the findings of the four research questions. I then look at the strengths and limitations of the study. I follow this with further research possibilities on the topic of SI. Then I explore the implications of my findings. Finally, I reflect on the research process as I experienced it and end with a final word.

8.2. Contributions of the Study

This study is the first empirical study of SI in SVG whether in its contemporary or colonial form. To begin, it has built my own knowledge and expertise on the issues of SI in SVG thereby allowing me to contribute to the development and

advancement of SI in my country. Second, it will provide the staff of the SIS Unit and other education policymakers in SVG with their first set of empirical knowledge of SI. This is critical to the SIS Unit's assessment of whether or not SI is achieving or is likely to achieve its remit of school improvement. Additionally, it is important to understanding whether or not SI is a useful means of accountability for the quality of education provided by primary schools in SVG.

The study expects to extend existing knowledge of SI in the local and international context. To do this, I will make it available to the local libraries for use by educators and researchers. It will also be uploaded to the University's e-thesis repository making it accessible to an international audience. Since the formulation of education policy in the OECS takes place on a sub-regional level with an international philosophical underpinning, I foresee more OECS countries moving to establishment of SI Units as SVG. In this regard, my study should be a source of relatability for these countries that have similar colonial historical developments of education as SVG. The study is also significant to the field of comparative education with specific reference to SI in SSTs.

SI in its current configuration, as noted before, is new to SVG. SI came about partly out of the expediency of globalisation in education, which heightened political pressure into its implementation. Principals and teachers did not have a say in how the process should operate. Therefore, I hope that policymakers will re-examine the SI process based on the findings and the suggestions that principals and teachers have made, on how to enact SI to better meet the needs of their schools. The engagement of key stakeholders, like principals and teachers, is critical to the success of SI as pointed out by Ehren and Visscher (2006). It is also useful from the perspective of postcolonial aspirations (Bristol, 2012; Lavia, 2006).

8.3. The Research Questions

Research question one:

How is SI in four primary schools in SVG experienced and perceived by principals and teachers?

The principals and teachers, in general, experienced and perceived SI as accountability, by ensuring that they adhere to laws and regulations and account for the quality of students' learning (Hooge et al., 2012). Their experiences of SI align with the processes set out in the SIS Unit's handbook for inspection of schools in SVG. SI can contribute to school improvement in primary schools in SVG, if they adopt the recommendations of the SIS Unit. The work of Hooge et al (2012) helps to support this view. All of them are in agreement with the introduction of SI in primary schools in SVG. However, they were dissatisfied with the top-down manner of its implementation. Except for one principal, everyone was in general agreement with the findings of the SI report, which indicates that there are experiences of SI contributing to negative unintended consequences like illness, fear, anxiety and window dressing on teachers. They perceived the findings to be more or less fair and accurate. Significantly, none of the principals, except for the *respected other* principal, reported any negative consequences of SI on them.

Research question two:

What do the results of the SI process indicate about teaching and learning, leadership and management in primary schools in SVG?

The results indicate that the dominant method of teaching in primary schools in SVG is teacher-centred or traditional. Only one of the schools shows a small degree of leaning towards student-centred teaching. Using the criteria of the SIS framework, the research highlights that three of the four schools have ineffective leadership and management. Importantly, all of the schools faced challenging circumstances with students coming from backgrounds of socio-economic deprivation. However, one of the schools ensures that its students are reaching and surpassing the national standards for primary schools in SVG. This school proves what is in the literature that school leadership plays a significant role in effecting change (Miller, 2013; Beckford & Lekule, 2012; Fullan, 2007).

Research question three:

To what extent have the inspection recommendations for teaching and learning, leadership and management been implemented, and what are the challenges to implementing them in the individual primary schools?

The inspectors made a number of recommendations for improvement in teaching and learning. However, only those recommendations that were easy to implement such as frequent reporting on student assessment, allowing a small amount of time for planning on Fridays, having parents' workshops, using more ICT, and checking on teachers' lesson planning and delivery, were put into effect in the schools. There were a number of challenges to implementing these recommendations. A few of the challenges revolved around the outcomes of the report; with disagreement by one principal with the recommendations for improvement. Beyond that, teachers were either resistant to change in general, or less willing to change. The latter was predominantly true in the case of older teachers with more experience being less willing to change. Also, more qualifications was also an obstacle as resistance was further heightened when teachers possessed equal or superior qualifications to some inspectors. In most schools, there was an absence of a community of learners and this proved a challenge to implementing the recommendations in most of the schools. Leadership was also a key factor in the implementation of recommendations, with effective leadership and management and limitations of SMT in carrying out leadership roles and responsibilities affecting compliance. The absence of community support in one school: because of the divisive partisan political affiliation of parents; unsystematic and informal use of SSE in most schools, and open plan classroom structure of some schools. Resistance from teachers as well as principals and internal and external factors are challenges to SI achieving school improvement (Ehren and Visscher, 2006) in primary schools in SVG.

Research question four:

How, from the perspective of principals and teachers, should SI be enacted in primary schools in SVG?

Enacting SI in SVG is a challenge relating to its SST status, its geography, and the availability of finance. The main concerns of the participants about the enactment of the inspection process were an insufficient number of days spent in schools, absence of follow-up and support, limiting the oral feedback only to the SMT, and the perceived limited experience of some inspectors. The participants suggested how SI might be enacted differently: engaging retired principals and teachers as well as current principals and teachers as inspectors, increasing the number of days for inspection, including the entire staff in the oral feedback after the inspection, separation of the inspection and improvement remits and making findings public.

8.4. Strengths and Limitations of the Study

The strength of my study lies in the methodology and methods. As a qualitative case study, it allowed me to do an in-depth study of participants' experiences and perceptions of SI. I was able, through semi-structured one-on-one interviews to obtain and analyse the views of eleven main participants and eleven *respected others* who offered confirmability of the findings from the main participants. The latter group included a retired principal, principals of a school not in the mini case study, teachers, a deputy inspector from Jamaica, the SEO (lead inspector) and another inspector. The use of documents and observations bolstered this. A clear articulation of my data collection and analysis is another strength that illustrates the thoroughness with which I attended to the ethical considerations while doing the research.

However, I encountered the limitation of a dearth of empirical literature on SI in the Caribbean. For example, there was no continuous writing on SI in SVG. I was only able to ascertain the date of its abolition after an interview with a retired principal who gave me a presumed year, which led me to search Hansard documents of parliament. Other references to SI in historical documents at the National Archives refer to the school inspector's duties and responsibilities. One journal article by London (2004) on SI in the Caribbean dealt with SI in Trinidad and Tobago during colonial times. Another journal article by Morrison (2009) researched school inspection in SSTs, but the focus was on Macau. While this article had some relatability, there were contextual and historical differences to

education in the Caribbean and SVG. The Morrison article referenced an article on contemporary SI in the Cayman Islands. I contacted him to get this article, but he could not locate it. I made multiple email contacts to the author of the article, who holds a top position in the MoE in the Cayman Islands, but the messages went unanswered. Then I contacted a university library in the Cayman Islands and UWI, but I was still unsuccessful in obtaining the article. This limitation is one of the reasons why my study is critical to SI in SVG, the Caribbean, and beyond.

Another limitation of the study relates to the topic of the research. The study has a specific focus on primary schools since they were the ones inspected at the time data gathering began. Therefore, its perspective is limited to this level of education. Moreover, it has an in-depth focus on principals and teachers and from a study that has a social justice outlook it does not consider, in an in-depth way, other views regarding SI in SVG. However, these shortcomings are areas that later research on the topic can pursue.

