

Organization of American States

Inter-American Program on  
Education for Democratic Values  
and Practices

## Evaluation Report

---

The Effectiveness of the Education  
for Democratic Citizenship in the  
Caribbean Project

**Evaluators:**

**Joel Warrican; Coreen J. Leacock**

**2011**

## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	ii
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 The Context .....	2
1.2 The Course.....	6
2. PROJECT EVALUATION .....	7
2.1 METHODOLOGY .....	8
2.1.1 Data Collection Tools.....	8
Online Questionnaire.....	9
Classroom Observation Tool.....	11
Students' Beliefs and Perceptions of Classroom Behaviours Questionnaire .....	11
Exit Course Evaluation Questionnaire .....	12
Interview Schedule.....	13
Drop Outs Questionnaire .....	13
2.1.2 Sources of Data .....	13
Course Participants.....	13
Classrooms .....	14
Students of the Participants of the Course .....	16
Course Site .....	17
2.1.3 Data Analysis .....	17
3. FINDINGS .....	18
3.1 To what extent was the EDCC program implemented as intended?.....	18
<u>Instructional Material</u> .....	18
<u>Provisions for Communication between Participants and Tutors</u> .....	20
<u>Technological Environment</u> .....	22
<u>Provision for Content and Technical Support</u> .....	24

3.2 What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course? .....	32
3.3 To what extent was the online course material used by the course participants?.....	39
3.4 To what extent do the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?.....	42
3.5 Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course? .....	61
<u>Student Belief</u> .....	61
.....	64
4.SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS .....	72
4.1 Findings .....	72
4.1 Conclusion.....	77
4.2 Recommendations .....	80
5. REFERENCES .....	81
6. APPENDICES.....	82



# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **INTRODUCTION**

In August 2005, Ministers of Education of OAS Member States adopted the Inter-American Program on Education for Democratic Values and Practices. The main objective of this program is to promote the development of a democratic culture through education. One of the means identified for doing this is through professional development for teachers.

The “**Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean: A Distance Course for Educators (EDCC)**” project emerged as an initiative of this Inter-American Program. This 3-year pilot project, aimed at the English-speaking Caribbean, was implemented online through the University of the West Indies Open Campus. It was funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and administered by the Organization of American States (OAS).

The project’s main objectives were:

- To enhance the capacity of primary and secondary school teachers in the English-speaking Caribbean to incorporate democratic values and practices into their classroom practices; and
- To inform development and implementation of regional and national policies in the English-speaking Caribbean relating to democratic citizenship education.

### ***Project development***

The OAS, in partnership with The University of the West Indies Open Campus (UWI Open Campus), developed the distance course with feedback from an Advisory Committee comprising policymakers, researchers and practitioners. Six pilot countries served as strategic partners in the project and contributed modest counterpart resources (human, in-kind and financial). The participating countries were Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago.

The project was developed in three main phases:

- ***The Needs Assessment phase (concluded in August 2007)***
- ***The Development phase (concluded in December 2008)***
- ***The Implementation phase (concluded in June 2010).***

The Needs Assessment phase drew heavily on feedback from Caribbean stakeholders, including policy makers, practitioners and researchers across the

region. The Development phase was guided by a University of the West Indies Open Campus (UWI Open Campus) team of experts charged with developing the course curriculum and content. Finally, the Implementation phase involved offering the course via UWI Open Campus' Moodle platform to teacher-participants from participating countries, and evaluating results both with stakeholders and through an external evaluation.

### ***Course structure***

The distance course comprised two segments: the first was an online segment in which teachers explore core the concepts of democracy and related teaching strategies. The second segment was a follow-on practicum in which teachers apply the concepts from the online segment to plan and teach portions of their curriculum, or work with groups of teachers from their schools to explore the application of democratic values and practices in classroom teaching. Teacher-participants who successfully completed the online and practicum segments received a UWI Open Campus Certificate of Completion.

### ***Participants***

The EDCC course was designed to be implemented with two cohorts of participants. The first cohort ran from February to July 2009, and involved participants from five countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago. The second cohort of participants started the course in September 2009. The second cohort included participants from the five original countries plus a sixth country, Belize. The second cohort concluded in May 2010.

## **The Context**

The English-speaking Caribbean consists of independent island states (Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago), British Dependencies (Anguilla, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands), Belize in Central America and Guyana in South America. Apart from sharing a geographical area and a common official language, many of these countries also share a common history, one that includes slavery and colonization by the British.

As a consequence of its history, the education system in the English-speaking Caribbean is predominantly based on the British system. Despite the fact that education is held in high esteem in the region, there have been some concerns recently about what transpires in the classroom. For example, there is concern that the teacher-dominated nature of Caribbean classrooms is a possible contributor to the passiveness of young people in the society. Social observers are suggesting that the perceived disconnect from society that young people are exhibiting may be linked to the manner in which they are educated and trained. Some of the conditions that are noted as perpetuating this situation include a heavily academic curriculum that promotes the alienation of students who are not strong academically; teaching methods that do not allow for significant input from the students; and growing intolerance for and/or indifference to people who are different from the majority. Social and political commentators point to a certain level of apathy, lack of interest and participation and the concomitant rise in violence among young people as a major consequence of this state of affairs in schools. It is in this setting that the Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean was introduced.

Along with the situation mentioned above, other recent developments in education trends in the Caribbean must be noted. For example, in the first decade of this twenty-first century, the notion of universal secondary education came to the fore. While this service was available in several of the countries in

the region since the 1970s (e.g. Barbados and St. Kitts / Nevis), it was only recently that other countries (e.g. St. Lucia, Dominica, St. Vincent & the Grenadines) followed suit. In response to this development, teacher education programmes have been revised to move teachers away from the teacher-centred approaches traditionally present in classroom to more student-sensitive ones. Thus, for example, training programmes coordinated by the Eastern Caribbean Joint Board of Teacher Education, the body responsible for teacher education in Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean, now expose teachers to methods and strategies for dealing with diversity in the classroom, for integrating technology in teaching and learning and for fostering cooperation rather than competition in the classroom among other things. Teachers are trained for example, to take students' interests into consideration when planning for instruction; to allow students to have make choices of reading material; to use assessment approaches that would allow students with reading and language difficulties to experience a measure of success; to deal respectfully with all students and to encourage their students to deal respectfully with each other. The idea is for teachers to provide high quality of instruction for all students whatever their individual characteristics. Though this trend in teacher education is still relatively new, some previously trained teachers were exposed to the approaches and strategies in workshops and other staff development activities.

The concept of democracy is not foreign to the countries of the region. Indeed, many of them champion democracy and at home and abroad. But in the face of current societal trends, it begs the question as to the extent to which the values and ideals of democratic behavior are being passed on to younger members of society. Since the school is one of the primary agents of socialization, an examination of some of the documents in which educational programmes are outlined were examined to determine the extent to which they espoused democratic principles and ideals.

Such documents were obtained from three of the countries that were included in the EDCC project: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and St. Lucia. Similar documents were requested from the Ministries of Education in the other

three countries, but none were submitted. The documents submitted provide some information relating to the extent to which citizenship and democratic principles are present. The examples from Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and St. Lucia suggest that concepts relating to education for democratic citizenship are incorporated to varying degrees into the curricula of Caribbean countries. What is evident from the examination of these documents is that citizenship education and democratic values and principles are associated primarily with Social Studies and the Social Sciences subjects. None of the countries submitted documents related to other subject areas in which reference is made to promoting democratic values and principles in the classroom. Thus, it is apparent that students may simply be learning *about* democratic principles rather than learning in an environment in which they are practiced, and consequently learning how to incorporate these ideas into their way of living and thinking. The value of the EDCC course then lies in the fact that teachers from any subject area can participate and can learn how to promote values and principles associated with democratic citizenship in their classrooms.

### ***The Course***

The EDCC course had two components. The first component took the form of an online program of instruction in which participants explored their own democratic values and principles, and developed knowledge, skills and methods to support a democratic environment for thought and discussion in their curriculum area. Participants completed the online component and required activities with the support of a tutor. The course consisted of four units of instruction, with readings, assignments, forums for discussion among participants, and guidelines for assessment. Assessment for this component included written papers, journal keeping and participation in online discussions. Participation during this component was asynchronous, and was supplemented by off-line activities for the participants.

The second component of the course involved voluntary practical work experience, for which the participants were afforded the opportunity to practice what they learned during the online component. This involved either using

what was learned during the online component to plan and teach lessons in which democratic ideals and principles are incorporated or work with colleagues at their schools to explore the use of democratic values and principles in their classrooms.<sup>1</sup> The participants in the practicum were to be supported by appropriate mentors/tutors. The implementation plan recommended that, ideally, mentoring should be done at a distance.

The Project Coordinator's record indicates that for the two cohorts that were involved in the online course, 262 participants were enrolled, 112 (43%) completed the online component and 92 (35%) finished the practicum.

## **PROJECT EVALUATION**

The project evaluation is to determine the extent to which the EDCC program achieved its stated goals and objectives. In order to make this determination, data were collected and analysed:

- Data were collected by questionnaire, interviews, observation and document analysis.
- Data were also mined from the course's online site.
- Data sources include the course planners and implementers, the participants, their technical and content supporters, their students.
- Educational policy documents and other curriculum documents were also examined.

This paper reports the findings from data collected for the two cohorts of participants. The data collected were analysed to seek answers to the following questions:

---

<sup>1</sup> Williams, D. (2010). *Report on the "Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean: A Distance Course for Educators" Project*. Project Coordinator's Report.

- **To what extent was the course implemented as intended?**
- **What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course?**
- **To what extent was the online course material used by the course participants?**
- **To what extent did the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?**
- **Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course?**

These findings can be useful in determining the impact of the course and in making decisions about its continuation.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research is designed to investigate both the *process* of implementing the program and the *product* (the outcomes). Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analysed for the investigation.

### ***Data Collection Tools***

A number of researcher-constructed tools were used to collect data. These include:

- online questionnaires for the course participants, administered at the start and end of the online component of the EDCC course;**
- questionnaires for students, also administered at the start and end of the online course;**
- an Exit Course Evaluation Questionnaire administered by the UWI Open C-campus to collect feedback from the participants;**

**-a Drop Outs Questionnaire designed to elicit feedback from participants who left the course before completion;**

**-an observation tool used during the classroom observation activities;**

**- Interview schedules.**

The themes related to democracy in the classroom included in the instruments were extracted from literature (e.g. Kesici, 2008; Shechman, 2002; Mappiasse, 2006) that explained behaviours, activities and beliefs that are fostered in classrooms in which democratic ideals are being implemented.

### ***Sources of Data***

Data for this study were collected from several sources. These included:

-the 262 course participants from the six participating countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago);

- 2240 students from the participating countries,

-197 classrooms,

- The online course site,

- Curriculum documents.

### ***Data Analysis***

Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures were used. The data collected were compiled in EXCEL or WORD files. Numerical data were also compiled in databases using Predictive Analysis Software (PASW, formerly SPSS) for statistical analysis. Qualitative data were examined for common themes, patterns and trends.

### ***Main Findings***

***To what extent was the course implemented as intended?***

- Generally, the conditions necessary for the successful implementation of the course were in place: the technology, the course content, the online tutoring, supervision and support for the participants.
- While the general consensus of participants was that the quality of the resources provided was excellent, it was apparent that initially, the quantity was somewhat overwhelming for some participants. Despite this initial concern, participants who continued in the programme found the content interesting and valuable. It can therefore be concluded that the chosen content was appropriate and adequate for the course.
- Even though the practicum component was implemented with success, next editions of this course should consider more innovative and concrete ways of providing support for the participants on-the-ground.
- The provision of the forums for discussion was successful in many ways and provided an avenue for the course participants to interact with their e-tutors as well as with each other. The fact that the discussions were primarily asynchronous was problematic to some of the participants. Thus, some of the participants suggested that discussion could have been enhanced if there were synchronous video lectures or at least a provision for all participants to be online at the same time for discussion.

***What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course?***

***Factors that facilitated the implementation of the online course:***

- Participants found course content to be relevant, informative and interesting and this motivated them.
- The availability of the technical support to assist the participants with technology-related challenges facilitated the successful implementation of the course.

- Apart from the support of e-tutors in relation to the course content, adequate technological support was also identified as crucial to the success of the course.
- Participants appreciated the training received to acquire the needed skills to learn how to use the online platform.
- The availability of trained e-tutors who were charged with assisting the participants contributed to the success of the programme.

***Factors that impeded the implementation of the online course:***

- The late addition of individuals to meet country quotas resulted in some participants joining the course while it was in progress, and correspondence from some of them suggested that they felt somewhat “lost” having joined the course late.
- Certain factors such as too challenging course content, unreliable connectivity and participants’ inadequate skills with the technology posed problems for some participants.
- The characteristics of the virtual platform and the lack of adequate activities to make this platform friendlier to participants. This led to a negative perception of the learning environment as it made some participants feel sometimes de-motivated and lonely.
- Some of the participants felt forced to take the course. They were selected without their knowledge or consent. This affected their participation in the course.

***To what extent was the online course material being used by the course participants?***

- The course learning resource pages were visited with varying degrees of frequency, while the pages containing the lessons (course content) for each unit visited most frequently. In addition, when the participants

visited the pages used for communication, they mainly viewed content, rather than posted messages.

- The pages that presented the goals and introduction for each unit were visited fewer times than any of the other pages, while the pages with the lessons (course content) were visited more often than the other pages.
- Posting to the personal journals was more frequent. Participants posted comments to the personal journal an average of two to three times, more frequently than they did to any other forum. This may have been because the personal journal was part of the assessment for the course.
- Participants viewed the discussion pages more often than they posted comments.

***To what extent did the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?***

- Though students showed a few undemocratic behaviours in their classrooms at the start of the course, large proportions of them from all six countries generally reported several behaviours and activities that reflect democratic principles. In the two countries where comparisons could be made (Trinidad and Tobago and St. Lucia), the changes in classroom behaviours reported by the students were slight.
- Even though the proportions of participants reporting that they use activities that reflect democratic values was high at the start of the course, by the end these proportions remained high and in some cases, increased. However, by the end of the course, the participants were still weak at giving the students choices in the classroom and promoting interaction among the students in the classroom<sup>2</sup>. This finding can

---

<sup>2</sup>Based on classrooms observations and online questionnaires (The participants completed the questionnaire at the start of the online course (Pre-assessment) and again at the end (Post-assessment)). For more information on data collection tools, please see page 41.

contribute to explain the slight changes in classroom behaviours reported by students.

***Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course?***

- As a group, only the participants in Antigua and Barbuda and St. Lucia showed significant positive changes in their democratic beliefs over the duration of the course.
- As individuals, only participants from Trinidad and Tobago showed significant positive changes on all three dimensions of democratic beliefs (Equality, Freedom and Justice) over the duration of the course. Participants from Antigua and Barbuda showed changes on two dimensions (Equality and Freedom), as did Grenada (Freedom and Justice).
- On the scenarios<sup>3</sup> designed to gauge practices and valuing of democratic ideals, participants demonstrated significant positive changes on all the three dimensions of democratic beliefs (Equality, Freedom and Justice) over the duration of the course.
- Even though the classroom practices of some participants prior to enrolling in the course may have reflected democratic values and principles, being a part of the course renewed commitment to upholding these values and principles.<sup>4</sup>
- For some participants, there was a positive change in the way they viewed their students and how they interacted with them.

---

<sup>3</sup> These scenarios were designed to assess the practices of the participants in situations in which democratic values should operate, as well as gauge their reaction to practices that do not reflect democratic ideals. For further information on how these scenarios were set, please see page 69.

<sup>4</sup> Based on online questionnaires for the course participants, administered at the start and end of the online component of the EDCC course, and on questionnaires for students, also administered at the start and end of the online course. For more information on data collection tools, please see page 61.

- Based on the comments from the participants, there were some positive changes in students who were part of classrooms in which participants applied the democratic principles and values to which they were exposed.

### ***Recommendations***

- The volume of the course content should be reviewed and edited down to make it more manageable for participants.
- **Future offering of this course should focus more on helping teachers to acquire skills at classroom management strategies that promote student involvement in an orderly manner.**
- **The participants were generally new to this mode of learning.** if the course is being offered online in the future, online tutors should provide participants with more support to facilitate their involvement in activities that require the participation in virtual discussions and debates, chats (with colleagues and/or tutors), etc.
- Consideration should be given to the requests for some synchronous sessions or instructional videos to be incorporated into the course.
- Consideration should also be given to providing more on-the-ground support for participants, especially during the practicum.

# Evaluation Report

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In August 2005, Ministers of Education of OAS member states adopted the Inter-American Program on Education for Democratic Values and Practices. The main objective of this program is to promote the development of a democratic culture through education. One of the means identified for doing this is through professional development for teachers. In relation to this, the *Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean* (EDCC) project emerged. This 3-year project, aimed at the English-speaking Caribbean, was implemented online through the University of the West Indies Open Campus. Its main objectives are:

- To enhance the capacity of primary and secondary school teachers in the English-speaking Caribbean to incorporate democratic values and practices into their classroom practices; and
- To inform development and implementation of regional and national policies in the English-speaking Caribbean relating to democratic citizenship education.

The EDCC project was designed to be implemented in two phases, with two cohorts of participants. The first cohort ran from February to July 2009, and involved participants from five countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago. The second cohort of participants started the course in September 2009. The second cohort included participants from the five original countries plus a sixth country, Belize. The second cohort concluded in May 2010.

## **1.1 The Context**

The English-speaking Caribbean consists of independent island states (Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago), British Dependencies (Anguilla, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Montserrat, Turks and Caicos Islands), Belize in Central America and Guyana in South America. Apart from sharing a geographical area and a common official language, many of these countries also share a common history, one that includes slavery and colonization by the British.

As a consequence of its history, the education system in the English-speaking Caribbean is predominantly based on the British system. Despite the fact that education is held in high esteem in the region, there have been some concerns recently about what transpires in the classroom. For example, there is concern that the teacher-dominated nature of Caribbean classrooms is a possible contributor to the passiveness of young people in the society. Social observers are suggesting that the perceived disconnect from society that young people are exhibiting may be linked to the manner in which they are educated and trained. Some of the conditions that are noted as perpetuating this situation include a heavily academic curriculum that promotes the alienation of students who are not strong academically; teaching methods that do not allow for significant input from the students; and growing intolerance for and/or indifference to people who are different from the majority. Social and political commentators point to a certain level of apathy, lack of interest and participation and the concomitant rise in violence among young people as a major consequence of this state of affairs in schools. It is in this setting that the Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean was introduced.

Along with the situation mentioned above, other recent developments in education trends in the Caribbean must be noted. For example, in the first decade of this twenty-first century, the notion of universal secondary education came to the fore. While this service was available in several of the countries in the region since the 1970s (e.g. Barbados and St. Kitts / Nevis), it was only

recently that other countries (e.g. St. Lucia, Dominica, St. Vincent & the Grenadines) followed suit. In response to this development, teacher education programmes have been revised to move teachers away from the teacher-centred approaches traditionally present in classroom to more student-sensitive ones. Thus, for example, training programmes coordinated by the Eastern Caribbean Joint Board of Teacher Education, the body responsible for teacher education in Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean, now expose teachers to methods and strategies for dealing with diversity in the classroom, for integrating technology in teaching and learning and for fostering cooperation rather than competition in the classroom among other things. Teachers are trained for example, to take students' interests into consideration when planning for instruction; to allow students to make choices of reading material; to use assessment approaches that would allow students with reading and language difficulties to experience a measure of success; to deal respectfully with all students and to encourage their students to deal respectfully with each other.

The idea is for teachers to provide high quality of instruction for all students whatever their individual characteristics. Though this trend in teacher education is still relatively new, some previously trained teachers were exposed to the approaches and strategies in workshops and other staff development activities.

#### 1.1.1 Democratic principles and ideals in the classrooms

The concept of democracy is not foreign to the countries of the region. Indeed, many of them champion democracy and at home and abroad. But in the face of current societal trends, it begs the question as to the extent to which the values and ideals of democratic behavior are being passed on to younger members of society. Since the school is one of the primary agents of socialization, an examination of some of the documents in which educational programmes are outlined were examined to determine the extent to which they espoused democratic principles and ideals.

Such documents were obtained from three of the countries that were included in the EDCC project: Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and St. Lucia. Similar documents were requested from the Ministries of Education in the other three countries, but none were submitted. The documents submitted provide some information relating to the extent to which citizenship and democratic principles are present.

### Antigua and Barbuda

There is a revised version of the 2009 Social Studies Curriculum that is captioned *Social Studies Education for Democratic Citizenship: K-9 Front Matter, Definitions, Lesson Plans*. In outlining the underlying reasons for preparing the Social Studies curriculum that promotes Education for Democratic Citizenship, the document states:

*First, in Antigua and Barbuda we live in a Democratic state, independent from Britain since 1981. Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC) would mean that the main outcome of schooling should be citizens with civic consciousness; not only equipped with knowledge but having the ability to demonstrate skills appropriate to such a citizen, who also exhibit democratic values. Second, there appears to be a democratic deficit. A high percentage of individuals do not vote or even show much interest in politics. EDC should help to improve individuals' levels of understanding of their lives and how they interact within society. Third, there was an upsurge of crime and violence in 2004. Of particular interest are the negative activities among the youth (which might be compounded by low value of self). These include school violence, drug related violence, increases in cases of HIV/AIDS, home invasions coupled with robbery and rape, murders and other gun related crimes. Fourth, surge in immigration of Caribbean neighbours and an influx of other immigrants, from as far as China. This has opened up the avenue for the focus on themes such as civic ideals and practices, identity, traditions, multiculturalism, cultural diversity and tolerance. All citizens need to tolerate peoples coming from other places, and also tolerate their differences. (p. 2)*

Through the document, references are made to education for democratic citizenship. Efforts are made to promote ideas and concepts relating to this theme. The individual programs for the different grade levels make no reference to democratic citizenship.

## St. Lucia

In the document titled *Social Science Curriculum for Lower Secondary Schools, Forms 1, 2 & 3*, there is a Module, GOVERNMENT AND CITIZENSHIP, to be delivered at the Form 2 level in the second term. The last three of the thirteen listed specific objectives state: **Identify some basic human rights of St. Lucians; Define what is meant by “Good Citizenship”;** and **List examples of good citizenship.** The other ten objectives relate to government. In terms of content, mention of democratic ideas is mainly in connection with forms of government. However, in the set of Teachers’ Resources, information is given under the caption “What is Social Studies” by Judith Gold. The curriculum users are given the following information:

*Like classroom life itself, Social Studies is a powerful arena for preparing children to live as citizens in a democracy. The skills and attitudes they will need are most effectively learned by being part of a democratic classroom where they have the opportunity to participate in making decisions, learn to work collaboratively, listen to each other’s ideas, and come to respect different points of view. Social studies provide many opportunities for this kind of working with others. (p. 67)*

## Grenada

In the Curriculum Policy Summary document for Grenada, while no specific mention is made of education for democratic citizenship, some democratic principles and values are discernible. For example, in discussing the *Ideal Grenadian*, values of tolerance of diversity (e.g. in ethnicity and religion) is mentioned. Furthermore, in describing the characteristics of the teacher, the document identifies catering to diversity as a desirable trait. The examples from Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and St. Lucia suggest that concepts relating to education for democratic citizenship are incorporated to varying degrees into the curricula of Caribbean countries. What is evident from the examination of these documents is that citizenship education and democratic values and principles are associated primarily with Social Studies and the Social Sciences subjects. None of the countries submitted documents related

to other subject areas in which reference is made to promoting democratic values and principles in the classroom. Thus, it is apparent that students may simply be learning *about* democratic principles rather than learning in an environment in which they are practiced, and consequently learning how to incorporate these ideas into their way of living and thinking. The value of the EDCC course then lies in the fact that teachers from any subject area can participate and can learn how to promote values and principles associated with democratic citizenship in their classrooms.

## **1.2 The Course**

The EDCC course had two components:

- The first component took the form of an online program of instruction in which participants explored their own democratic values and principles, and developed knowledge, skills and methods to support a democratic environment for thought and discussion in their curriculum area. Participants completed the online component and required activities with the support of a tutor. The course consisted of four units of instruction, with readings, assignments, forums for discussion among participants, and guidelines for assessment. Assessment for this component included written papers, journal keeping and participation in online discussions. Participation during this component was asynchronous, and was supplemented by off-line activities for the participants. The second component of the course involved voluntary practical work experience, for which the participants were afforded the opportunity to practice what they learned during the online component. This involved either using what was learned during the online component to plan and teach lessons in which democratic ideals and principles are incorporated or work with colleagues at their schools to explore the use of democratic values and principles in their classrooms.<sup>5</sup> The participants in the practicum were

---

<sup>5</sup> Williams, D. (2010). *Report on the "Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean: A Distance Course for Educators" Project*. Project Coordinator's Report.

to be supported by appropriate mentors/tutors. The implementation plan recommended that, ideally, mentoring should be done at a distance.

The Project Coordinator's record indicates that for the two cohorts that were involved in the online course, 262 participants were enrolled, 112 (43%) completed the online component and 92 (35%) finished the practicum.

## **2. PROJECT EVALUATION**

The project evaluation is to determine the extent to which the EDCC program achieved its stated goals and objectives. In order to make this determination, data were collected and analysed.

Data were collected by questionnaire, interviews, observation and document analysis. Data were also mined from the course's online site. Data sources include the course planners and implementers, the participants, their technical and content supporters, their students. Educational policy documents and other curriculum documents were also examined.

This paper reports the findings from data collected for the two cohorts of participants. The data collected were analysed to seek answers to the following questions:

- **To what extent was the course implemented as intended?**
- **What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course?**
- **To what extent was the online course material used by the course participants?**
- **To what extent did the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?**
- **Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course?**

These findings can be useful in determining the impact of the course and in making decisions about its continuation.

## **2.1 METHODOLOGY**

This research is designed to investigate both the *process* of implementing the program and the *product* (the outcomes). Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analysed for the investigation.

### **2.1.1 Data Collection Tools**

A number of tools were used to collect data. These include:

- Online questionnaires for the course participants;
- Questionnaires for students,
- An observation tool
- Interview schedules.

The themes included in these instruments were extracted from literature (e.g. Kesici, 2008; Shechman, 2002; Mappiasse, 2006) that explained behaviours, activities and beliefs that are fostered in classrooms in which democratic ideals are being implemented.

#### Online Questionnaire

Data were collected from the participants by means of an online questionnaire distributed via Survey Monkey<sup>6</sup>. This questionnaire was constructed by the evaluators and was designed to determine views, perceptions, and classroom practices of the course participants in relation to democratic principle and values and their application in their classrooms. It contained 4 sections.

- **Section 1 collected demographic data (e.g. personal information, teaching experience)**

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com)

- **Section 2 provided 9 scenarios that reflected the themes of equality, freedom and justice.** These three themes emerged from the literature consulted (e.g. Kesici, 2008) as ideals basic to democratic thought. The participants were asked to indicate what action they would take or to state their view of the situation. These scenarios were designed to gauge the respondents' awareness of classroom/school behaviours that conform to democratic values and ideals. The participants' responses were scored on a scale from 1 (Does not reflect democratic ideals at all) to 5 (Definitely reflects democratic ideals). Two sets of scenarios were compiled: one set was included on the questionnaire administered at the start of the course and the other set were included on the one administered at the end. There were 2 scenarios common to the two sets.
- **Section 3 consists of 24 approaches and activities that are included in the course outline as being desirable in a democratic classroom.** The participants were asked to indicate the frequency with which they used these approaches and activities in their classrooms in the period prior to the administration of the instrument. The options were Never; Seldom (1 – 3 times); Sometimes (4 – 6 times); Often (7 or more times). These items were used to gauge the extent to which the participants incorporated into their practice activities that reflect democratic values and ideals.
- **Section 4 contained 33 statements reflecting beliefs held about issues related to teaching and learning situations.** This section of the instrument was adapted from the 34-item Democratic Teacher Belief Scale developed by Shechtman (2002). Adaptations included modifying the statement '*Arab students are low achievers, especially in math*' to read '*Students who live in government housing schemes are low achievers, especially in math*'.

The statement *‘Students of Asian-African origin have more difficulties in science than their Western counterparts’* was modified to read *‘Students from the other Caribbean territories have more difficulties in science than those from this country’*, but was eventually removed from the scale after piloting. These modifications maintained the intent of the items while making them more relevant to the intended participants. The participants were asked to indicate on the five-point Likert scale, the extent to which they agreed with each statement. The statements on the Belief Scale reflect the ideals of Freedom (15 items), Justice (7 items) and Equality (11 items).

The link to the questionnaire was sent to each participant using the email addresses provided by the local Ministries of Education.

The participants completed the instrument at the start of the course and again after completing the online component. Data from these questionnaires were used to obtain a sense of the participants’ knowledge, behaviours and beliefs in relation to democratic ideals in the classroom, and to determine the extent to which these changed over the duration of the course.

Data from this questionnaire were compiled in EXCEL and SPSS databases for analysis.

### Classroom Observation Tool

In order to assess the activities of the participants, an observation instrument was constructed by the evaluators, again based on the behaviours identified by the literature. This 17-item instrument was divided into 2 parts: Part A (2 items) rated the participant’s plans for the lesson to be observed, noting the extent to which these plans reflected democratic ideals; Part B (15 items) rated the classroom interactions between the participant and the students as well as participation among the students.