8.5. Further Research

Further research on SI in SVG can occur in a number of areas. First, there should be research on gaining the perspectives of a larger number of individuals: teachers, principals, school inspectors, education officers, parents and children. This will bring other perspectives, as well as further clarity, on the emerging knowledge of SI in SVG. Second, research that focuses on school improvement will also be important since the process is going on to four years, which according to Fullan (2007) is the consolidation phase in implementing a new education policy. This phase is what Ehren and Visscher (2006) consider the continuation or incorporation and institutionalisation phase of SI. Third, there should also be research on teacher professionalism and leadership and management, with reference to SI, to develop further the findings of this study on these topics. Finally, with the starting of secondary school inspections, there will be a need for research at that level. This is so because of the many differences between primary and secondary schools.

8.6. The Implications of My Findings

While the previous section looked at what further research can be done on SI in SVG, this section reflects on the implications of my study for the theoretical literature on SI, leadership and management, and teaching and learning that I reviewed in chapter three. To create further critical analysis, I will also establish a link to the literature I reviewed on postcolonial perspectives, education in small states and the transfer of global education agendas. I am doing this in order to show how my study supports, builds on as well as challenges these theoretical literatures. Additionally, I will consider other implications of the study's findings on SI in primary schools in SVG.

In chapters one and two, I explained how global education policy agendas, as articulated through EFA and the MDGs, significantly influence education policies in SSTs. In this regard, SI emerged as a pervasive education policy of accountability and school improvement in many developed and developing countries (Jones & Tymms, 2014). Therefore, SVG was no exception to the spread of the global education policy agenda of SI, which it implemented in 2012. SI in SVG's context is an 'assessment of the standards attained by students in our primary and secondary schools at key points in their education and to report on how well they perform or improve, as they progress through their school and learning life' (Ministry of Education, 2012, p.3). This perception of SI is not unlike that articulated by Wilcox who defines it as 'the process of assessing the quality and/or performance of institutions… by those (inspectors)… The common outcome is a written report of the inspector's findings' (Wilcox, 2000, pp. 15-16). The SIS Unit conducts SI in a manner similar to how Wilcox (2000) and Janssens (2007) define it from a European context. This is why Lavia (2007), as well as others, argues that former colonial powers continue to have leverage over how teachers in postcolonial spaces experience education. Often, these countries import education policies with little concern for the local context (Crossley, 2010). Therefore, it is important that there be consideration, in Crossley's (2010) view as well as this study, of local perspectives to avoid the uncritical transfer of education policies that often times do not match the context of SSTs.

At the core of SI is accountability and its link to the neo-liberal perspective of value for money that became a mantra in education in Europe from the 1980s through to the present century (Eurydice, 2007). Of course, this discourse spread to the rest of the developing world where former colonial powers invest their money to "develop" these countries' education systems. My study showed that accountability is at the core of SI in SVG as it is philosophically enshrined in the motto of the SIS Unit. More importantly, the teachers and principals in my study experienced and perceived SI as a means of holding them accountable for the quality of education they provide to students.

As part of the global transfer of the education policy agenda of SI from developed countries to SSTs, school improvement works in tandem with accountability. In chapter three, I discussed Ehren and Visscher's (2006) theory of SI and school improvement effects as one means of understanding the data findings of my study. Ehren and Visscher, as well as others, are of the perspective that SI can lead to school improvement. I found that all of the principals and teachers believed that SI has the potential to lead to school improvement in primary schools in SVG. However, some principals and teachers expressed the view that this improvement can only happen in a context where inspectors are objective. They may be inferring that SI has the potential to be subjective because of the small size of SVG, familial and other close relationships between inspectors and school staff (Morrison, 2009).

While Ehren and Visscher (2006) theorise that SI can lead to school improvement, they like others, including Case et al (2000) and Milewski (2012), acknowledge that there are side-effects of SI on schools and their staff. These side-effects include stress, absenteeism, window dressing, gaming, and fatigue among others. There were similar side-effects that I found in my study of SI in primary schools in SVG. I believe these side-effects of SI need to be 're-interrogated, re-interpreted and re-positioned discursively through practices and policies *of* and *for* social justice' (Bristol, 2012, p. 21). If this is not done, then local principals and teachers may experience side-effects similar to those, outlined in chapter two, that their predecessors experienced during colonial SI.

The consensus of many postcolonial theorists like Lavia (2006), Bristol (2012), Spivak (2003) and others is that the local or the subaltern voice, as Spivak (2003)

calls it, does not figure adequately, if at all, in postcolonial spaces where the colonial experience is re-enacted through globalisation and neo-colonialism. I found that my study of SI in primary schools in SVG gave principals and teachers a voice to challenge the top-down manner of SI's implementation. They shared with me that no discussion took place with them on the relevance of SI to the local educational setting. Therefore, some principals and teachers felt as if the SI process were putting them 'under the microscope' or like the 'police doing an investigation'. These perceptions of SI are in concert with those who see the process as a means of keeping teachers under surveillance (Perryman, 2006; Jeffrey & Woods, 1996).

My study also explored the critical role that leadership and management as well as teaching and learning play in SI. The literature points to instructional leadership theory as a dominant theory of school leadership (Hallinger, 2003). In this study, the MoE saw instructional leadership as the preferred style of leadership for SI in primary schools in SVG. The literature is also replete with views on school leaders making a substantial difference to a school's success (Miller, 2012; Fullan, 2007). My study showed that the four principals were leading schools facing challenging circumstance such as low socio-economic status and weak parental involvement. However, one of the principals led with a strong understanding of leadership theory (Evans et al., 2012). In that school, students were achieving beyond the national standards in terminal examinations. The work of Beckford and Lekule (2012) and Miller (2013) suggest that systematic leadership of schools in the Caribbean is still in the developmental stages. This study revealed that principals of primary schools in SVG were still learning to lead schools using an awareness of school leadership theories. This is so as most principals only received training in leadership and management since the Education Revolution (ER) of 2002. With respect to teaching, the literature asserts that traditional teaching is the dominant pedagogical method teachers used even when they were exposed to student-centred pedagogies (O'Grady et al, 2014; Kulinna & Cothran, 2003). Traditional teaching was also very prevalent in the four schools in my study.

The research of Fullan (2007) as well as Matthews and Smith (1995) on implementing change found that schools often implemented the easy change

recommendations such as greater supervision of teachers' work, providing curriculum documents among others. This was also the case in this study. In Fullan's (2007) view, implementation is difficult when it requires teachers to change and adapt new ways and philosophies of teaching. I found, teachers reverted to traditional teaching, which the inspection report found was dominant in the four schools. Thus, according to Kowalski (2003), teachers returned to routine behaviour once pressure to change subsided. Furthermore sudden change, such as SI was in primary schools in SVG, led to stress and resistance in employees (Nahavandi, 2009). There was, in my study, resistance from principals and teachers to implementing some of the inspection recommendations.

While my study supports the existing theoretical literature on SI (Jones & Tymms, 2014; Milewski, 2012; Lavia, 2007; Ehren & Visscher, 2006) including others, it also helps to build on it. In searching for literature on SI in SSTs, I found there was a dearth of empirical literature on the subject of SI in these SSTs. This is, therefore, one reason why my work is an indispensable addition to filling the gap that exists in the literature on SI in SSTs. I also see this study contributing to the existing work on leadership and management in primary schools within the context of SI in SSTs. Additionally, it contributes to the literature on the implementation of education policy in SSTs, and the importance of involving teachers and principals in the initiation phase of education policy consideration. By exploring how SI became an education policy in SVG, my work will build on the literature that speaks to the need for analysing what Crossley (2010) refers to as the uncritical transfer of global education agendas to postcolonial countries and SSTs in particular. In another way, this work supports the corpus of existing literature on issues relating to postcolonial perspectives as an aspirational agenda (Lavia, 2006) and as a methodological and theoretical basis for conducting research in postcolonial contexts (Bristol, 2012). In this regard, I carried out this study using postcolonial perspectives as one means through which I could understand SI in primary schools in SVG. Finally, I envisage my work contributing to the argument that, 'in the face of new global challenges the case for increased support for educational research in small states is both urgent and strong' (Crossley, 2008, p.250).

Just as my study added to and supported the theoretical literature, it also challenges some of the discourse in the literature. For example, writers like Dean (1995) expressed the view that during preliminary SI visits to gather data for an impending inspection some school staff reported negative experiences of the inspectors' visit. However, in my study, there was no instance of there being any negative impact of the preliminary inspection visit on school staff. Morrison (2009) in his work of SI in Macau suggested a merger of the inspection and school improvement roles of school inspectorates in SSTs. In Morrison's (2009) view, a merger of these roles will be a cost saving measure. However, I have found that merging both roles resulted in a neglect of the role of improvement because of the limited human resource capacity of the SIS Unit. I feel it may be best to separate these roles because of the small size of the inspectorate and the complaints from schools of not receiving help following inspection. The staff in the MoE, who prior to SI worked on improving teachers pedagogical skills, should deal with the work on improvement. In the discussion of the implications of my research on SI in primary schools in SVG to the theoretical literature, I believe it is relevant at this point to consider whether SI, as an education policy geared at school improvement, is relevant to the context of SSTs.

In the addition to the implications of my study of SI in SVG for the theoretical literature, I also hope that those in the upper organisational structure of the MoE, under whose directive the SIS Unit falls, will find the study useful to understanding how SI is operating in primary schools in SVG. Through this understanding, I hope they will move towards collaborating with the SEO, his staff, and me in making changes, where necessary, to the way SI is enacted in primary schools in SVG.

Additionally, out of the findings of this study, I expect teachers in primary schools in SVG will reassess their teaching methods and strategies as well as their role in improving the life chances of children from deprived socioeconomic backgrounds. If the quality of teaching remains traditional and uninspiring, these children do not stand an equal chance as those from the upper socio-economic backgrounds.

At present student teachers, at the college where I work, do not have any knowledge of SI, which they will encounter when they become full-time teachers.

The findings of the study can find its way in the content of a current course that focuses on educational issues in SVG. I will lobby for this. I also hope that the findings on teaching and learning will inspire student teachers to become more effective classroom teachers. The next section makes recommendations based on the study's findings.

8.7. Recommendations

In addition to the insights above, the following suggestions from my study may be useful to enacting SI in SVG:

a) retired educators, and current principals and teachers should be trained to assist with conducting SI

b) there needs to be an increase in the staff of the SIS Unit through attracting more qualified and competent educators to become school inspectors

c) SSE could be developed as an essential partner to SI.

d) consultations should be held with principals and teachers on SSE and its role in SI so that it becomes a participatory exercise that gives a critical voice to these stakeholders

e) SSE should be used as the basis for full inspection where findings from the former show clear weaknesses in schools

f) A system of positive pressure should be applied to schools that are failing; and where the principals do not show an inclination to improving them and the quality of education they offer. In the upcoming section, I reflect on my experiences during the research.

8.8. Reflections on the Research Process

Pursuing doctoral studies has created tremendous growth, development and confidence in my understanding of and ability to do educational research. When I began this research journey, I had never done any primary research, as my M.Ed. comprised a major research paper that utilised only documentary sources. Thus, there were times when I felt inadequate to undertake this kind of research. I read and heard many times about qualitative research being iterative and thought this was a cliché. However, I have lived that experience as I moved through the various

stages of the study. I have learnt that despite the many research texts on analysing qualitative data, that practice based on intuition and actually engaging in the process is more educative. I also found that as the research progressed I had to constantly refine my research questions. Doing this made me feel that I was not getting it right, but my supervisor's reassurance kept me focused. One of the greatest memories I have during my study is reading *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples* by Linda Tuhiwai-Smith. It opened my world to the need for using theories and methodologies appropriate to doing research in a postcolonial context like my own. I also gained an appreciation for conducting research in an ethical manner. I had never really considered this before. However, as one who believes in social justice it was something that resonated with my own values. Doing this study was an enormous challenge, but it was a fulfilling life experience.

8.9. Final Words

This study looked at SI in primary schools in SVG, a small island independent country of thirty-two (32) islands and cays with a landmass of 389 sq. km (150 sq. miles) and a population of just over one hundred thousand people, located in the Eastern Caribbean. In doing this study, it was important for me to highlight the history and development of primary education in SVG as well as postcolonial perspectives. To me, these were moral, ethical, and theoretical obligations of a beginning researcher operating in a postcolonial space. I believe SI in SVG must take into consideration the history and development of our primary education system. As teachers in this context are often merely implementers of education policy devised for them elsewhere and by others considered more intellectually astute than they were. I believe that education policymakers in SVG must be well grounded in the postcolonial perspectives outlined in chapter two. It is important that they understand these perspectives as the process of SI moves into phase three where it becomes incorporated or institutionalised (Fullan, 2007) into the culture of primary schools.

References

Agee, J., 2002. "Winks upon winks": multiple lenses on setting in qualitative educational research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 15(5), pp.569-85.

Al'Abri, K., 2011. The impact of globalization on education policy of developing countries: Oman as an example. *Literacy Information and Computer Education*, 2(4), pp.491-502.

Allen, R. & Burgess, S., 2012. *How should we treat underperforming schools? a regression discontinuity analysis of school inspection in England*. [Online] Available at: http://www.bristol.ac.uk/compo/ [Accessed 17 March 2013].

Almerindo, A., 2014. The emergence of accountability in the Portuguese education system. *European Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1(2), pp.125-32.

Alsaeedi, F. & Male, T., 2013. Transformational leadership and globalisation: attitudes of school principals in Kuwait. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 41(5), pp.640-57.

Anderson, M., 1938. *St. Vincent handbook*. 5th ed. Kingstown: The Vincentian.

Anderson, J., 2005. *Accountability in education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Anderson, S. & Payne, M.A., 1994. Corporal punishment in elementary education: views of Barbadian school children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 18(4), pp.377-86.

Anonymous, 2012. Teachers use stress as excuse: says Ofsted chief. *The Safety and Health Practitioner*, 30(6), p.8.

Appadurai, A., 2000. Grassroot globalization and the research imagination. *Public Culture*, 12(1), pp.1-19.

Aske, D., Connolly, L. & Corman, R.R., 2012. Accessibility or accountability? the rhetoric and reality of no child left behind. *The Academy for Economics and Economic Education*, 15(2), pp.1-30.

Aslam, M. & Kingdom, G., 2011. What can teachers do to raise pupil achievement? *Economics of Education Review*, 30, pp.559-74.

Baldacchino, G., 2010. "Upside down decolonization" in subnational islands jurisdictions: questioning the "post" in postcolonialism. *Space and Culture*, 13(2), pp.188-202.