The instrument aimed to assess evidence of ideals such as respect, freedom and tolerance. In addition to this, the instrument was designed to not only record the presence of the characteristic sought, but also to rate each of these on a scale from 1 (No evidence of the characteristic) to 4 (characteristic present and excellently displayed).

Data from the observation tool were used to identify the frequency of certain behaviours in the classrooms of course participants.

### Students' Beliefs and Perceptions of Classroom Behaviours Questionnaire

The Students' Beliefs and Perceptions of Classroom Behaviours instrument was used to collect data from students of participants of the course. This tool contained three sections:

- **Section 1: contained 20 items about classroom behaviours.**

The students were required to indicate whether each statement was true or false, based on their perceptions of what occurs in the classrooms of the participant. Examples of the statements include

*I feel free to share my ideas in class.*

*The teacher is usually fair when disciplining children in the classroom.*

*The teacher deals with all the children in the classroom with care and respect.*

- **Section 2: contained 9 items designed to gauge the students' beliefs relating to issues of democracy.** The students were required to either agree or disagree with each statement. Examples of the statements are:

*Children who come from other countries to live in ours should have the same rights as all the other children.*

*All students should be made to attend morning worship in the school hall, no matter what their religion is.*

- **Section 3: collected demographic data.**

As was mentioned earlier, the instrument was administered to students being taught by course participants. Students were advised to think of the classrooms of these teachers as they completed the questionnaire. The instrument was administered to the students in the absence of the course participant.

### Exit Course Evaluation Questionnaire

On completion of the component of the course, exiting participants were requested to complete a questionnaire designed to get feedback about their experiences as course participants. Questionnaire items focused on their perceptions of the course resources, the support they received from the technical team as well as their e-tutors. These data were used to help tell the story of the challenges and successes of the course participants. This instrument was created by the course designers and was administered on the course site at the end of the online component.

### Interview Schedule

An interview schedule for semi-structures interviews was developed to collect data from course participants in relation to their perceptions and experiences of the course. Questions related to their perceptions of the course material, the support that they received, and their challenges and successes for the online component as well as the practicum.

### Drop Outs Questionnaire

A short questionnaire was prepared and administered via Survey Monkey to participants who dropped out of the course. This questionnaire, designed by the evaluators, aimed to get a sense of the reasons why these individuals left the course prematurely.

Data collection tools are presented in Appendices 1 to 4.

### **2.1.2 Sources of Data**

Data for this study were collected from several sources, including interviews, questionnaires, classroom observations, review of curriculum materials and course site.

#### Course Participants

Data were collected from participants of the two cohorts of participants of the course. Fifty (50) participants were initially enrolled for the first cohort and 212 for the second. Participants were primarily primary and secondary school teachers, though, especially for the first cohort, there were also participants from tertiary level institutions and within the Ministries of Education (Education Officers). Participants were located in six (6) countries across the region. Table 1 shows the distribution of the participants across institution levels and countries.

Table 1: No. of Participants Initially Enrolled in the EDCC Course for Each Cohort, by Country

<b>Country</b>	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	TOTAL
Antigua & Barbuda	8	21	29
Belize	-	02	02
Grenada	9	44	53
Jamaica	13	47	60
St. Lucia	10	34	44
Trinidad and Tobago	10	64	74
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>262</b>

Of the 50 participants from the first cohort, 39 submitted the pre-assessment questionnaire that was administered at the start of the course but only 36 (72%) were filled out and 11 submitted the post-assessment instrument administered at the end of the instructional period but before the start of the teaching practicum, but only 9 (18%) were completed. From the 212 registered for the second cohort, 153 submitted the pre-assessment questionnaire but only 140 (66%) completed it, while 66 submitted the post-assessment

instrument, but only 55 (26%) were completed. The fall in the proportion of the participants who responded on the Post Assessment may be attributable to fact that, for reasons that are presented later, some participants left the course before finishing it. A breakdown of the participants who submitted the online questionnaire by country is shown in Table 2 below. Comprehensive profiles of the participants who completed these instruments by cohort and country can be found in Appendix 5.

Eleven (22%) participants from Cohort 1 completed the Exit Course Evaluation Questionnaire<sup>7</sup>. Fifty-nine (28%) of them also completed the Exit Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Since the Exit Course Evaluation Questionnaire did not collect demographics, profiles for these two samples were unavailable.

Table 2: Percentage of Each Cohort that Responded to the Online Questionnaire by COUNTRY

Country	Cohort 1		Cohort 2	
	Pre-Assessment	Post-Assessment	Pre-Assessment	Post-Assessment
Antigua & Barbuda	50	13	90	43
Belize	-	-	100	100
Grenada	100	44	55	16
Jamaica	69	0	49	13
St. Lucia	90	30	68	38
Trinidad and Tobago	50	10	70	28
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>26</b>

Apart from the questionnaires, data were also collected by means of interviews. Thirty-five (35) participants (15 from Antigua, 4 from Jamaica and 16 from St. Lucia) were interviewed by members of the evaluation team during visits for observation purposes. No visits were made to Belize, Grenada or Trinidad and Tobago (The next section offers more information).

<sup>7</sup> These instruments are discussed later.

## Classrooms

The course participants were expected to incorporate the knowledge and skills that they acquired during the online component into their classroom teaching and practice. In order to gauge the extent to which this was done, data were collected by observation in their classrooms. One hundred and ninety-seven (197) classrooms observations were conducted: 16% were with participants from Cohort 1 and 84% from Cohort 2. The breakdown of number of classrooms observed across both cohorts by country is shown below in Table 3.

Table 3: No. of Classroom Observations Conducted by Country

Country	No. of Participants in Observed	No. of Classrooms Observed		
		By Locals	By Evaluators	TOTAL
Antigua And Barbuda	30	24	11	35
Grenada	22	38	0	38
St. Lucia	35	26	10	36
Trinidad and Tobago	36	77	0	77
Jamaica	5	0	5	5
Belize	2	6	0	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>197</b>

The original plan was for local assessors to visit each participant in his or her classroom at least three times during the practicum period so that the stability of their practices could be determined. A sample of the participants was also to be seen by members of the evaluation team. Constraints of time, available personnel and variations in school activities interfered with this intention. Consequently, participants were observed 1 to 3 times as the above constraints allowed.

Observations were carried out by personnel from the local Ministries of Education and by independent members of the project evaluation team. The evaluation team observed participants in Antigua and Barbuda, Jamaica and St. Lucia. Budgeting and other constraints did not allow for visits to all six countries involved in the project. The three countries visited therefore represent a sample of those involved in the project. Visits to classrooms in Grenada and

Trinidad and Tobago could not be facilitated due to scheduling difficulties. For example, schools in these countries were involved with events such as end of term examinations and schools' athletics. No visits were planned for Belize since there were only two participants from that country and such a visit would not have been cost effective.

Though some of the participants were observed more than once, each observation was taken as an independent record of behaviour within a classroom.

### Students of the Participants of the Course

Data were also collected by questionnaire from the 2240 students (612 from Cohort 1 and 1628 from Cohort 2) who were being taught by the participants near the start of the course. The breakdown by country is shown below in Table 4.

Table 4: Breakdown of the Countries of Origin of Students who Completed the Questionnaire at the **START** of the Course by Cohort

COUNTRY	COHORT		TOTAL
	First	Second	
Antigua & Barbuda	0	219	219
Belize	-	73	73
Grenada	182	309	491
Jamaica	0	146	146
St. Lucia	209	343	552
Trinidad and Tobago	221	538	759
	612	1628	2240

The student questionnaire was not administered in Antigua and Barbuda for the first cohort since the course participants in this country were not classroom teachers. Student questionnaires were also sent to be administered in Jamaica for the first cohort of participants, but due to unforeseen circumstances, including the departure of the original coordinator in that country and challenges in identifying supervisors, these questionnaires were not administered.

The Student Questionnaire was also used to collect from 775 students in St. Lucia (312) and Trinidad and Tobago (463) at the end of the online component. These were the only two countries that administered the Students Questionnaire at this time. The other countries experienced some challenges in getting the questionnaires to the students, since as mentioned earlier, unlike the participants' questionnaire which was administered online, the Student Questionnaire was administered face to face by Ministry Officers. At the end of the online component when the questionnaire was to be re-administered, many of these officials were engaged in other activities related to their posts.

Thus, only these two countries, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago, administered the questionnaire at the start and at the end of the online component of the course. The students who completed the questionnaire at the end of the course are not included in the frequencies in Table 3 above. These data were only used to investigate changes in student perspectives in the two countries involved. The profile of that sample is given later at the point where that analysis is presented.

### Course Site

Data were mined from the course website administered by the University of the West Indies (UWI) Open Campus. This site was examined to provide data relating to the nature and organisation of the course content, as well as the activities of the course coordinator, the e-tutors and the course participants tutors. From the site, data relating to the activities of the e-tutors and the participants were gathered.

### **2.1.3 Data Analysis**

Both quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures were used. The data collected were compiled in EXCEL or WORD files. Numerical data were also compiled in databases using Predictive Analysis Software (PASW, formerly SPSS) for statistical analysis. Qualitative data were examined for common themes, patterns and trends.

### **3. FINDINGS**

In this section, the findings in relation to the various research questions will be presented. The findings will be presented according to the research questions.

#### ***3.1 To what extent was the EDCC program implemented as intended?***

In order to answer this question, data from the program documents and from the course site were examined. Data from the participants' questionnaires and interviews were also consulted. Areas investigated included the available instructional material, provisions for communication between participants and e-tutors, the technological environment and the provision of "on-the-ground" support for the participants (technological and content).

#### Instructional Material

According to the document in which the plans for the course are articulated, participants were to be exposed to four units of work to be covered over the period of study. A visit to the course site revealed that students had access to and visited content units as follows:

Unit 1: Democratic Foundations & Caribbean Citizenship Development

Unit 2: Teacher and Student Behaviour in the Classroom

Unit 3: Teaching Strategies and Approaches

Unit 4: Professional Reflection and Assessment

The content of these units was in keeping with the nature of the course. Each unit of study was accompanied by supporting resources. For example, each unit was divided into several lessons; each one with accompanying readings. There were also general readings related to the topic of the unit. Activities and assignments were also included. For Unit 1, there was an assessment rubric for the assignment associated with that unit. The designers of the course

provided a good selection of content and a range of supporting resources for the course participants.

In order to ascertain the participants' perceptions, those who were interviewed were asked what they thought of the course content that was provided. Their comments revealed that there was a range of views. These comments include:

“It was very informative. It consolidated my values and principles. It helped me [to] teach life-skills and social skills. It strengthened my view to that type of behaviour. My one concern is that it was too much to read, write, discuss and do my job at the same time.”  
[Participant from St. Lucia]

“I was overwhelmed at first. It was a struggle at first to find out what were my key areas of focus. The first unit was based on Social Science and it was challenging. When we got into the education bit the course got better. The material was generally sound.” [Participant from St. Lucia]

“It was satisfactory, very useful for what I had to do. It was a lot of reading but relevant and adequate for completing assignment. Some of the links did not open up.” [Participant from Antigua & Barbuda]

The comments above were typical of those made by the interviewees. Of note is the fact that they felt that the course material was relevant, informative and sound. However, while the general consensus was the quality of the resources provided was excellent, it was apparent that initially, the quantity was somewhat overwhelming for some participants. Despite this initial concern, participants who continued in the programme found the content interesting and valuable. It can therefore be concluded that the chosen content was appropriate and adequate for the course.

## Provisions for communication between participants and tutors

The ability to communicate with their tutors is a valuable contributor to the success of an online course. In the implementation plan, the OAS team indicated that e-tutors would be available to work with the participants. These e-tutors would be in contact with the participants by means of electronic technology, specifically via the Internet. For the first cohort of 51 participants, two e-tutors were provided, while for the second cohort (250 participants), 10 were provided. This was in keeping with the project implementation plan, and represented a student to tutor ratio of 1 to 25. However, since there was some attrition among participants, the e-tutors worked with fewer than this number.

To facilitate communication between the e-tutors and the participants as well as among participants, discussion forums were created. Some of these forums facilitated discussion of general topics; others were dedicated to discussion of specific course content. For example, general forums included

- a **Tutor-Student-Exchange Forum** where tutors and participants discussed “items related to the the course and other issues related to the domain of study”;
- a **Class Cafe and Student Notice Board** which was a Cyber Lounge and Class Cafe or virtual class café. Participants were encouraged to discuss in this space, issues that bear no direct relevance to the Unit forum discussions.

Unit related discussion forums included

- **Lesson 1.1 Discussion - Definition of Democracy**, where there was discussion about the definition of democracy.
- **Lesson 2.2 Discussion - Creating a Democratic Classroom**, where issues related to the creation of democratic classrooms were discussed.

The presence of the e-tutors was evident in the various forums (see Table 2 below), and based on the comments of the course participants, interaction

between e-tutors and participants and among the participants was, for the most part, satisfactory.

“I discussed a lot with other teachers taking the program online.”  
[Participant from St. Lucia]

“The e-tutor responded right away and clarified our misconceptions. The chat/forum is really helpful.” [Participant from St. Lucia]

“I had good support from e-tutor up to this time, but not a lot of support from my colleagues.” [Participant from Antigua & Barbuda]

Thus, generally, the provision of the forums for discussion was successful in many ways and provided an avenue for the course participants to interact with their e-tutors as well as with each other.

The fact that the discussions were primarily asynchronous was problematic to some of the participants. These views are captured in these comments made on the Exit survey in response to an item that asked what might be done to enhance discussion:

“The main problem was that since the discussion was not in real time, it was a bit difficult to keep the same level of interest in some of the discussions. The fact that we had to wait for responses etc, made it seem a bit artificial”. [Participant – Cohort 2]

“A forum should be provided where all students meet online at a certain time. Furthermore a video session where the e-tutor lectures to students online should be made available.” [Participant – Cohort 2]

“Live video chatting like a messenger where we can see each other/have a conference meeting.” [Participant – Cohort 1]

Some of the participants reported feeling isolated in this learning environment and suggested that discussion could have been enhanced if there were synchronous video lectures or at least a provision for all participants to be online at the same time for discussion. Some participants would have welcomed some opportunity to “meet” their colleagues and tutors online.

### Technological Environment

Apart from the support of e-tutors in relation to the course content, adequate technological support was also identified as crucial to the success of the course. Indeed, one of the prerequisites for signing up for the course was access to a computer and Internet connection. Hence, consideration was given to the technological environment that was in place to support the course.