Bartle, G.F., 1992. The role of the British and foreign society in the education of poor children of the metropolis during the first half of the 19th century. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 24(1), pp.74-79.

Bassey, M., 2001. A solution to the problem of generalization in educational research: fuzzy prediction. *Oxford Review of Education*, 27(1), pp.5-22.

Baxter, J.A., 2013. Professional inspector or inspecting professionals? teachers as inspectors in a new regulatory regime for education in England. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43(4), pp.467-85.

Baxter, J.A., 2014. An independent inspectorate? addressing the paradox of educational inspection in 2013. *School Leadership and Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 34(1), pp.21-38.

Beckford, C. & Lekule, C., 2012. Towards a model of educational leadership for the Caribbean: making the case for distributed leadership principles. *Journal of the University College of the Cayman Islands*, 6, pp.158-73.

Bennett, J. & Kavanagh, J.J., 1996. The assessment of quality in primary schools: assistant teachers' perspectives on whole school inspections. *Irish Educational Studies*, 15(1), pp.14-25.

Best, J.W. & Khan, J.V., 2006. *Research in Education*. 10th ed. Boston: Pearson Education Inc.

Bibby, C., 1956. T.H. Huxley and the training of teachers. *Educational Review*, 8(2), pp.137-45.

Bonal, X., 2002. Plus ca change the world bank global education policy and the post-Washington consensus. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 12(1), pp.3-22.

Borden, A., 2002. *School principals in Latin America and the Caribbean: leaders for change or subjects of change*. [Online] Available at: http://www.iadb.org/wmsfiles/products/publications/documents/646204.pdf [Accessed 6 May 2016].

Botha, R.C., 2010. School effectiveness: conceptualising divergent assessment approaches. *South African Journal of Education*, 30, pp.605-20.

Brimblecombe, N., Ormston, M. & Shaw, M., 1995. Teachers' perception of school inspection: a stressful experience. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 25(1), pp.53-61.

Bristol, L.S.M., 2012. *Plantation pedagogy: a postcolonial and global perspective*. New York: Peter Lang.

Brock, C. & Crossley, M., 2013. Revisiting scale: comparative research and education in small states. *Comparative Education*, 49(3), pp.388-403.

Browne, J.D., 1970. The act of 1870 and the training of teachers. *Education Review*, 22(2), pp.131-40.

Bryman, A., 2008. *Social research methods*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bush, T., 2015. Understanding instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 43(4), pp.487-89.

Carr, W., 1998. *For education: towards critical educational inquiry*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Carraway, J.H. & Young, T., 2015. Implementation of a districtwide policy to improve principals' instructional leadership: principals' sensemaking of the skillful observational and coaching laboratory. *Educational Policy*, 29(1), pp.230-56.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S., 1986. *Becoming critical: education, knowledge and action research*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Case, P., Case, P. & Catling, S., 2000. Please show you're working: a critical assessment of the impact of OFSTED inspection on primary teachers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(4), pp.605-21.

Castello, D., 2015. Challenges and support of instructional leadership in schools. *Antistasis*, 5(1), pp.3-6.

Chance, J., 1950. A hundred years of teacher training. *Educational Review*, 2(3), pp.191-97.

Chapman, C., 2001a. Unlocking the potential: inspection as a mechanism for school improvement. *Improving Schools*, 4(3), pp.41-50.

Chapman, C., 2001. Changing classrooms through inspection. *School Leadership and Management*, 21(1), pp.59-73.

Chingos, M.M. & Peterson, P.E., 2011. It's easier to pick a good teacher than to train one: familiar and new results on the correlates of teacher effectiveness. *Economics of Education Review*, 30, pp.449-65.

Colonial Government, 1912. *The laws of St. Vincent: a new and revised edition volume II 1898-1911*. Bridgetown: Advocate Co Ltd.

Colonial Government, 1958. *Department of education triennial report 1955-1957*. Kingstown: Department of Education.

Colonial Office, 1854. *Annual report for the colony of St. Vincent*. Kingstown: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1911. *Annual report for the colony of St. Vincent 1909/1910*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1915. *Colony of St. Vincent schedule of taxes, duties, fees, and all other sources of revenue*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1932. *Annual Report for the colony of St. Vincent*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1946. *Annual report for St. Vincent British West Indies*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1948. *Annual report on St. Vincent British West Indies 1947*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1962. *Annual report for the colony of St. Vincent*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Colonial Office, 1965. *The colonial office list*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

Conrad, A., Browne, L.I. & Crockett, J., 2006. Spirited to leadership: Caribbean educational leaders share their stories. *International Electronic Journal of Leadership*, 10(17), pp.17-27.

Cowie, L.W., 1957. Cannon Barnett and the training of teachers. *Educational Review*, 9(3), pp.212-20.

Creswell, J.W., 2012. *Educational research: planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston: Pearson.

Crossley, M., 2008. The advancement of educational research in small states. *Comparative Education*, 44(2), pp.247-54.

Crossley, M., 2010. Context matters in eduational research and international development: learning from the small states experience. *Prospects*, 40, pp.421-29.

Crossley, M. & Holmes, K., 2001. Challenges for educational research: international development, partnerships and capacity building in small states. *Oxford Review of Education*, 27(3), pp.395-409.

Crossley, M. & Tikly, L., 2004. Postcolonial perspectives and comparative and international research in education: a critical introduction. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), pp.147-56.

Crossley, M. & Vulliamy, G., 1984. Case-study research methods and comparative education. *Comparative Education*, 20(2), pp.193-207.

Dalin, P., 2005. *School development: theories and strategies*. London: Continuum.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Ascher, C., 1991. *Accountability mechanism in big city school systems*. [Online] Available at: www.eric.ed.gov [Accessed 17 November 2013].

Davis, P.W., Chandler, J.L. & La Rossa, R., 2004. "I've tried the switch but he laughs through tears": the use of corporal punishment during the machine age 1924-1939. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 28, pp.1291-542.

De Grauwe, A., 2009. *School monitoring systems and their impact on disparities.* [online] Available at: http://www.researchgate.net/profile [Accessed 26 April 2015].

de Wolf, I.F. & Janssens, F.J.G., 2007. Effects and side effects of inspections and accountability in education: an overview of empirical studies. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(3), pp.379-96.

Dean, J., 1995. What teachers and headteachers think about inspection. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 25(1), pp.45-52.

Dedering, K. & Sabine, M., 2011. School improvement through inspection? first empirical insights from Germany. *Journal of Educational Change*, 12, pp.301-22.

Demetriou, D. & Kyriakides, L., 2012. The impact of school self-evaluation upon student achievement: a group randomised study. *Oxford Review of Education*, 38(2), pp.149-70.

Denscombe , M., 2003. *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. 2nd ed. London: Open University Press.

Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S., 2008. Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. 3rd ed. London: Sage Publications, Inc. pp.1-44.

Dewey, J., 1938. *Experience and education*. New York: Kappa Delta Pi, Touchstone.

Dimmer, T. & Metiuk, J., 1998. The use of and impact of OFSTEAD in a primary school. In P. Earley, ed. *School improvement after inspection? school and LEA responses*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd. pp.51-76.

Dobbelaer, M., Prins, F.J. & van Dongen, D., 2013. The impact of feedback training on inspectors. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 37(1), pp.86-104.

Dzakiria, H., 2012. Theory of relatability as a possible alternative to the issue of generalising of research findings: the case of open and distant learning at Universiti Utara Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Distance Education*, 14(1), pp.41-58.