As was mentioned earlier, the course was being offered in partnership with the UWI Open Campus. As a result, there was access to technological resources available to this institution. The online component of the course was run on the Open Campus Moodle Learning Management System. Participants had to learn to navigate this environment in order to make best use of the resources provided. There was some training for the participants to help them to acquire the needed skills. Comments made by participants during the interviews and on the Exit Survey suggest that this helped some of the participants, and they were able to access and navigate the environment after the initial problems were rectified. Reflective of these experiences are these comments made during the interviews:

“I had no problems with the site. I took some time to find my way around the site because my computer skills are not good.”  
[Participant from Antigua & Barbuda]

“I never really experienced difficulty. Every time I went on to the system things just flowed.” [Participant from St. Lucia]

Problems navigating the technological environment were linked to the technology itself and to personal characteristics of the participants. For

example, participants reported having difficulty logging on because their names were incorrectly spelt; because of poor connections (e.g. using dial-up connections and timing out due to slow connection); difficulties uploading assignments (e.g. written papers, journal entries) and insufficient space for required activities (e.g. submitting journal entries). Other challenges with the environment included the participants own lack of skills and confidence. Reflecting of these difficulties were comments such as:

“My problem was not related to the U.W.I and the site. My only problem was getting disconnected because of slow loading.”  
[Participant from Antigua & Barbuda]

“There were times when I could not get on because I was using Dial-up... Then, my computer crashed and left me stranded for a long while.” [Participant from Antigua & Barbuda]

“The technical problems I had was the use of the internet. Sometimes it would not work and caused me to be frustrated.”  
[From Exit Survey, Cohort 2]

The evidence therefore suggests that there were some environment-related issues that arose, some related to the technology and some to the competencies of the participants. For those relating to competency, at least two of the participants believed that these could have been addressed by allotting a longer period for training. Referring to the opportunity to explore the technology, one participant said during the interview:

“One week was not sufficient to learn everything.” [Participant from St. Lucia]

These personal challenges were confirmed by the Course Coordinator who reported that the participants’ lack of experience with online environments was one of the challenges faced.

The difficulties in the environment that could be fixed by the project's technical team were generally adequately addressed, but some participants were still affected by problems such as poor connectivity that were outside of the influence of the project's technical team.

### Provision for Content and Technical Support

During the online component of the course, participants received support from the course coordinator and the e-tutors. As mentioned earlier, discussion forums were set up for this purpose. An example of the interaction between the E-Tutors and the course participants is shown below.

#### **Classroom Behaviours (Discussion Initiated by Ann)**

**Ann - Tuesday, 27 October 2009, 08:45 PM**

Honestly, there were many instances when intolerance, prejudice and of course unfair treatment were displayed. First of all there has been an increase in the number of non-national students who have joined the school and for the life of me I just could not see myself giving them the best materials and furniture that are available over my native ... students. Moreover, some of these students have never been to school before 5th grade and I was convinced that I was going to teach my curriculum and nothing else so they had better come up to standards. There were also cases whereby some students, especially boys, fool around and take a very long time to understand concepts that were taught. I would sometimes have to give them a little spanking to keep them on task. After reading and studying, I realized that I was sort of unfair and prejudice and as a result I started to teach in the zone of proximal development so as to be a bit more democratic in my undertakings.

Students would usually accept students from other cultures but they were often quick to remind them that they were "foreigners". Disputes often arise but I usually deal with them in a very fair and consistent manner. I often engage my students in co-operative learning groups so that they can interact more and assist each other. They also agree to treat each other fairly and when they misbehave or step out of line I would usually ask them to think about what they did and should have done and also they are asked to state the type of punishment they think they should be given.

**E-Tutor - Wednesday, 28 October 2009, 05:05 AM**

Ann, this again brings into context the work of Marcus Garvey. Discrimination exists in many of our classrooms. Often we do it without much thought.

Do you know that our students pick up on the discrimination even before we realize that we are doing it?

How has the new approach that you chose worked so far?

**Ann - Wednesday, 28 October 2009, 08:44 AM**

Of course I know that some students pick up on discrimination and some of them tend to be very reserved in class. For the new strategies, my students are more motivated and united and this has motivated me to want to teach them to learn. They are also more eager to participate in classroom activities and as a result I am often challenged to find activities to keep up with them but that is democracy at work.

**E-Tutor - Thursday, 29 October 2009, 06:01 AM**

It is good to know that your new approach has motivated both you and your students. As they become more motivated and participate more you as the teacher will learn a lot more from them and will find that the teaching-learning becomes more meaningful.

**Betty - Sunday, 1 November 2009, 11:07 AM**

I find that despite many approaches some students simply cannot be motivated. How do teachers deal with that? Some students from (the) inner city ... will tell you that they do not see the purpose of an education because even if they acquire it they cannot get a job because of their "Address". People will simply not hire them.

**E-Tutor - Monday, 2 November 2009, 04:45 AM**

Motivation comes in many forms. If what we are doing is not motivating them then we need to find what motivates them. Education should not just be seen as a means of getting a job. It is a form of empowerment. Knowledge is power. It allows us to get out of our box. We should look at the global benefits of education.

DCE should help with the motivation that you are looking for. If the students have developed positive character, acquired citizenship skills and gained the knowledge required for the jobs then they should be able to get employed. They need to develop negotiation skills and skills required to market themselves.

**Ann- Monday, 2 November 2009, 07:35 AM**

I can see your point Betty. I often have students, especially boys, who would fail to become motivated to do school work... Some teachers are so fed up they ignore them and wonder as to what else they can do in order to motivate these students... I see that we are having a serious problem trying to motivate students like these.

**E-Tutor - Tuesday, 3 November 2009, 04:30 AM**

Do your schools offer skills (technical subjects) and extracurricular activities that those boys can engage in? Maybe this would be more meaningful to them than the normal academics, the main objective of which is to get results from external exams.

**Ann - Tuesday, 3 November 2009, 06:22 AM:**

My school has a technical and vocational centre but guess what it has become obsolete. When it used to be in operation, there were hardly materials available for them to work with and this sort of demotivated the students so much so that the teacher had problems with them not attending classes. I marked Common Entrance Social Studies Examination for the past 4 years and it is becoming an easier task because some students who are unable to read just write their ID numbers on the paper and nothing else. It is sad but it is the fact.

**E-Tutor Wednesday, 4 November 2009, 04:09 AM**

Ann, this seems to be a problem all over. It is sad that pupils go through the entire primary system and the secondary system and leave with only the basic literacy and numeracy skills.

Who do you think is responsible for this?

How can the schools reverse this trend?

**Ann - Wednesday, 4 November 2009, 03:22 PM**

I think that the system is partly responsible for this and as teachers some of us are to be blamed. Time after time we teach all students the same way despite their learning styles and expect to get results... There are some teachers who may not be good at a particular subject area or a particular topic and because of pride we do not ask those who have the knowledge for any assistance. Instead we neglect the topic or subject and the students are the ones who suffer in the end. To reverse the trend, we need to work together as teachers in our respective schools and ask for help when we need it so that we can adequately cater to the educational needs of our students. Trust me, it is the fault of the parents not carrying out their responsibilities but in the same vain we have to look at ourselves as teachers and do whatever it takes to get the students to the level we want them to be when they are in our care. There are some parents who would not be able to assist their children at home because of reasons beyond their control. However, someone has to fill this gap and if it means that we are going to fore go some of our break and lunch time to assist these children, we have to do something because in the end we all want our students to succeed

**E-Tutor Wednesday, 4 November 2009, 05:25 PM**

I think the school has a major role in this. Many parents are themselves ... unable to assist the child.

1. Should a student be promoted to a higher grade if he/she is unable to master the minimum competency for the lower grade?
2. Do we as teachers cater for the learning styles and needs of all those pupils?
3. What are the measures that your school has in place to help pupils meet the basic requirements for their grade level?
4. When those children fail should it be a reflection of the home or the teachers?
5. Are we employed to teach "curriculum" or children?
6. Are our classes student-centered or teacher centered?

These are some questions for reflection.

**Betty - Friday, 6 November 2009, 04:48 PM**

The ... educators are advocating that primary school children do not move on if they have not mastered the curriculum. They are advocating for a policy that will prevent students who cannot read from graduating from primary schools. Frankly it is very difficult to cater for multiple intelligences when we have classes of 50 and over.

**Debbie - Saturday, 7 November 2009, 12:07 AM**

As I reach this stage of discussion I feel somewhat reluctant in posting my views... I want to agree with E-Tutor's statement that the school has a role and a major one too. Yes indeed many of our parents today ... are unable to assist their children .Now at my school all the students are promoted to higher forms and most if not all are unable to master the minimum competency for the lower grades. They all want to offer CSEC

which the Ministry of Education stresses on. The students come to school not to learn, in most of the cases they are involved in delinquent acts and they disrupt classes. Here the school/the ministry have nothing in place to help these children meet the basic requirements. The Principal blames the teachers for the students' failure claiming that the teachers are not teaching above the threshold for the students to meet the above requirements for CESC. My concerns are, whether we are preparing these children to take up meaningful roles and function in society? Or we are preparing them to offer CSEC and fail entirely. With that in mind they will eventually see themselves as failure and will continue in their deviant behaviours. My Classes most of the time are teacher centered because the students are so low in their thinking, they refused to take part in discussions they rather lay their heads down on the desks and sleep. Nothing interests them. If when encourage to participate they end up speaking vulgar things which leads to disrespect to peers as well as teachers. Do we still as teachers be blamed for this downfall?

**E-Tutor - Saturday, 7 November 2009, 09:32 AM**

There is no need for you to feel reluctant. The discussions will help you with ideas and maybe even present solutions to your problems.

I know the situation which exists at your school. My proposal would be for your school to focus on literacy and numeracy in the first two forms. Develop a strong, comprehensive literacy and numeracy programme that will give the students the basics that they require to function at a secondary level.

I do not believe that your school is ready to go the CSEC or CCSLC route as a whole school. There will be a few that can be taken that way but the majority of the students are not prepared for that.

For now you should focus on developing their literacy and numeracy, their self esteem (through HFLE, DCE, Character Building and Social skills).

**Debbie - Saturday, 7 November 2009, 02:34 PM**

Thank you for the encouragement. Yes I agree with you that the students as a whole are not fully prepare for both exams. The teachers shared the same views but the Principal is a very head strong individual, lacking in a few of the democratic principles. For the time being I will try my best to do what I can do to help the students who need the help while I am there.

**Eve - Saturday, 7 November 2009, 07:16 PM**

Ann, I do agree with you that the system is partly responsible and some teachers are really to blame. But since we are on the topic of democracy, I would like to say that maybe teachers should be given a chance to choose the level and subjects that they are most comfortable teaching. Too many times teachers are placed where they are not comfortable and they are expected to perform well. This can be very frustrating, especially when the teachers were not trained how to teach children with varying abilities and teaching styles.

**E-Tutor - Tuesday, 10 November 2009, 05:41 PM**

Eve, you noted that the teachers needs to feel comfortable. While I agree with you we need to be careful that we do not make the teacher the focus of education when it should be the student.

Secondly you said that teachers are not trained to deal with students of different learning styles and those with varying abilities. Too often, teachers wait of their

Ministries of Education to give them knowledge that they, the teachers, can obtain on their own. We need to always be proactive and keep ourselves up to date with the new information and research that is being done out there.

**Ann - Wednesday, 11 November 2009, 06:40 AM**

I am definitely in agreement with your points made. Some Teachers in my opinion are too comfortable and need to be removed from their comfort zone so that they can learn about the new trends in education. Time after time too many of us sit on our laurels and just depend on the class textbooks for the little information in them instead of engaging in meaningful research to find activities that will challenge our students. If we are going to allow teachers to choose the subjects that they want to teach, trust me, we would not have any Language Arts or Reading Teachers. This is a subject that is feared by many teachers and I believe that is one of the major reasons why some of our students are not reading (comprehending) or are unable to write compositions or engage in critical thinking. As you rightly said we need to be proactive. We need to go out there and seek opportunities that are available to aid in our professional development.

This exchange was initiated by Ann who was responding to the stimulus *“Reflect on your own classroom behaviours/interactions, and honestly identify any instances of intolerance, unfair treatment, prejudice, etc. and consider how to establish a mechanism for resolving disputes/conflict, and improving the social life of the group”*. The discussion, led by the E-Tutor, caused the participants to examine not only their classroom practices, but also factors that influence these practices, with a view to seeking solutions for those situations that impede the application democratic values and practices in the classroom.

Of note is that the forums were not only for discussion of course content. There were also areas for discussion of non-course related topics. Course participants could support each other emotionally as well as academically. An example of such interaction is shown below.

**TOPIC: Hey everyone smile. [Initiated by Participant A]**

**Participant A:** Yes, smile. We're getting there. We've made it thus far. Let's try and finish the course.

**Participant B:** YEP. WE ARE! WE WILL! WE CAN!

**E-Tutor:** Thank you [Participants A and B] for the motivational words. My wish is that we all make it to the end. I am concerned about [Participants C, D and E]. I am hoping that they will join us soon.

**Participant A:** Yes [e-Tutor], I have already sent out a SOS for [Participants E] and am now doing so for the others. HEY GUYS DON'T GIVE UP NOW. HANG IN THERE. WE ARE IN THIS TOGETHER. LET US KNOW HOW WE CAN HELP.

Apart from support from the course coordinator and e-tutors during the online component of the course, participants were also to receive support during the practicum component of the course. According to the implementation plan, “there should be at least one tutor/mentor located in the participating countries<sup>8</sup>. Indications are that the first cohort of participants who moved on to the practicum component of the course did so with little or no support. Indeed, in her report in relation to the first cohort, the Course Coordinator referred to this aspect of the course as “a disappointment” and recommended that “on-site/island supervisors become involved during the practicum.” She added that there was no way to verify that the practicum took place as reported by the participants in their reports.

For the second cohort, mentors/tutors were appointed to support the participants, and based on the comments from the respondents, they provided various levels of support. For example, of the 35 participants interviewed, only 13 (9 from St. Lucia and 4 from Antigua and Barbuda) reported receiving support during the practicum. In the case of the participants from Antigua and Barbuda, the support generally came from e-tutors, coordinator and mentors in different countries. Of note is that none of the participants from Jamaica had been seen or assisted by anyone. In fact, one of them reported to the interviewer who had done a classroom observation prior to the interview that he was the first and only one to have visited her classroom up to that point (this was very near the end of the practicum period). Thus, it is apparent that some of the participants who moved into the practicum might not have had the on-the-ground support that they needed to successfully complete the practicum.

In relation to technical support, participants and others working with the online course received technical support from the UWI Open Campus Learning Support Supervisor and his team. Participants reported technical difficulties such as inability to log on to the course site; inability to upload assignments;

---

<sup>8</sup> OAS Democracy Programme Implementation Plan – Version 2 for the Course Delivery Phase, p.2

and in a few cases, inability to access the resources on the site. In almost every case, participants reported that they were ably assisted by the technical UWI Open Campus team. In at least two cases, technical support came from the course coordinator. Two participants reported seeking technical assistance from family members. There were only three instances (1 from Jamaica; 1 from Antigua and Barbuda and 1 from St. Lucia) in which participants reported inadequate response to their technical problems. Based on this evidence, it appears that the technical support that the participants received was generally good.

### The Practicum

Despite some initial challenges, evidence suggests that for the most part, the practicum experience for participants was positive. In her report, the Course Coordinator pointed out that there was a period of inactivity because of a change of Programme Coordinator at the Open Campus. According to the Academic Coordinator,

A lull was created with the departure of [the Programme Coordinator] from the programme. Queries and concerns were communicated to him but they were always passed on to the new programme coordinator. This created a doubt in the mentors mind as to whether the practicum would begin, since the new programme coordinator had not yet taken up the position. The break and change in programme coordinators and in continuity created delays in the submission of practicum proposal which was the first requirement for the practicum. The new programme coordinator seemed to have been insufficiently brief on the preparation for the project and this created further delays in the commencement of the project. ... However things finally got started and the new programme coordinator delivered. Responsibilities for mentors were created as we proceeded since the role of the mentors were never fully discussed and recorded with the outgoing programme coordinator. (Charles, 2010)

Apparently though, after these initial setbacks, the practicum sessions proceeded with some degree of success. One challenge though was to find individuals on-ground who had enough time to visit and support the

participants in the exercise. Despite this, there is evidence to suggest that participants were supported by their e-tutors online.

The success of the practicum is reflected in the comments made by some of the participants. Indeed, several of the students commented on the positive impact of the online course content on their classroom activity.

I can say without any doubt that I have developed immensely since taking this course. I do hope that it will continue so that other educators can be trained in this field. I have to confess that having done this course I have changed my position of thinking that there is little hope for the future generations. This course really gives the children a chance to become the future of our Caribbean and our world. As the principal of my school I will be forging ahead to make this concept an integral part of the culture of the school. I am so thankful that I have a colleague who also did the course with me. Together we will be making, actually we have already started to make the change possible. (*Antigua & Barbuda; Cohort 2*)

In one of the lessons the groups staged a simulation exercise which was videotaped. When ... asked whether they were all prepared for the presentation most of them were confident because they had it all planned. But they were all disappointed in the end product after they viewed the video. One of the things I learnt through this exercise is that it is important for students to be given the opportunity to systematically assess and evaluate their performance. By so doing they are better able to appreciate their strengths and their weaknesses and thus try to improve. I also can attest to the fact that there is less focus on talking and misbehaviour when students take charge of their own learning. In order words they are too busy working to find time for negative behaviour. Although the course is officially over, for me, the practicum is still on and is being practised in all my classes to a certain degree. I have not been able to put all the assessment tools in place but I hope to develop these tools little by little as the need arises. (*St. Lucia, Cohort 2*)

The students liked the fact that they can choose their group members. They also liked the fact they can select their own activities. I enjoyed watching the students work in teams and assisting the weaker ones. It was a wonderful experience. Democratic principles have taught me how to make teaching student centered rather than teacher centered. Students who were below average started to make improvements not only through my direct efforts, but also largely due to the fact that students assisted and supported their peers. (*St. Lucia, Cohort 2*)

Based on these comments, it is evident that the participants were making an effort to change the way they and their students behaved in the classroom so that their interactions better reflected the democratic values and principles to which they were exposed during the online component of the course.

### **Conclusion**

**Generally then, in answer to the question to what extent was the EDCC program implemented as intended, it can be concluded that all of the important elements identified by the course designers were present. Relevant learning material was provided; an appropriate technological environment was found, and a team of technical experts were available to the participants; and support was provided in the form of e-tutors and the course coordinator for the online component.**

### ***3.2 What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course?***

There were some conditions that facilitated the implementation of the program. For example, there is the **UWI Open Campus structure** through which the program was offered. The Open Campus provided the technology and the technical expertise to get the program online and to provide assistance to those in need. Support for this assertion was found in the data collected by means of the Exit Course Evaluation Survey conducted at the end of the online component of the program. Respondents were asked to rate the quality of the technical assistance and support provided by the Web Administrators and Site Technical Support Personnel. Of the 70 (11 from Cohort 1 and 59 from Cohort 2) participants who completed the evaluation form, 11 (16%) rated this support as excellent and 33 (47%) rated it as good. Eleven participant (16%) rated it as fair; 2 (3%) rated it as poor and 12 (17%) offered no opinion.

Another factor that facilitated the implementation of the online course is the **availability of technology in the region** in general, since access to technology such as computers and the Internet by the participants was vital. Course participants needed access to the course resources at times convenient to

them, and with a reasonable degree of efficiency. While no formal data were collected in relation to their access to computers and the Internet, an examination of the times at which participants were active on the site (often between midnight and 3 a.m.) suggests that they had access to these facilities from their homes. In addition, there were some reports of problematic Internet connections, but these were in the minority, again suggesting that Internet connections were fairly efficient. As mentioned earlier, most of the connectivity difficulties that arose for the participants were resolved satisfactorily and in a timely manner. The swift and effective responses to technical difficulties had a positive effect on the implementation of the online course, contributing to a reduction in the sources of frustration that participants could have experienced.

Apart from technical assistance and support, the program required that the participants also receive **support with the content of the course**. This support was available via the course coordinator and the online tutors. Data collected from the course site indicated that these individuals visited the site often, monitoring the various forums, posting comments and questions to the discussions areas, communicating with individual students and uploading resource materials. Table 5 shows the frequency of actions performed by the tutors and course coordinator in support of the participants of the course.

Table 5: Frequency of Various Actions by the Tutors and Coordinator of the Online Course

Action	Cohort 1			Cohort 2										
	Tutor 1	Tutor 2	Coordinator	Tutor 1	Tutor 2	Tutor 3	Tutor 4	Tutor 5	Tutor 7	Tutor 8	Tutor 9	Tutor 11	Tutor 12	Coordinator
Assignment update grades	68	104	104	36	95	87	10	53	59	24	111	39	106	0
Assignment view	17	65	119	5	226	216	24	150	112	10	120	39	114	181
Assignment view all	29	39	56	14	61	87	0	2	6	21	5	57	164	4
Assignment view submission	61	120	175	43	342	425	51	241	178	48	254	122	213	409
Blog view	3	16	26	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3	1	10	2
Course report log	0	2	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	5	31	0
Course user report	47	307	384	0	404	176	41	14	1	35	58	8	701	91
Course view	249	779	1331	25	771	611	189	502	281	207	543	336	1288	627
Discussion mark read	0	0	9	0	0	11	1	0	0	0	5	32	3	10
Forum add discussion	41	79	93	0	37	26	5	42	13	8	23	11	31	40
Forum add post	172	364	379	0	89	125	50	76	143	49	18	43	409	48
Forum mark read	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	0	7	8	5	59
Forum update post	29	88	88	0	30	23	4	93	0	5	4	5	22	11
Forum view discussion	718	1726	1886	0	856	965	189	2097	474	314	618	263	1417	251
Forum view forum	494	1305	1680	1	724	670	173	575	266	355	460	262	1281	421
Forum view forums	143	384	410	2	130	18	18	5	3	88	0	56	607	44
Journal update feedback	5	10	12	3	3	9	4	0	16	0	14	4	19	1
Journal view	0	16	27	0	12	31	0	17	47	6	40	2	19	12
Journal view all	9	35	42	2	24	42	8	1	10	5	1	16	102	3
Journal view responses	7	33	41	1	47	37	7	8	41	7	41	15	89	11
Questionnaire view	3	8	23	0	4	36	3	4	1	1	3	0	20	1
Questionnaire view all	1	3	5	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	0
Resource view	96	335	556	0	142	152	61	182	55	172	154	41	160	85
Resource view all	1	7	15	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0
User view	155	557	723	4	464	325	89	104	41	58	209	102	915	142
User view all	141	644	1212	14	712	426	104	141	118	87	256	175	590	846
<b>Total</b>	<b>2489</b>	<b>7027</b>	<b>9400</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>5177</b>	<b>4507</b>	<b>1032</b>	<b>4309</b>	<b>1867</b>	<b>1504</b>	<b>2947</b>	<b>1642</b>	<b>8339</b>	<b>3299</b>

The table reveals that generally the e-tutors frequently visited the discussion forums (Forum View Discussion), monitoring discussions, and posting comments. This interaction would have been useful to the course participants as they worked their way through the course content.

On the exit survey, respondents were asked to rate their tutor in several areas. In all cases, the majority of the participants who responded to this questionnaire rated their tutor highly. Table 6 below shows participants ratings.

Table 6: No. of Participants who Gave Various Ratings to Areas of their Tutor's Support (**n = 70**)

Areas of Support	RATINGS						
	EXCEL- LENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	VERY POOR	NOT APP /NO OPIN*	NO RESP#
The quality of the responses and information provided by the course tutor when responding to the online course discussion	30	29	6	1	0	1	3
The feedback provided by the course tutor regarding my understanding and progress in the course and on my assignments	29	30	8	1	0	1	1
Promptness of the course tutor's responses to my personal and course questions and concerns and to my submitted assignments	31	20	13	0	1	2	3
Thoroughness of the course tutor's responses to my questions and concerns	26	30	9	0	1	2	2
The quality of the guidance and instructions provided by the course coordinator throughout the course	20	43	3	0	0	1	3

\* Not Applicable / No Opinion

# No Response

Table 6 reveals that on all except one (promptness of response) of the areas of support that they offered, the e-tutors were rated as excellent or good by 80% or more of the respondents. This suggests that the majority of the participants who completed the exit questionnaire thought that the quality of the support and supervision provided by the course coordinator and e-tutors were of a high standard. This notion was supported by the comments made by the

participants who were interviewed and on the exit survey where several of the participants credited their success with the course to the course coordinator and the e-tutors.

Another factor that contributed to the successful implementation of the course was the **perceived need for such information** among the participants. Despite complaining about the volume and intensity of the content, many of the participants expressed gratitude for the exposure to the content, noting that it re-awakened in them the zeal and commitment to the positive ideals that some of them had forgotten after many challenging years in the field of teaching.

I am quite pleased to be a part of this online course and I remain committed to putting into practice the various methodologies to create student centered learning for my students. [*Cohort 1, Exit Survey*]

I would like to say that this course has opened up the window to my understanding as it relates to democracy. Although I live in a democratic country I would hear the word over and over again, but now I have a clearer understanding of what democracy is all about, my rights and responsibilities as a citizen of my country and now (I) get the opportunity to impart my knowledge to my students and other citizens. [*Cohort 1, Exit Survey*]

All in all, the course is a very good idea with a wealth of relevant information for the classroom teacher. It serves as an excellent tool for professional development and reflective practice for both the new and experienced teacher. [*Cohort 2, Exit Survey*]

It is understandable why participants will hold this view. Earlier in this document where a discussion about classroom behaviour of teachers was presented, the view was expressed that intolerance and apathy were escalating

in some classrooms. **Being exposed to this course provided teachers who experience these negative conditions with new ideas for improving interactions in the classroom. It is evident from the comments made by some of the participants that the course was successful at energising them to make a greater effort to meet the needs of the students, and by extension raise the students' drive to participate and contribute to their community, be it the classroom, the school, the immediate community or ultimately, their country.**

There were some conditions that threatened the implementation of the course. One such problem was the selection of participants. In her final report, the Project Officer indicated that in some cases, participants were nominated without their knowledge or consent. The report suggested that this had an impact on the quality of the work produced by the participants and may have even contributed to the "higher than expected rate of attrition". Efforts to determine the extent to which the selection process and other factors influenced participants' decision to discontinue the course were not very successful. A questionnaire was sent to 24 of these individuals from the first cohort, but only six (6) of them responded. Of these, only one implied that her selection might not have been her choice. She responded "*I was informed that I had to do it*" when asked why she signed up for the course. Despite the absence of evidence from the participants who dropped out of the course, there was still some indication of reasons for the attrition. In her report on the project, the Project Officer cited "(i) feeling of isolation by teachers from being in online environment; (ii) lack of incentives for teacher-participants i.e. the perception that a Certificate of Completion was insufficient return for the effort expended; (iii) difficulty in managing the requirements of the course (time and effort) alongside their job and domestic commitments; and (iv) technical difficulties related to course-site issues and at other times to band-width issues within participants' country" (Williams, 2010, p. 5) as factors that contributed to the high rate of attrition.

However, the absence of evidence from the participants who dropped out of the course makes it impossible to determine definitively if there was a correlation between the rate of attrition and the selection process. Whatever the reasons for leaving the course prematurely, the literature reports that online courses worldwide are plagued by high rates of attrition. Indeed attrition rates ranging from 10% to 80% have been reported (Tyler-Smith, 2006; Flood, 2002; Frankola, 2001).

Another factor that affected the implementation of the course was late notification. Incorrect email addresses and late addition of individuals to meet country quotas resulted in some participants joining the course while it was in progress, and correspondence from some of them suggested that they felt somewhat “lost” having joined the course late. This situation no doubt had an impact on their participation in the course. Again, it could not be ascertained the extent to which late addition to the course contributed to the rate of attrition.

E-learning is relatively new to the Caribbean region, and courses such as this one can help educators interested in promoting this form of learning to identify factors that can lead to success and those that can impede progress. The implementation of this course showed that factors such as availability of an appropriate technological structure or platform, good access to computers and the Internet and adequate support, both technical and content-related, for the participants can contribute to success. Absence of these basic facilities can be detrimental.