Ehren, M., Altricher, H. & McNamara, G., 2013. Impact of school inspection on improvement of schools describing assumptions on causal mechanisms in six European countries. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 25, pp.3-43.

Ehren, M.C.M. & Visscher, A.J., 2006. Towards a theory on the impact of school inspections. *British Journal of Educational Change*, 54(1), pp.51-72.

Ehren, M.C.M. & Visscher, A.J., 2008. The relationship between school inspection, school characteristics and school improvement. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 56(2), pp.205-27.

Eurydice, 2007. *School autonomy in Europe: policies and measures*. [Online] Available at: http//www.eurydice.org [Accessed 12 July 2013].

Evans, L., Thornton, B. & Usinger, J., 2012. Theoretical frameworks to guide school improvement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 96(2), pp.154-71.

Fergusson, N., Earley, P., Outston, J. & Fuller, B., 1999. New heads: OFSTED inspections and prospect for school improvement. *Educational Research*, 41(3), pp.241-49.

Fetterman, D.M., 2010. *Ethnography step by step*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Figlio, D. & Loeb, S., 2011. School accountability. In E.A. Hanushek, S. Machin & L. Woessmann, eds. *Handbook of the economics of education*. North Holland: Elsevier B.V. pp.383-421.

Floyd, A. & Arthur, L., 2012. Researching from within: external and internal ethical engagement. *International Journal of Research and Methods in Education*, 35(2), pp.171-80.

Freire, P., 1996. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Penguin Books.

Fullan, M., 2007. *The new meaning of educational change*. 4th ed. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Gaertner, H., Wursten, S. & Pant, H.A., 2014. The effect of school inspections on school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: an International Journal of Research*, 25(4), pp.489-508.

Gandhi, L., 1998. *Postcolonial theory: a critical introduction*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Ganser, T., 2001. *At the beginning of a new century: observations on teaching as a profession*. [Online] Ocho Rios Available at: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED457140 [Accessed 12 September 2015].

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E. & Airasian, P., 2009. *Educational research: competencies for analysis and applications*. 9th ed. Upper Saddle River New Jersey: Pearson.

Giddens, A., 2003. *Run away world: how globalisation is reshaping our lives*. New York: Routledge.

Gilbert, C., 2012. *Towards a self-improving system: the role of school accountability*. [Online] Available at: dera.ioe.ac.uk/1419/1 [Accessed 23 April 2015].

Giroux, H.A., 1978. Developing educational programs: overcoming the hidden curriculum. *The Clearing House*, 52(4), pp.148-51.

Glickman, C., Gordon, S. & Ross-Gordon, J., 2010. *SuperVision and instructional leadership: a developmental approach*. Needham Height, M.A: Allyn and Bacon.

Gonsalves, R.E., 2010. *Lifting the education revolution to the next level*. Kingstown: Office of the Prime Minister.

Gorard, S., 2010. Serious doubts about school effectiveness. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(5), pp.745-66.

Gordon, S., 1963. *A century of West Indian education: a source book*. London: Longman.

Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines, 2006. *Education Act 2006*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines

Government of St.Vincent and the Grenadines, 2013. *St.Vincent & the Grenadines social development plan 2013-2015*. Kingstown: Government Printery.

Grover, V.K., 2014. Top down versus bottom up accountability: an analysis for implementation in educational institutions. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Educational Research*, 3(10 -1), pp.258-76.

Gulcan, M.G., 2012. On instructional leadership competencies of school principals. *Education*, 132(3), pp.625-35.

Gumus, S. & Akcaoglu, M., 2013. Instructional leadership in Turkish primary schools: an analysis of teachers' perceptions and current policy. *Educational Management and Leadership*, 41(3), pp.289-302.

Hallinger, P., 2003. Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), pp.329-52.

Hallinger, P. & Lee, M., 2014. Instructional leadership in Thailand: has education reform impacted principal practice. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(1), pp.6-29.

Halloway, S., 2013. Postcolonial education through literature: in memoriam Chinua Achebe (1930-2013). *Postcolonial Directions in Education*, 2(1), pp.160-65.

Harris, A., 2005. *School improvement: what's in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.

Hodges Kulinna, P. & Cothran, D.J., 2003. Physical education teachers' self-reported use and perception of various teaching styles. *Learning and Instruction*, 13, pp.597-609.

Hooge, E., Burns, T. & Wilkoszewski, H., 2012. *Looking beyond the numbers: stakeholders and multiple school accountability*. [Online] Available at: http://www.oecd.org/edu [Accessed 16 April 2015].

Hopkins, D., 2001. *School improvement for real*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Hopkins, D. & Reynolds, D., 2001. The past, present, and future of school improvement: towards the third age. *British Educational Resesarch Journal*, 27(4), pp.459-75.

Hopkins, D. & West, M., 2002. Evaluation as school improvement: a developmental perspective from England. In D. Nevo, ed. *School-based evaluation: an international perspective*. Emerald Group Publishing Ltd. pp.89-112.

Jaffer, K., 2010. School inspection and supervision in Pakistan: approaches and issues. *Prospects*, 40, pp.375-92.

James, C.L.R., 1986. *Beyond a boundary*. London: The Anchor Press Ltd.

James, G., 2013. *Licks as pedagogy: the mirroring of a method of plantation slavery discipline in twenty-first century Vincentian student teachers*. Doctor of Education coursework assignment. Univeristy of Sheffield.

Janesick, V.J., 2003. The choregoraphy of qualitative research design. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. London: SAGE Publications. pp.46-79.

Janssens, F.J.G. & van Amelsvoort, G.H.W.C.H., 2008. School self-evaluations and school inspections in Europe: an exploratory study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 34 (1), pp.15-23.

Jeffrey, B. & Woods, P., 1996. Feeling deprofessionalised: the social construction of emotions during an OFSTED inspection. *Cambridge Journal of Education* , 26(3), pp.325-43.

Jones, K. & Tymms, P., 2014. Ofsted's role in promoting school improvement: the mechanisms of the school inspection system in England. *Oxford Review of Education*, 40(3), pp.315-30.

Jules, D., 2008. Rethinking education for the Caribbean: a radical approach. *Comparative Education*, 44(2), pp.203-14.

Jupp, V., 2006. *The SAGE dictionary of social research methods*. London: SAGE Publications.

Kane, T.J., Rockoff, J.E. & Staiger, D.O., 2008. What does certification tell us about teacher effectiveness? evidence from New York. *Economics of Education Review*, 27, pp.615-31.

Karagiorgi, Y., Nicolaidou, M., Yiasemis, C. & Georghiades, P., 2015. Emergent data-driven approaches to school improvement: the journey of three schools through self-evaluation. *Improving Schools*, 18(1), pp.69-82.

Kieh Jr, G.K., 2012. Neocolonialism: American foreign policy and the first Liberian civil war. *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, 5(1), pp.164-84.

Kowalski, T.J., 2003. *Contemporary school administration: an introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Latrobe, C.J., 1838. *Negro education Windward and Leeward Islands*. London: House of Commons.

Lavia, J., 2006. The practices of postcoloniality: a pedagogy of hope. *Pedagogy Culture and Society*, 14(3), pp.279-93.

Lavia, J., 2007. Repositioning pedagogies and post-colonialism: theories contradictions and possibilities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(3), pp.283-300.