### ***3.3 To what extent was the online course material used by the course participants?***

The EDCC is an online course with a main objective of enhancing the capacity of primary and secondary school teachers in the participating countries to incorporate democratic values and practices into their classroom activities. In order for this to occur, participants had to make full use of all the online course resources that were available to them. It was therefore worthwhile to determine

---

the extent to which the participants used the resources. To do this, data were collected from the course site. The activities of the 28 participants from Cohort 1 and the 161 from Cohort 2 in relation to the course content pages were investigated to determine the frequency with which participants visited the pages containing instructional material. Table 7 below shows the number of students who visited the pages and the number of visits to each page. The mean number of visits to each page per participant is also given. Table 7: No. of Times Participants Visited Various Pages on the Course Site (n = 189)

<b>Pages</b>	<b>No. of Participants Who Visited</b>	<b>No. of Visits</b>	<b>Mean No. of Visits per Student</b>
Course Goals, Objectives and Outcomes	147	293	2.0
Course Readings	174	980	5.6
Course Assignments & Activities	178	764	4.3
Unit One Goals & Introduction	164	590	3.6
Unit One Assignment	183	1329	7.3
Unit One Assessments Rubric	165	481	2.9
<b>Unit One Readings</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>1933</b>	<b>10.6</b>
<b>Unit One Lessons</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>2757</b>	<b>15.3</b>
Unit Two Goals & Introduction	113	316	2.8
Unit Two Assignment	148	749	5.1
Unit Two Readings	146	1089	7.5
<b>Unit Two Lessons</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>2071</b>	<b>14.3</b>
Unit Three Goals & Introduction	88	299	3.4
Unit Three Assignment	145	1181	8.1
Unit Three Assessments Rubric	134	681	5.1
Unit Three Readings	133	824	6.2
<b>Unit Three Lessons</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>1309</b>	<b>9.4</b>
Unit Four Goals & Introduction	67	177	2.6
Unit Four Assignment	122	591	4.8
Unit Four Readings	102	469	4.6
<b>Unit Four Lessons</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>1219</b>	<b>10.6</b>

Of note is the fact that the pages that presented the goals and introduction for each unit were visited fewer times than any of the other pages, while the pages with the lessons (the course content) were visited more often than the other pages, with perhaps the exception of the readings for Unit 1. The frequent visits to the readings for Unit 1 may have been related to the fact that many of the participants found this unit very challenging. An alternative explanation may be that participants were more engaged earlier on in the course. It is possible that they needed to re-visit the readings for this unit in order to get a better grasp of the unit content. Furthermore, some participants did not visit some of

the pages at all. This is especially true for Unit 4. Perhaps by this time, the course was already being affected by attrition or there was fall off in interest and engagement of the participants.

It should also be noted that in some cases a single participant visited a page many times while others visited very few. For example, though the mean number of visits per participant to the Unit 1 readings was 10.6, one participant visited 175 times, while 13 of them visited only once.

Apart from visiting the pages with the instructional material, participants could also visit the discussion pages where they could view the on-going discussions and make contributions of their own. Table 8 shows the frequency of their engaging in these activities.

Table 8: No. of Times Participants Viewed or Posted a Messages to Various Pages

Action	No. of Participants	No. of Times	Mean No. of Times Per Participant
View Exchange Forum	158	5273	33.4
Post to Exchange Forum	75	346	4.6
View Students' Café & Notice Board	160	2100	13.1
Post to Students' Café & Notice Board	93	572	6.2
View Personal Journal	162	5556	34.3
Post to Personal Journal	143	1755	12.3

What is evident from this table is that some participants viewed the discussion pages often, but posted few comments. Furthermore, when they posted entries, they tended to do so to the personal journals more so than to engage in exchanges with their colleagues. It is possible that this was so because the personal journal was part of the assessment for the course. It is perhaps this trend of shying away from the public discussion that prompted some participants to express disappointment that some of their colleagues were not as keen to interact and share as they expected. Indeed, on the exit survey, some participants recommended making posting to the discussions mandatory, with mechanisms in place to monitor this activity and to send reminders to

those who do make a contribution. Examples of comments from the survey are shown below.

It should be mandatory that students post discussions and respond to questions of other students. [*Cohort 1, Exit Survey*]

A lot depends on students making contribution to the discussions. Therefore the tutor can make more interventions in the discussions eg: reminding students to contribute with direct e-mails; by asking students their opinion, especially those who have not contributed or is late. [*Cohort 2, Exit Survey*]

Give two deadlines: One for [making] initial posts and one for [contributing to the] discussion. [*Cohort 2, Exit Survey*]

Generally then, the course learning resource pages were visited with varying degrees of frequency, with the pages containing the lessons (content) for each unit visited most frequently. In addition, when the participants visited the pages used for communication, they mainly viewed content, rather than posted messages. Posting to the personal journals was more frequent. This may have been because the personal journal was part of the assessment for the course.

### ***3.4 To what extent do the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?***

One of the goals of the EDCC project was to encourage participating teachers to incorporate values that reflect democratic ideals into their practice. In order to investigate the extent to which this was so, data relating to their classroom activities were collected: by observation as well as by questionnaire. Section 3 of the online questionnaire asked the participants to report on their practices in the classroom. The participants completed the questionnaire at the start of the online course (Pre-assessment) and again at the end (Post-assessment).

The sample that completed this section on the pre-assessment consisted of 172 participants, 138 female and 34 male. The majority (68%) were university graduates with teacher training. Their years of experience in teaching ranged from 1 year to 39 years, with an average of 15 years. Most of these participants taught at the primary and secondary levels (43% and 54% respectively), with a few (3%) coming from tertiary level institutions. Among the 64 who completed the post-assessment, 50 were female and 14 male. Of these, 55% were teacher-trained university graduates, with experience ranging from 2 to 35 years, averaging 15 years among them. Thirty-nine percent of these teachers taught at the primary level, 58% at secondary and 3% tertiary. These participants reported the frequency with which they used classroom and instructional practices that reflect democratic values and ideals. Their responses are shown in Table 9 below. This table presents the percentages<sup>9</sup> of the participants who selected the various options.

---

<sup>9</sup> Percentages were used here because there were unequal numbers of participants completed the pre- and post-assessment questionnaires.

Table 9: Percentage of Respondents Reporting Use of Certain Practices in Classroom on the PRE- and POST-Assessment

% of Participants (**Pre-Assessment**: n =176; **Post-Assessment**: n = 64)

Activities	Never		Seldom (1 – 3 times)		Sometimes (4 – 6 times)		Often (7 or more times)		Unsure/Not Applicable	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
<b>Use didactic questions</b>	2	2	11	9	42	34	31	55	15	0
Use demonstrations	1	2	5	14	26	23	67	61	2	0
Use guided methods (e.g. Guided reading)	1	2	7	13	27	36	60	48	6	2
<b>Use shared methods (e.g. Shared writing)</b>	6	5	14	16	42	42	33	36	6	2
<b>Use journals</b>	21	23	28	23	25	23	19	25	7	5
Use learning logs	26	36	28	30	22	22	7	6	17	6
Use research projects	5	8	22	30	37	30	32	33	4	0
<b>Use learning centres</b>	25	23	24	23	24	30	16	19	11	5
<b>Use learning contracts</b>	34	36	24	28	17	20	6	8	20	8
<b>Use differentiated instruction</b>	3	5	17	17	31	36	42	39	7	3
<b>Use problem solving approaches</b>	1	3	11	8	31	39	55	50	3	0
Use case based method	13	14	24	41	30	22	18	20	15	3
<b>Use reflective discussions</b>	3	3	14	14	35	27	44	56	3	0
<b>Use simulations</b>	9	13	24	20	34	38	28	28	5	2
<b>Use field observation</b>	13	17	30	30	33	36	17	13	7	5
<b>Use role play</b>	5	6	19	19	31	22	41	53	5	0
<b>Use service learning</b>	19	33	26	38	12	17	9	9	34	3
<b>Use co-operative and collaborative learning</b>	2	3	13	6	29	33	53	56	3	2
<b>Use controversial discussions</b>	13	16	23	19	33	33	22	28	9	5
<b>Use debates</b>	22	27	36	31	23	19	11	20	8	3
Use peer partner learning	5	2	11	20	35	38	47	41	3	0
<b>Tell the students the objectives of an assessment activity</b>	3	2	14	14	22	19	56	64	4	2
<b>Allowed the students to rate their own work before you graded it</b>	25	16	37	34	23	31	10	17	5	2
<b>Allowed the students to engage in peer assessment activities</b>	11	16	31	20	33	41	19	22	6	2

Acknowledging that it may not be appropriate to use the various activities listed with the same degree of frequency, the table was examined to determine whether the participants used them at least sometimes (4 – 6 times during the term). Thus, the percentage of the participants reporting that they used the activities sometimes or often were considered together and then these

combined percentages were compared across the pre- and post assessment results.

**What is evident from the table is that large proportions of the participants reported using many of the activities sometimes or often before they started the course.** For example, on the pre-assessment over 80% of the respondents reported using *demonstrations*; *guided methods (e.g. guided reading)*; *problem solving approaches*; *co-operative and collaborative learning*; and *peer partner learning* at least sometimes prior to participating in the online course. This is perhaps a reflection of the training that these teachers received since these activities are among those featured in the existing teacher education programmes and other staff development activities. Other activities were used by less than a third of the respondents prior to taking the course. For example, less than 30% reported using *learning logs*, *learning contracts*, *service learning*. By the end of the course, 17 of the 24 activities (in bold on the table) showed increases in the proportions of respondents reporting that they used the activities at least sometimes. Thus, though some of these concepts may not be new to some of the participants, participating in the course seemed to have encouraged them either to continue their use of these activities that reflect democratic values in their classrooms, increasing the frequency with which they used them or to try using some that they may not have tried in the past.

Comparison across the two occasions on which the questionnaire was administered was done to determine whether the practices reported by the teachers in the sample changed over the duration of the course. There were 59 participants (9 from Cohort 1 and 50 from Cohort 2) whose responses could be matched on the pre- and post-assessment data. These respondents came from across the different school levels: primary (39%), secondary (58%) and tertiary (3%). Of these, 78% were female; 93% teacher trained; 63% graduates and 66% were 35 years and over. This group had an average of 16 years teaching

experience, with the range spanning from 3 to 35 years. Matched data from this sample were used to investigate the changes in the distribution of the participants across the response categories.

Table 10 below shows the distribution of the responses of the 59 participants over the response categories at the start and the end of the instructional period.

Table 10: The distribution (%) of the responses of the participants over the response categories, MATCHED on the PRE- and POST-Assessment (n = 59)

Activities	Never		Seldom (1 – 3 times)		Sometimes (4 – 6 times)		Often (7 or more times)		Unsure/Not Applicable	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
Use didactic questions	2	0	10	12	34	34	54	41	0	14
Use demonstrations	2	0	12	2	25	27	61	71	0	0
Use guided methods (e.g. Guided reading)	2	0	10	7	37	25	49	63	2	5
Use shared methods (e.g. Shared writing)	3	3	17	12	44	42	34	36	2	7
Use journals	22	17	22	27	25	27	25	20	5	8
Use learning logs	34	27	31	31	24	17	5	7	7	19
Use research projects	7	7	27	17	31	37	36	39	0	0
Use learning centres	22	24	20	19	32	31	20	17	5	10
Use learning contracts	34	34	29	22	20	17	8	5	8	22
Use differentiated instruction	3	2	17	17	39	29	39	49	2	3
Use problem solving approaches	3	0	8	8	36	31	53	61	0	0
Use case based method	14	10	39	27	22	39	22	15	3	8
Use reflective discussions	3	2	12	14	25	41	59	44	0	0
Use simulations	14	7	19	32	39	29	27	29	2	3
Use field observation	14	20	31	27	37	32	14	17	5	3
Use role play	7	5	17	20	24	25	53	46	0	3
Use service learning	32	25	39	27	15	15	10	2	3	31
Use co-operative and collaborative learning	3	3	5	14	36	27	54	54	2	2
Use controversial discussions	15	14	19	17	36	34	25	25	5	10
Use debates	27	22	32	39	20	20	17	10	3	8
Use peer partner learning	2	5	17	8	39	36	42	51	0	0
Tell the students the objectives of an assessment activity	2	3	14	12	19	27	64	56	2	2
Allowed the students to rate their own work before you graded it	17	22	32	47	32	20	17	10	2	0
Allowed the students to engage in peer assessment activities	17	19	19	25	41	31	22	24	2	2

An examination of this table does not reveal that the distribution of this matched sample generally reflects the pattern observed for the unmatched groups in Table 9 above. For example, the sample here also showed large proportions reporting that they used the activities at least 4 to 6 times in the term prior to enrolling in the course (pre-assessment). On the post-assessment, these proportions remained high, in some cases showing further increases (e.g. using *demonstrations, guided methods, problem solving approaches, peer partner learning*). As with the unmatched sample, this matched sample showed a few activities that were somewhat underused. For example, less than one quarter of them reported using *learning logs, learning contracts* and *service learning* in their practice. It is possible that these activities do not readily lend themselves to the age levels or subject areas taught by the respondents, and hence the infrequent use. It may also be that the respondents did not have the confidence to use these activities. **This may be an indication that, since these activities reflect the incorporation of democratic values and principles in the classroom, future courses of this nature might need to focus more on these areas, providing participants with more exposure to their use in instructional practices.**

### Students' views

Apart from the participants' reports of their activities, the **views of their students** were also sought. A questionnaire was administered at the start of the online component to the students taught by the participants of the course. The questionnaire was to be administered again at the end of the instruction, but this was done in only two countries (St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago). The data collected at the start of the course will be presented now. On the questionnaire there were 11 statements relating to behaviours that reflect democratic ideals. The students were required to indicate whether the statements were true or false about practices in their classrooms. The

breakdown of the sample by country and by sex and grade is shown below in Table 11.

Table 11: Distribution (%) of the Student Sample the Completed the Questionnaire at the **START** of the Course Across **Countries** by **Sex** and **Grade**

Country of Residence of Respondent	Grade Category (%)	Student's Sex (%)			Total %
		Female	Male	Unknown	
Antigua & Barbuda (n = 219)	Up to Grade 6	39	32	0	<b>71</b>
	Grade 7 and Beyond	12	17	0	<b>29</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
Grenada (n = 491)	Up to Grade 6	36	24	0	<b>60</b>
	Grade 7 and Beyond	20	18	0	<b>38</b>
	Unknown	1	0	0	<b>2</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
St. Lucia (n = 552)	Up to Grade 6	4	5	0	<b>9</b>
	Grade 7 and Beyond	47	43	1	<b>90</b>
	Unknown	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>
Jamaica (n = 146)	Grade 7 and Beyond	60	24	1	<b>86</b>
	Unknown	6	8	1	<b>14</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>
Trinidad and Tobago (n = 759)	Up to Grade 6	14	13	0	<b>28</b>
	Grade 7 and Beyond	35	37	0	<b>72</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100</b>
Belize (n = 73)	Grade 7 and Beyond	47	51	0	<b>97</b>
	Unknown	0	3	0	<b>3</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>

Of the 2240 students in the sample, 612 were from Cohort 1 and 1628 from Cohort 2. The information presented here was compiled from questionnaires that were administered to the students in the participants' classes at or near the start of the course.

The first 11 statements on the questionnaire reflect democratic ideals in the classroom while the other 9 indicate practices that are at odds with democratic principles. Table 12 indicate the percentage of the respondents from each country who selected the two options.

Table 12: Percentage (%) of Students Indicating the Presence of Certain Classroom Behaviours

STATEMENTS	Antigua & Barbuda		Grenada		St. Lucia		Jamaica		Trinidad and Tobago		Belize	
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
1. The teacher usually tells us the different things we are going to learn about at the start of the lesson.	<b>89</b>	11	<b>90</b>	10	<b>90</b>	10	<b>92</b>	8	<b>90</b>	10	<b>85</b>	15
2. If we don't understand something when it is done the first time, the teacher finds other ways of teaching it.	<b>92</b>	8	<b>89</b>	11	<b>91</b>	9	<b>85</b>	15	<b>91</b>	9	<b>92</b>	8
3. The teacher deals with all the children in the classroom with care and respect.	<b>85</b>	15	<b>86</b>	14	<b>86</b>	14	<u>72</u>	28	<b>91</b>	9	<b>85</b>	15
4. I feel free to share my ideas in class.	<b>82</b>	18	<b>82</b>	18	<u>79</u>	21	<b>84</b>	16	<b>83</b>	17	<b>95</b>	5
5. The teacher makes sure that all the children get a chance to answer questions in class.	<b>89</b>	11	<b>86</b>	14	<b>80</b>	20	<u>77</u>	23	<b>88</b>	13	<b>90</b>	10
6. The teacher is usually fair when disciplining children in the classroom.	<u>79</u>	21	<u>77</u>	23	<u>76</u>	24	<u>73</u>	27	<b>84</b>	16	<b>81</b>	19
7. If any of the students do not understand something after many lessons, the teacher finds time to work with them individually or in small groups.	<u>78</u>	22	<b>83</b>	17	<u>71</u>	29	64	36	68	32	<b>81</b>	19
8. The teacher does not get upset if we make mistakes in class.	67	33	<u>71</u>	29	<u>73</u>	27	61	39	68	32	<u>73</u>	27
9. I am free to disagree with the teacher's views.	44	56	48	52	66	34	<u>71</u>	29	66	34	63	38
10. The teacher allows us to choose some of the activities we do in class.	44	56	59	41	48	52	43	57	61	39	60	40
11. The teacher sometimes allows us to present our assignments in any way we choose (e.g. in writing; in art; orally in power point).	44	56	52	48	48	52	50	50	49	51	67	33

Table 12 Cont'd: Percentage (%) of Students Indicating the Presence of Certain Classroom Behaviours

	Antigua & Barbuda		Grenada		St. Lucia		Jamaica		Trinidad and Tobago		Belize	
	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F	T	F
12. The teacher spends most of the lesson time with the bright students.	26	<u>74</u>	17	<b>83</b>	9	<b>91</b>	14	<b>86</b>	6	<b>94</b>	7	<b>93</b>
13. The teacher sometimes says unkind things to children who cannot get the work done.	29	<u>71</u>	20	<b>80</b>	33	67	44	56	21	<u>79</u>	21	<u>79</u>
14. If two children are arguing over something, the teacher usually just shouts at them and tells them to sit down.	36	64	34	66	37	63	43	57	33	67	25	<u>75</u>
15. Sometimes the teacher punishes a student for doing something but then lets another student get away with doing the same thing.	44	56	34	66	39	61	55	45	24	<u>76</u>	29	<u>71</u>
16. We hardly ever get the chance to choose who we work with in class.	52	48	36	64	43	57	50	50	30	<u>70</u>	23	<u>77</u>
17. When we get a test, we always have to give the teacher's answer or we don't get marks.	63	37	60	40	52	48	55	45	42	58	44	56
18. Only certain children are asked to be in charge if the teacher has to leave the classroom.	71	29	54	46	62	38	71	29	46	54	44	56
19. Sometimes the teachers tells you 'no' if you ask to go to the toilet.	71	29	71	29	73	27	84	16	63	37	42	58
20. The teacher sets the classroom rules.	77	23	83	17	79	21	63	37	84	16	79	21

The tables were examined to determine instances where 80%<sup>10</sup> or more of the students who responded perceived the presence of desired practices and the absence of undesirable ones. What is evident is that near the start of the online course, the majority of the students from all six countries perceived desired practices in relation to being informed at the start of lessons about the nature of the lesson and their teachers' willingness to find other ways of presenting

<sup>10</sup> The arbitrary figure of 80% was chosen it would indicate that a large majority of the students who completed the questionnaire at the time agreed on the presence or absence of the behaviours in the classrooms of the participants as a group.

content if they (the students) do not understand what is done initially (Statements 1 and 2). The majority of students from five of the countries reported that their teachers dealt with all students with respect and care (Statement 3); that they were free to share their ideas in class (Statement 4); and that their teachers make sure that all students get a chance to answer questions in class (Statement 5). For all six countries, over 60% of the students felt that their teachers were fair when administering discipline (Statement 6); that their teachers were willing to work with students individually or in small groups (Statement 7); and that their teachers did not get upset when mistakes were made in class (Statement 8). Furthermore across all six countries, about half or fewer of the students reported feeling free to disagree with the teacher's view (Statement 9), that the teacher allows them to choose some classroom activities (Statement 10) and that they are sometimes allowed to present their assignments in any way form they choose (Statement 11).

In terms of the undesirable behaviours, the majority of the students from five countries rejected the idea that their teachers spent most lesson time with bright students (Statement 12). Large proportions (60% or more) of students from five of the countries also rejected the idea that their teachers said unkind things to students who cannot get the work done (Statement 13) and that teachers merely shout at students who are having a disagreement (Statement 14). Smaller proportions, in some cases less than one quarter of the students from all of the countries reported favourably on issues such as having to give the teacher's answers to be awarded marks on tests; the teachers only selecting certain students to be in charge if he or she has to leave the room; being prevented from going to the toilet; and the teacher setting the classroom rules (Statements 17 – 20).

The findings from these student data generally support those obtained from the course participants in relation to the use of classroom practices that reflect democratic principles prior to enrolling in the course.

Despite the fact that both the teachers and students reported that many of the activities that were identified were part of their classroom experiences prior to the online course, evidence of continued use and where usage was low, increased usage was sought.

However, as explained earlier, only students of participants in Cohort 2 from two countries, St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago, completed the questionnaire at the end on the online component of the programme. Therefore, the exploration of changes involved only these countries and the extent to which changes occurred in the students' perceptions was explored only among these groups. This sample consisted of 1656 students: 655 from St. Lucia and 1001 from Trinidad and Tobago. The breakdown of the sample over the data collection periods is shown below in Table 13.

Table 13: The Distribution (%) of Students who Completed the Student Questionnaire at the Start and END of the Online Course by COUNTRY, SEX and GRADE

Country of Residence of Respondent	Time of Administration of Instrument	Grade Category (%)	Student's Sex (%)			Total (%)
			Female	Male	Unknown	
St. Lucia	At Start	Up to Grade 6	6	8	0	14
		Grade 7 and Beyond	47	38	0	86
		<b>Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
	At End	Up to Grade 6	4	4	0	8
		Grade 7 and Beyond	50	41	0	92
		<b>Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
Trinidad and Tobago	At Start	Up to Grade 6	20	18	0	39
		Grade 7 and Beyond	28	33	0	61
		<b>Total</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>
	At End	Up to Grade 6	24	21	0	44
		Grade 7 and Beyond	26	30	0	56
		<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>

The percentages of the samples that responded **TRUE** to the twenty statements at the start and at the end of the online course are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Percentages of the Students who Answered TRUE for the Statements about Classroom Practices

STATEMENTS	St. Lucia		Trinidad and Tobago	
	START	END	START	END
1. The teacher usually tells us the different things we are going to learn about at the start of the lesson.	89	93	86	88
2. If we don't understand something when it is done the first time, the teacher finds other ways of teaching it.	92	93	87	88
3. The teacher deals with all the children in the classroom with care and respect.	87	89	87	83
4. I feel free to share my ideas in class.	80	83	81	80
5. The teacher makes sure that all the children get a chance to answer questions in class.	82	85	85	85
6. The teacher is usually fair when disciplining children in the classroom.	78	81	80	74
7. If any of the students do not understand something after many lessons, the teacher finds time to work with them individually or in small groups.	71	73	63	69
8. The teacher does not get upset if we make mistakes in class.	76	72	64	63
9. I am free to disagree with the teacher's views.	64	64	60	54
10. The teacher allows us to choose some of the activities we do in class.	47	<b>56</b>	58	<b>65</b>
11. The teacher sometimes allows us to present our assignments in any way we choose (e.g. in writing; in art; orally in power point).	49	<b>50</b>	46	<b>49</b>
12. The teacher spends most of the lesson time with the bright students.	6	7	8	<b>7</b>
13. The teacher sometimes says unkind things to children who cannot get the work done.	27	<b>21</b>	22	25
14. If two children are arguing over something, the teacher usually just shouts at them and tells them to sit down.	35	<b>25</b>	35	41
15. Sometimes the teacher punishes a student for doing something but then lets another student get away with doing the same thing.	32	<b>29</b>	24	25
16. We hardly ever get the chance to choose who we work with in class.	43	<b>24</b>	29	36
17. When we get a test, we always have to give the teacher's answer or we don't get marks.	52	<b>40</b>	46	49
18. Only certain children are asked to be in charge if the teacher has to leave the classroom.	60	<b>54</b>	46	50
19. Sometimes the teachers tells you 'no' if you ask to go to the toilet.	66	<b>64</b>	61	<b>56</b>
20. The teacher sets the classroom rules.	79	82	84	<b>77</b>

The table was examined to identify changes in these percentages. For Statements 1 to 11 (the desirable practices), evidence of increases over time was sought, while evidence of decreases in proportions was sought for Statements 12 to 20 (undesirable practices).

**The figures indicate for both St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago, the proportion of students reporting favourable behaviour in relation to being informed of lesson objectives, teachers' willingness to seek alternative ways of teaching, teachers showing care and respect for the students,**

**students feeling free to share their ideas and teachers making sure that all students get a chance to answer questions in class (Statements 1 to 5) remained high (over 80%) and in some cases increased.** For St. Lucia, there was a slight decline in the proportion of students reporting favourable behaviour relating to teachers becoming upset if students make mistakes in class (Statement 8). There was also a slight decline in the proportion of students from Trinidad and Tobago reporting favourable behaviour for Statement 8 as well.

Of particular interest are the statements *I am free to disagree with the teacher's views* (Statement 9), *The teacher allows us to choose some of the activities we do in class* (Statement 10) and *The teacher sometimes allows us to present our assignments in any way we choose* (Statement 11). These are the areas for which smaller proportions of the sample from the six countries reported favourable behaviour. The samples from St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago recorded increases in the proportion of students reporting favourable behaviour in relation to being allowed to choose classroom activities and to present assignments in any way they choose. There was no change in the proportion of students from St. Lucia who reported feeling free to disagree with their teachers and a slight decline in the proportion of students from Trinidad and Tobago on this issue.

For the undesirable practices, where a decrease in the proportions of students answering **TRUE** would have indicated positive change, St. Lucia had considerable decreases (10% or more) for statements relating to *the teacher merely shouting at children who are arguing over something, hardly ever getting the chance to choose who we work with in class, and always having to give the teacher's answer on a test to get marks* (Statements 14, 16, and 17). There were also slight decreases (less than 10%) for the statements relating to *teachers saying unkind things to children who cannot get the work done, punishing a student for doing something but then lets another student get away with doing*

*the same thing, only selecting certain children to be in charge if they have to leave the classroom, and saying 'no' to students who ask to go to the toilet (Statements 13, 15, 18 and 19).* Slight increases were recorded for statements relating to *teachers' spending most of the time with bright students and setting the classroom rules (Statements 12 and 20).* For Trinidad and Tobago, slight decreases were recorded in relation to statements about *teachers' spending most of the time with bright students, only selecting certain children to be in charge if they have to leave the classroom, and setting the classroom rules (Statements 12, 19 and 20).* There were also slight increases for the other six statements.

These findings suggest that in these two countries, both before and after their teachers participated in the online course, the large proportions of the students (over 80% in several cases) discerned behaviours that reflect democratic ideals. Perhaps because these behaviours were already present in these classrooms, the changes in the proportion of students reporting these practices were not large. **Of note though is the decrease in the proportion of the students who reported the presence of behaviours and practices that do not reflect the desired values and principles. In some cases, the decrease was as high as 10%. These changes may well be linked to their teachers' participation in the online course.**

Of note are the areas that, though there were increases in the proportion of students perceiving behaviours that reflect democratic principles, the overall proportion perceiving these behaviours remained relatively low. For example, according to the students' perceptions, teachers still tended to make most of the choices relating to classroom activities and to set rules for the students. Perhaps this situation is linked with the perception of some teachers that allowing students a say in such activities will lead to anarchy in the classroom and threaten the teacher's authority. In fact, a few teachers expressed such views during the interviews with members of the evaluation team who were

involved in the classroom observation activities. The implication here is that similar courses should address deep seated beliefs about power-sharing in the classroom, and strategies for implementing it without diminishing the teacher or promoting a breakdown of orderliness.

Apart from their own reports and the perceptions of their students, the classroom practices of the course participants were also gauged through **classroom observation**. As was mentioned earlier, 197 classrooms (31 from Cohort 1 and 166 from Cohort 2) were observed. One hundred and forty-four (144) of the classroom teachers were female and 53 male. One hundred and seventy-one of the classrooms were observed by local personnel and 26 by members of the evaluation team. The levels of the institutions in which the classrooms were located by country are shown below in Table 15.

Table 15: Levels of the Classrooms Observed by Country

Country	Level of the Institution				Total
	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary	Special School	
Antigua And Barbuda*	27	7	0	0	34
Grenada	23	13	0	2	38
St. Lucia	0	36	0	0	36
Trinidad and Tobago	22	55	0	0	77
Jamaica	0	4	1	0	5
Belize	0	3	3	0	6
Total	72	118	4	2	196*

\* There was no institution level for one classroom in Antigua and Barbuda

The observation tool took into consideration the nature of the lesson plan made by the participant and the behaviours and activities that occurred during the lesson. The ratings for the plan and the behaviours and activities are shown below.

<b>Ratings for the Plan</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>NP</b>
	No Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Weak or Poor Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Good Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Excellent Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Teacher had no plan
<b>Ratings for Behaviour s and Activities</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>NA</b>
	Behaviour or Activity not Observed	Behaviour or Activity Observed, but poorly executed	Behaviour or Activity Observed, fairly well-executed, but Improvements can be Made	Behaviour or Activity Observed, Appropriately Displayed or Carried Out	Behaviour or Activity not Applicable to the Lesson.

Lessons were observed in different subject areas, including the core areas of Language Arts, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies at the primary level and English (Language and Literature), Communication Studies, Geography, Industrial Arts and Life Skills at the secondary level. The percentages of the lessons receiving the various ratings on the identified features are shown in Table 16 below.