Lavia, J., 2012. Resisting the inner plantation: decolonisation and the practice of education in the work of Eric Wiliams. *Postcolonial Directions in Education*, 1(1), pp.9-30.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D., 1990. Transformational leadership: how principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(4), pp.249-80.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D. & McElheron-Hopkins, C., 2006. The development and testing of a school improvement model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(4), pp.441-46.

Lobb, R.P., 1919. *Education in the West Indies*. Minute Paper. Kingstown: St. Vincent Government Office.

London, N.A., 2004. School inspection: the inspectorate and educational practice in Trinidad and Tobago. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(4), pp.479-502.

Londsdale, P. & Parsons, C., 1998. Inspection and the school improvement hoax. In P. Earley, ed. *School improvement after inspection? school and LEA responses*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing. pp.110-25.

Louisy, P., 2001. Globalisation and comparative education: a Caribbean perspective. *Comparative Education*, 37(4), pp.425-38.

Louisy, P., 2004. Whose context for what quality? informing education strategies for the Caribbean. *Compare*, 34(3), pp.285-92.

MacBeath, J., 1999. *Schools must speak for themselves: the case for school self-evaluation*. London: Routledge Falmer.

MacBeath, J., 2004. Democratic learning and school effectiveness: are they by any chance related? In M. John & L. Moos, eds. *Democratic learning: the challenge of school effectiveness*. London: Routledge Falmer. pp.15-41.

MacBeath, J., 2006. *School inspection and self-evaluation*. London: Routledge.

Maile, S., 2002. Accountability: an essential aspect of governance. *South African Journal of Education*, 22(4), pp.326-31.

Marks, P., 2015. *Interviewed by: James, G.* (11th February 2015).

Marks, H.M. & Printy, S.M., 2003. Principal leadership and school performance: an integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), pp.370-97.

Matthews, P. & Sammons, P., 2004. *Improvement through inspection: an evaluation of the impact of Ofsted's work*. [Online] Available at: www.ofsted.gov.uk [Accessed 21 September 2015].

Matthews, P. & Smith, G., 1995. OFSTED: inspecting schools and improvement through inspection. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 25(1), pp.23-34.

Mc Crone, T., Coghlan, M., Wade, P. & Rudd, P., 2009. *Evaluation of the impact of section 5 inspection: strand 3 final report of Ofsted*. [Online] Available at: www.nfer.ac.uk [Accessed 15 January 2013].

Mc Laughlin, T.H., 2001. Four philosophical perspectives on school inspection: an introduction. *Journal of Philosophy*, 35(4), pp.647-54.

Mc Nab, D., 2004. Hearts, minds and external supervision of schools: direction and development. *Educational Review*, 56(1), pp.53-64.

McNamara, G. & O'Hara, J., 2006. Workable compromise or pointless exercise? school-based evaluation in the Irish context. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(4), pp.564-82.

McNamara, G. & O'Hara, J., 2008. The importance of the concept of self-evaluation in the changing landscape of education policy. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 34, pp.173-79.

McNess, E., Arthur, L. & Crossley, M., 2015. 'Ethnographic dazzle' and the construction of the 'other' revisiting dimensions of insider and outsider research for international and comparative education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 45(2), pp.295-316.

Mercer, J., 2007. The challenges of insider research in educational institutions: wielding a double-edge sword and resolving delicate dilemmas. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(1), pp.1-17.

Mezzadra, S. & Rahola, F., 2006. The postcolonial condition: a few notes on the quality of historical time in the global present. *Postcolonial Text*, 2(1), pp.1-12.

Milewski, P., 2012. Perilous times: an oral history of teachers' experience with school inspection in the 1930s. *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 41(5), pp.637-56.

Miller, P., 2012. The changing nature of educational leadership: Caribbean and international perspectives. *Journal of the University College of the Cayman Islands*, 6, pp.9-12.

Miller, P., 2013. School leadership in the Caribbean: approaches and development. In P. Miller , ed. *School Leadership in the Caribbean: perceptions, practices and paradigms*. Oxford: Symposium Books Ltd. pp.13-24.

Ministry of Education, 2012. *School inspection and supervision: handbook for inspections*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Ministry of Education, 2012. *St. Vincent & the Grenadines draft education sector development plan*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Ministry of Education, 2012. *St. Vincent & the Grenadines statistical digest 2012*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Ministry of Education, 2012. *The headteacher/principal as instructional leader*. Kingstown: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education, 2013. *St. Vincent & the Grenadines educational statistical digest 2013*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Ministry of Education, 2014. *Education statistical digest 2013/2014*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Moosa, D., 2013. Challenges to anonymity and representations in educational qualitative research in a small community: a reflection on my research journey. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(4), pp.483-95.

Morrison, K., 2009. School inspection in small states and territories: an overview and case study of Macau. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(6), pp.751-67.

Mujis, D. et al., 2004. Improving schools in socio-economically disadvantaged areas: a review of research evidence. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(2), pp.149-75.

Murphy, J., 2013. "The architecture of school improvement". *Journal of Educational Adminstration*, 51(3), pp.252-63.

Nahavandi, A., 2009. *The art and science of leadership*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Education Inc.

National Education Inspectorate, 2015. *About us: roles and Responsibilities*. [Online] Available at: test11-vm12.camb-ed.com/About-us/About-us [Accessed 1 May 2015].

Neuman, W.L., 2003. *Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative*. 5th ed. Boston: Pearson Educational Inc.

Nevo, D., 2002. Dialogue evaluation: combining internal and external evaluation. In D. Nevo, ed. *School-based evaluation: an international perspective*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd. pp.3-16.

Ngcobo, T. & Tikly, L.P., 2010. Key dimensions of effective leadership for change: a focus on townships and rural schools in South Africa. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 38(2), pp.202-28.

O' Day, J., 2002. Complexity, accountability and school improvement. *Harvard Educational Review*, 72(3), pp.293-329.

O Hara, J. et al., 2015. *Google Scholar*. [Online] Available at: http//www.doc.utwente.nl/97316/1/EERA-ECER%200'Hara.pdf [Accessed 6 December 2015].

O'Brien, S., Mc Namara, G. & O'Hara, J., 2015. Supporting the consistent implementation of school self-evaluation in Irish post-primary schools. *Educational Assessment Evaluation and Accountability*, 27(3), pp.377-93.

O'Brien, S., McNamara, G. & O'Hara, J., 2014. Critical facilitators: external supports for self-evaluation and improvement in schools. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 43, pp.169-77.

Ochuba, V.O., 2009. Improving the quality of education in Nigeria through effective inspection of schools. *Education*, 129(4), pp.734-41.

OECD, 2013. *Synergies for better learning: an international perspective on evaluation and assessment*. [Online] Available at: file:///F:/School%20Insp%203/Synergies%20for%20Better%20Learning_Summary.pd [Accessed 12 September 2015].

OECS Education Reform Unit, 2012. *OECS education sector strategy 2012-2021*. Castries: OECS Education Reform Unit.

Ofsted, 2015. *School inspection handbook*. [Online] Available at: www.ofsted.gov.uk [Accessed 1 August 2015].

O'Grady, A., Mooney, G. & Kennedy, S., 2014. Why change to active learning? pre-service and in-service science teachers' perceptions. *European Journal of Education*, 37(1), pp.35-50.

Ormston, M., Brimblecombe, N. & Shaw, M., 1995. Inspection and change: help or hinderance for the classroom teacher. *British Journal of In-service Education*, 21(3), pp.311-18.

Ouston, J. & Davies, J., 1998. OFSTED and afterwards? schools' responses to inspection. In P. Earley, ed. *School improvement after inspection? School and LEA responses*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing. pp.13-24.

Owens, R.G., 2004. *Organizational behaviour in education: adaptive leadership and school reform*. 8th ed. Boston: Pearson.

Park, J., 2013. *Detoxifying school accountability: the case for multiple perspective inspection*. London: Demos.

Perryman, J., 2006. Panoptic performativity and school inspection regimes: discipline mechanisms and life under special measures. *Journal of Education Policy*, 2(21), pp.147-61.

Perryman, J., 2009. Inspection and the formation of professional and performative processes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 24(5), pp.611-31.

Psacheropoulous, G., 2006. World bank policy on education: a personal account. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26, pp.329-38.

Quayson, A., 2005. Postcolonialism and postmodernism. In H. Schwartz & S. Ray, eds. *A companion to postcolonial studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. pp.87-111.

Rizvi, F., Lingard, B. & Lavia, J., 2006. Postcolonialism and education: negotiating a contested terrain. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 14(3), pp.249-62.

Robertson, S. et al., 2007. *Globalisation, education and development: ideas, actors and dynamics*. [Online] Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http:/www.dfid.gov.uk/documents/publications/global-education-dev-68.pdf [Accessed 15 March 2013].

Robinson, V., Lloyd, C. & Rowe, K., 2008. The impact of leadership on student outcomes: an analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), pp.635-74.

Robson, C., 2002. *Real world research: a resource for social scientist and practitioner-researchers*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Rule, P., Davey, B. & Balfour, R.J., 2011. Unpacking the predominance of case study methodology in South African post-graduate educational research. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 25(2), pp.301-21.

Salo, P., Nyluad, J. & Stjernstrom, E., 2015. On the practice architectures of instructional leadership. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 43(4), pp.490-506.

Sammons, P., 2008. Zero tolerance and failure and New Labour appraoches to school improvement. *Oxford Review of Education*, 34(6), pp.651-64.

Scheerens, J., 2000. *Improving school effectiveness*. [Online] Available at: http://www.unesco.org/iiep [Accessed 10 December 2012].

Schildkamp, K., Vanhoof, J., van Petegem, P. & Visscher, A., 2012. The use of school self-evaluation results in the Netherlands and Flanders. *British Educational Research Journal*, 38(1), pp.125-52.

Schildkamp, K. & Visscher, A., 2010. The use of performance feedback in school improvement in Louisiana. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, pp.1389-403.

Schwerdt, G. & Wuppermann, A., 2011. Is traditional teaching really all that bad? a within-student between subject approach. *Economics of Education Review*, 30, pp.365-79.

Shatzer, R.H., Calderella, P., Hallam, P.R. & Brown, B., 2014. Comparing effects of instructional and transformational leadership on student achievement: implications for practice. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42(4), pp.445-59.

Shaw, I., Newton, D.P., Aitkin, M. & Darnell, R., 2003. Do OFSTED inspection of secondary schools make a difference to GCSE results? *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(1), pp.63-75.

Shohat, E., 1992. Third world and postcolonial issues. *Social Texts*, (31/32), pp.99-113.

Sikes, P., 2006. On dodgy ground? Problematics and ethics in educational research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 29(1), pp.105-17.

Sikes, P. & Potts, A., 2008. *Researching education from the inside: investigations from within*. London: Taylor and Francis Group.

Simon, V., 2014. *Voices from St. Lucia: a dialogue on curriculum change in a small state.* Sheffield: Unpublished Doctoral Thesis University of Sheffield.

Simons, H., 2002. School self-evaluation in a democracy. In D. Nevo, ed. *School-based evaluation: an international perspective*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd. pp.17-34.

Spivak, G.C., 2003. Can the subaltern speak? *Die Philosophin*, 14(27), pp.42-58.

Spivak, G.C., 1991. Neocolonialism and the secret agent of knowledge. *Oxford Literary Review*, 13(1), pp.220-51.

Stake, R.E., 2003. Case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, eds. *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oak: SAGE Publications. pp.134-64.

Stake, R.E., 2010. *Qualitative research: studying how things work*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Sun, H., Creemers, B.P.M. & de jong, R., 2007. Contextual factors and effective school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement: An International Journal of Research*, 18(1), pp.93-122.

The House of Assembly, 1970. *Hansard: the parliamentary debates*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

The House of Assembly, 1980. *Hansard: the parliamentary debates*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

The House of Assembly, 1983. *The 1983/1984 estimates of the House of Assembly*. Kingstown: Government Printery of St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

The World Bank, 2014. *Small states overview*. [Online] Available at: http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/smallstates/overview [Accessed 22 September 2015].

Tight, M., 2010. The curious case of case study: a view-point. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(4), pp.329-39.

Tikly, L., 1999. Postcolonialism and comparative education. *International Review of Education*, 45(5/6), pp.603-21.

Tikly, L., 2001. Globalisation and education in the postcolonial world: towards a conceptual framework. *Comparative Education*, 37(2), pp.151-71.

Tikly, L. & Bond, T., 2013. Towards a postcolonial research ethic in comparative and international education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 43(4), pp.422-42.

Tuhiwai-Smith, L., 2012. *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Uibu, K. & Kikas, E., 2014. Authoritative and authoritarian-inconsistent teachers' preference for teaching methods and instructional goals: Education 3-13. *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, 42(1), pp.5-22.

Uibu, K., Kikas, E. & Tropp, K., 2011. Instructional approaches: differences between kindergarten and primary school teachers. *Comapre: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(1), pp.91-111.

Unluer, S., 2012. Being an insider researcher while conducting case study research. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(58), pp.1-14.

van Bruggen, J., 2010. Inspectorates of education in Europe: some comparative remarks about their task and work., 2010. SICI Report.

Whitby, K., 2010. *School inspection: recent experiences in high performing education systems*. London: CfBT.

Whittaker, J., 2014. *School inspection unit revived*. [Online] Available at: http://www.compasscayman.com/story.aspx?id=140 [Accessed 12 February 2015].

Wilcox, B., 2000. *Making inspection visits more effective: the English experience*. [Online] Paris: International Institute for Educational Planning Available at: http://www.unesco.org/iiep [Accessed 23 July 2013].

Wilcox, B. & Gray, J., 1994. Reactions to inspection: a study of three variants. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 24(2), pp.245-69.

Williams, E., 1946. *Education in the British West Indies*. New York: Eworld Inc.

Wong, M. & Li, H., 2010. From external inspection to self-evaluation: a study of quality assurance in Hong Kong kindergartens. *Early Education and Development*, 21(2), pp.205-33.

Wright Mills, C., 1959. *The sociological imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wrigley, T., 2003. Is 'school effectiveness' antidemocratic? *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51(2), pp.89-112.

Wrigley, T., 2006. Schools and poverty: questioning the effectiveness and improvement paradigms. *SAGE Publications*, 9(3), pp.273-90.

Wyllie, H., 2001. *The development of primary education in St. Vincent & the Grenadines: education policy and practices in a small Caribbean state with special reference to the period 1960-2000*. Unpublished MPhil Thesis. Bridgetown: UWI.

Xiaolin, Y., Chengyam, S. & Hechuan, S., 2006. Comparative study of the educational inspectorate systems in the United Kingdom, France and China. In *APERA Conference*. Hong Kong, 2006.

Yilmaz, K., 2013. Comparison of quantative and qualitative research traditions: epistemology, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education*, 48(2), pp.311-25.

Yin, R.K., 2003. *Case study research: design and methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Young, R.J.C., 2003. *Postcolonialism: a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix 1
Ethical Approval Letter

23/07/2014

Godwin James School of Education

Dear Godwin

PROJECT TITLE: EDUR29: A Case Study of Perceptions on School Inspection in Primary Schools in St. Vincent & the Grenadines. APPLICATION: Reference Number 001280

On behalf of the University ethics reviewers who reviewed your project, I am pleased to inform you that on 23/07/2014 the above-named project was approved on ethics grounds, on the basis that you will adhere to the following documentation that you submitted for ethics review:

University research ethics application form 001280 (dated 12/07/2014). Participant information sheet 002005 (12/07/2014) Participant consent form 002004 (12/07/2014)

If during the course of the project you need to deviate significantly from the above-approved documentation please inform me since written approval will be required.

Yours sincerely,
Professor Daniel Goodley
Ethics Administrator
School of Education

Appendix 2
Letter of Request to Conduct Research

<div style="text-align: right">

Clifton
Union Island & Ratho Mill
Kingstown
21st July, 2014.

</div>

The Chief Education Officer
Ministry of Education
Kingstown, St. Vincent & the Grenadines.

Dear Ms Gilchrist,

I am a distance education student with the University of Sheffield, England pursuing a Doctor of Education (Ed.D) degree in Educational Studies. I am proceeding to my third year which commences the thesis (dissertation) phase of the programme.

I have submitted a proposal to research the topic of school inspection in primary schools in St. Vincent & the Grenadines. The tentative topic is: *A Case Study of Perceptions on School Inspection in Primary Schools in St. Vincent & the Grenadines*. In order to research this topic I will have to interview teachers and principals, as well as observe classes and the operation of schools.

The research is expected to be conducted in the 2014/2015 academic year. The schools I would like to have permission to conduct the research in are: (school names omitted). I assure you that all necessary ethical procedures will be followed as per the University of Sheffield's procedures. At the end of my research a copy of the finding will be disseminated to the Ministry of Education.

I thank you in advance for your co-operation in granting me permission to conduct data collection in the schools selected.

Yours sincerely,

Godwin E. James

Appendix 3

Principal Interview Schedule

Name--

Age--------------

School Currently Heading--

Gender: Male □   Female □

Marital Status: Married □ Single □ Divorced □

Date--

PART A: PERSONAL DATA & INFORMATION

1. Were you trained at the St. Vincent Teachers' College?

2. What is your current highest qualification?

3. How many years have you been a principal?

4. How many years have you been principal of this school?

PART B: THE SCHOOL INSPECTION TEAM/ PROCESS

1. Describe for me what your responsibilities as principal of this school entail.

BEFORE INSPECTION

2. How was your school notified that it was going to be inspected?

   - Parent student/ questionnaire

   - Documents requested

3. Did your school do a self-evaluation prior to the inspection of the school and if so describe how it was done?

4. Describe what the inspectors' preliminary visit to your school was like.

- preparation made by you

- activities engaged in

- atmosphere

DURING THE INSPECTION

1. How was the inspection conducted at your school?

- activities that the inspectors engaged in during inspection

- the atmosphere that existed in the school during the time the inspectors were here?

- manner and professionalism of the team

- personal impression of the oral feedback of their findings?

2. In your opinion, how accurate were the inspectors' observations on you and on the school?

INSPECTION REPORT

3. What did the inspection report say about?

- You

- Staff

- The school

4. In your opinion, how fair were the inspectors' findings (judgments) about your school?

- You as a principal

PART C: IMPACT OF INSPECTION

1. The SIS Handbook mentions a number of areas regarding the educational provision of all schools

   - Effectiveness of leadership & management by principal and SMT

   - Student performance on national tests/assessment

   - Use of resources both human and physical

   - Meeting students safety, security, health and wellbeing

   - Effectiveness of teaching in supporting student learning

   - Progress of students in personal and social development

   - Progress of students in relation to starting point

How have these areas changed in your school as a consequence of the inspection process?

2. What would you say are the benefits of school inspection?

3. What do you consider to be the disadvantages of school inspection?

4. In your opinion does school inspection affect teacher professionalism?

PART D: INSPECTION & SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

1. Has your school prepared an action plan for the SIS Unit since being inspected and if so what feedback has been received from them regarding it?

2. It is stated that school inspection is meant to lead to school improvement. What for you is school improvement and what are your views about school inspection leading to school improvement?

3. What support has been offered by the SIS Unit to your school since it completed the school inspection?

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS/REMARKS

1. What are your personal views regarding the implementation of school inspection in Vincentian schools?

2. Do you have any other comments to make regarding school inspection?

Thank you for taking the time and effort to participate in this research.

Appendix 4

Teacher Interview Schedule

Name--

Age--------------

School Currently Heading---

Gender: Male □   Female □

Marital Status: Married □ Single □ Divorced □

Date--

PART A: PERSONAL DATA & INFORMATION

5. Were you trained at the St. Vincent Teachers' College?

6. What is your current highest qualification?

7. How many years have you been a teacher?

8. How many years have you been a teacher at this school?

PART B: THE SCHOOL INSPECTION TEAM/PROCESS

5. Describe for me what your responsibilities as a teacher of this school entail.

BEFORE INSPECTION

6. How were your notified that your school was going to be inspected?
   - Parent student/ questionnaire
   - Documents requested

7. Did your school do a self-evaluation before the inspection of the school and if so describe how it was done?

8. Describe what the inspectors' preliminary visit to your school was like.
   - preparation made by you
   - activities engaged in
   - atmosphere

DURING THE INSPECTION

5. How was the inspection conducted at your school?
   - activities that the inspectors engaged in during inspection

- the atmosphere that existed in the school during the time the inspectors were here?
- manner and professionalism of the team
- personal impression of the oral feedback of their findings?

6. In your opinion, how accurate were the inspectors' observations on you and on the school?

INSPECTION REPORT

7. What did the inspection report say about?
   - You
   - Staff
   - The school

8. In your opinion, how fair were the inspectors' findings (judgments) about your school?
   - You as a teacher

PART C: IMPACT OF INSPECTION

5. The SIS Handbook mentions a number of areas regarding the educational provision of all schools
   - Effectiveness of leadership & management by principal and SMT
   - Student performance on national tests/assessment
   - Use of resources both human and physical
   - Meeting students safety, security, health and wellbeing
   - Effectiveness of teaching in supporting student learning
   - Progress of students in personal and social development
   - Progress of students in relation to starting point

How have these areas changed in your school as a consequence of the inspection process?

6. Before school inspection did your school do a SDP, and has your school prepared one since being inspected and what has been the feedback of the SIS Unit to the SDP?

7. What would you say are the benefits of school inspection?

8. What do you consider to be the disadvantages of school inspection?

9. In your opinion does school inspection affect teacher professionalism?

PART D: INSPECTION & SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

4. It is stated that school inspection is meant to lead to school improvement. What for you is school improvement and what are your views about school inspection leading to school improvement?
5. What support has been offered by the SIS Unit to your school since it completed the school inspection?

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS/REMARKS

3. What are your personal views regarding the implementation of school inspection in Vincentian schools?
4. Did you know about school inspection before the inspection team came to your school and if so where did you learn about it?
5. Do you have any other comments to make regarding school inspection?

Thank you for taking the time and effort to participate in this research.