Table 16: Percentage of Lessons Observed Receiving the Various Ratings on the Identified Behaviours and Activities

Behaviours & Activities	Ratings									
	1		2		3		4		No Rating	
	Local (n = 171)	Ext (n = 26)	Local (n = 171)	Ext (n = 26)	Local (n = 171)	Ext (n = 26)	Local (n = 171)	Ext (n = 26)	Local (n = 171)	Ext (n = 26)
Planned Lesson is substantial and worthwhile	1	4	3	15	22	50	64	31	11	0
Planned lesson reflects democratic ideals	1	4	5	27	32	54	50	15	11	0
Instruction executed in harmony with the planned objectives	0	4	3	4	26	58	59	27	12	8
Teacher demonstrated sound knowledge of content	0	4	1	19	9	15	87	62	4	0
Teacher was respectful to the students	0	4	0	4	12	27	87	62	1	4
Students were respectful to the teacher and to each other	0	12	1	8	29	23	68	58	1	0
Teacher is caring, without being overly affectionate	0	4	1	8	32	50	64	35	4	4
Teacher demonstrates fairness in dealing with the students	0	8	2	19	25	35	71	15	2	23
Students could express their opinions freely	0	8	1	23	20	19	73	50	6	0
Teacher showed tolerance for the differences among the students	0	19	2	4	26	50	61	23	11	4
Students showed tolerance for each other's differences	2	19	4	12	43	58	39	12	12	0
Students allowed to make choices at appropriate times	4	8	9	23	30	46	33	23	23	0
Teacher provides opportunities for students to interact with their peers	2	0	8	15	27	27	57	58	6	0
Teacher arranged the classroom to promote interaction	4	4	12	8	20	31	40	58	24	0
Teacher displayed a clear approach to discipline that emphasized responsibility and self-control	1	23	5	8	25	38	54	19	15	12
Teacher provided opportunity for students to reflect on what they were learning	0	12	6	31	37	23	54	31	3	4
Teacher created an environment that fostered interdependence	1	19	8	19	37	31	42	31	13	0

The table shows the ratings awarded by the local observers and those given by the external observers from the evaluation team. It is also noteworthy that for the most part, the external assessors rated greater proportions of the lesson features at the lower end of the scale than did the local assessors. Since none of the lessons were observed by both external and local assessors simultaneously, it is not possible to explore this further. What is evident is that for all the features observed, the majority of the lessons received a rating of 3 (Behaviour or Activity Observed, fairly well-executed, but Improvements can be Made) or 4 (Behaviour or Activity Observed, Appropriately Displayed or Carried Out) from both local and external assessors. Table 17 shows the percentage of the sample of lessons that received these ratings for each feature, arranged from the features with the highest proportion to the lowest of the local assessors.

Table 17: Percentage of Sample Assigned a Rating of **3 or 4** for Various Lesson and Classroom Behaviours & Activities by Local (n = 171) and External (n = 26) Observers

<b>Behaviours &amp; Activities</b>	<b>Local</b>	<b>Ext</b>
Planned Lesson is substantial and worthwhile	86	81
Planned lesson reflects democratic ideals	82	69
Teacher was respectful to the students	99	88
Students were respectful to the teacher and to each other	98	81
Teacher demonstrated sound knowledge of content	96	77
Teacher is caring, without being overly affectionate	96	85
Teacher demonstrates fairness in dealing with the students	96	50
Students could express their opinions freely	93	69
Teacher provided opportunity for students to reflect on what they were learning	91	54
Teacher showed tolerance for the differences among the students	87	73
Instruction executed in harmony with the planned objectives	85	85
Teacher provides opportunities for students to interact with their peers	84	85
Students showed tolerance for each other's differences	82	69
Teacher displayed a clear approach to discipline that emphasized responsibility and self-control	79	58
Teacher created an environment that fostered interdependence	78	62
Students allowed to make choices at appropriate times	64	69

Of note is that for all but three features for classroom behaviour, the proportion of lessons receiving the ratings of 3 and 4 from local assessors is higher than 80%. For one of these behaviours/activities- *Students allowed making choices at appropriate times*- only 64% obtained a rating of 3 or 4 by local assessors. This is perhaps symptomatic of the traditional practices in Caribbean classrooms which tended to be teacher-centred and competitive rather than collaborative. Resistance to giving choice was linked to the misperceptions held by some of the participants. For example, observers on the evaluation team reported that some of the participants had the view that giving

choice meant allowing the students to do anything they wanted, and for them, that represented anarchy in the classroom, a situation that teachers often seek to avoid. **Whatever the cause, it is evident that there is room for improvement, especially in the areas of student choice and the promotion of classroom interaction. Thus, based only on the observations of local assessors, the implication here is that future offering of this course should focus more on helping teachers to acquire skills at classroom management strategies that promote student involvement in an orderly manner.**

Of further note here is the discrepancy between local and external assessors in relation to the proportion of lessons that received high ratings (3 and 4) on the various features. Several possible reasons may account for these discrepancies. For example, the project's budget did not allow for training local observers in the various countries to use the observation tool.

Even though instructions on the instrument provided guidance for using the tool, it is always best to have training sessions with potential observers to ensure that they understand how to use it. Furthermore, since the project coordinators had no control over who performed this task in the various countries, it is possible that those selected interpreted the instrument according to their own knowledge and beliefs about democratic principles. There is no measure of the extent to which these match what was espoused on the instrument. Finally, it is possible that, in the face of any uncertainty, the phenomenon of leniency error<sup>11</sup> may have come into play.

Overall, the data analysed here suggest that within the classrooms of the participants of the course, there is evidence of behaviours and activities that reflect the ideals associated with democracy. However, as with all things, there appears to be room for improvement. The responses from the students and the

---

<sup>11</sup> A phenomenon that sees raters giving high ratings, whether actual performance, in an effort to avoid conflict or to make themselves look good.

classroom observation data indicate that there is still the need for the teachers to give their students more opportunities to make choices, to interact with their peers, and to recognise the value of tolerance. When the traditional (teacher-centred) Caribbean classroom is taken into consideration though, the presence of the practices that reflect democratic values and principles in the classrooms of the course participant is indeed very commendable.

### ***3.5 Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course?***

The above question is concerned with ascertaining the impact of the course on the participants, and through them, on their students. Both the online questionnaire completed by the participants and the questionnaire for their students contained a section designed to gauge the beliefs of the respondents. The intention was to administer these instruments at the start and the end of the course so that changes in views and beliefs may be determined. While the course participants had the opportunity to complete the instrument as intended, in four of the six countries the classroom students completed their questionnaire on only one occasion. Only classroom students in St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago completed the questionnaire at the start and again at the end of the online course.

In this section of the report, data collected by means of the student questionnaire are presented to give a snap shot of their beliefs at the start of the course. Data from St. Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago are used to explore changes in the students' beliefs over the duration of the course.

#### Student Belief

Section 2 on the student questionnaire contained 9 statements expressing belief of issues related to democratic ideals. Two of the items were stated so as to reflect democratic ideals and the others did not reflect these ideals. The students either agreed or disagreed with each statement. Examples of these

items include *Children who come from other countries to live in ours should have the same rights as all the other children; All students should be made to attend morning worship in the school hall, no matter what their religion is; and It is alright for the teachers to always make decisions about field trips because they are the adults.* The items were scored so that the higher the score, the greater the reflection of democratic values: agreement with a statement reflecting democratic values was scored 1 point, disagreement scored 0; agreement with a statement that does not reflect democratic values was scored 0; disagreement was scored 1.

The sample whose scores are presented here consisted of 612 students from the first cohort and 1628 from the second. Table 19 shows the number of students who scored all the possible scores (0 – 9) by country. The means and standard deviation for the set of scores are also presented (Table 18).

Table 18: No. & Percentage of Students who Obtained the Possible Scores on the Student Belief Scale by Country

No. & % Obtaining the Score (by Country)		Score on Belief Scale										TOTAL
		<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	
Antigua & Barbuda	No.	0	0	10	25	55	69	34	19	7	0	219
	%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	100
Grenada	No.	1	3	22	42	103	91	98	81	43	7	491
	%	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	100
St. Lucia	No.	1	1	3	8	20	70	121	160	126	42	552
	%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8</b>	100
Jamaica	No.	0	0	1	6	12	30	35	39	18	5	146
	%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	100
Trinidad and Tobago	No.	2	2	2	12	65	130	201	179	127	39	759
	%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5</b>	100
Belize	No.	0	0	1	4	7	12	16	10	15	8	73
	%	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>	100

This table indicates that for four of the countries (St. Lucia, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago and Belize), the majority of the students scores 6 or higher on the scale. It is noteworthy that only a relatively small proportion (27%) of the students from Antigua and Barbuda score 6 and higher on the scale. These students also obtained the lowest country mean (Table 19).

Table 19: Mean and Standard Deviation of the Scores obtained by the Students on the Belief Scale

<b>Country</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Antigua & Barbuda	219	4.8	1.4
Grenada	491	5.3	1.7
St. Lucia*	552	6.7	1.4
Jamaica	146	6.1	1.4
Trinidad and Tobago*	759	6.3	1.5
Belize	73	6.3	1.8
Total	2240	6.0	1.6

\* These figures do not include those collected at the END of the course.

This suggests that the teachers of these students may have to make a great effort to help them to acquire the principles and values that reflect democratic thought. This is also true for the students in Grenada, where just under half of them scored 6 or higher on the scale.

The two countries (St Lucia and Trinidad and Tobago) where large percentages of the students scored 6 or higher at the start of the course are the two in which the questionnaire was completed on a second occasion. The data collected at the start and the end of the course in these two countries, were used to investigate changes in the beliefs of the students. The percentages of students who obtained the various possible scores for the two countries are shown in Table 20 below.

Table 20: Percentage of Students who Obtained the Various Scores on the Democratic Belief Scale

Score	St. Lucia		Trinidad and Tobago	
	At Start (n = 343)	At End (n = 311)	At Start (n = 538)	At End (n = 462)
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	1
3	2	2	2	2
4	4	6	11	10
5	14	14	21	22
6	<b>23</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>25</b>
7	<b>26</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>
8	<b>22</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>16</b>
9	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>

In the case of St. Lucia, 80% of the students scored 6 or higher at the start of the course. By the end of the course, 77% of the sample scored in this range. In Trinidad and Tobago, at the start and at the end of the course, 65% of the sample scored 6 or higher. Thus, it appears that, for these two countries, no significant change in the attitudes of the students of the course participants was found. This may be due to the fact that change takes time.

#### Participants' Beliefs

To gauge participants' beliefs, a 33-item scale was used, accompanied by a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = Strongly Agree and 5 = Strongly Disagree. As stated earlier, the items reflect the ideals of equality, freedom and justice. Eleven of the items relate to the value of equality; fifteen to freedom and eleven to justice. Three items were stated to reflect democratic thought, and the other thirty items reflected undemocratic thought. The items were scored so that the higher the score, the more democratic the beliefs of the respondent; with a possible maximum score of 165 (33 items each with a possible maximum score of 5).

One hundred and seventy-four (174) participants (36 from Cohort 1 and 138 from Cohort 2) completed the belief scale at the start of the online course (**Pre-assessment**); Sixty three (63) participants (9 from Cohort 1 and 54 from Cohort 2) completed the questionnaire at the end (**Post-assessment**). The scale was found to be very reliable on both occasions of administration, with an alpha coefficient of 0.83 for the pre-assessment data and 0.82 for the post-assessment.

The means and standard deviations for the six countries on each of the three dimensions of democratic belief scale are shown below in Table 21. The statistics are given for the data collected at the start and at the end of the online component of the course. Because the numbers in the sample were somewhat small, non-parametric tests of significance were used to investigate whether the differences in the scores obtained for the two data collection periods were significant.

Table 21: The Mean and SD obtained by the Participants on the Democratic Beliefs Scale for the Pre- and Post-Assessment.

Country	Time of Data Collection	Dimensions			
			EQUALITY (Max = 55)	FREEDOM (Max = 75)	JUSTICE (Max = 35)
Antigua & Barbuda	Pre-Assessment - n = 25	Mean (SD)	39.4 (4.3)	50.4 (5.6)	27.6 (2.7)
	Post-Assessment - n = 10	Mean (SD)	44.7 (4.9)	55.5 (5.58)	29.0 (3.8)
Grenada	Pre-Assessment - n = 33	Mean (SD)	40.1 (6.1)	53.3 (4.5)	26.8 (3.6)
	Post-Assessment - n = 11	Mean (SD)	44.9 (4.0)	59.2 (2.3)	30.5 (1.8)
St. Lucia	Pre-Assessment - n = 32	Mean (SD)	41.7 (6.4)	55.5 (6.3)	28.2 (3.5)
	Post-Assessment - n = 26	Mean (SD)	44.4 (4.4)	59.0 (5.2)	29.4 (3.4)
Jamaica	Pre-Assessment - n = 32	Mean (SD)	40.0 (6.4)	53.8 (5.4)	26.5 (3.3)
	Post-Assessment - n = 6	Mean (SD)	42.5 (6.5)	54.7 (6.9)	28.2 (2.7)
Trinidad and Tobago	Pre-Assessment - n = 50	Mean (SD)	41.9 (6.3)	54.0 (6.9)	27.4 (4.5)

	Post-Assessment - n = 18	Mean (SD)	44.4 (6.0)	56.9 (5.7)	28.2 (4.0)
Belize	Pre-Assessment - n = 2	Mean (SD)	36.5 (4.9)	55.5 (10.6)	29.5 (2.1)
	Post-Assessment - n = 2	Mean (SD)	40.5 (3.5)	58.0 (2.8)	25.5 (3.5)

**An examination of the table reveals that for five of the countries, the mean score at the end of the course was slightly higher than it was at the start of the course, on all three dimensions. This suggests that a positive change in beliefs was recorded over the duration of the online course.** Only for Belize, there was a decrease in the mean at the end of the course for the Justice dimension. The non-parametric Mann Whitney U test<sup>12</sup> was applied to determine if the differences in the means were statistically significant. The results of that test are shown in Appendix 8.

**The results of the Mann Whitney U test suggest that there were significant changes in beliefs on all three dimensions for participants in Grenada; on the Equality and Freedom dimensions for Antigua and Barbuda and on the Freedom dimension for St. Lucia. It is likely that these significant changes can be attributed to participation in the online course.** The changes that occurred over time in the belief of the participants in the other countries though generally positive were not statistically significant.

In order to investigate changes in individuals' beliefs, participants for whom both pre- and post- assessment scores on the scale were available, were identified. There were 58 of them. The distribution of these participants over the six countries is shown below in Table 22.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Mann Whitney U test is a statistical procedure used to determine whether observed differences in measurement taken from two groups on the same instrument are just random (by chance) or represent real difference. This test is appropriate when data are ordinal (e.g. collected using a Likert scale) and/or when the groups being compared are relatively small. Each test returns a standard score (z score) and the probability of obtaining the observed results by chance (p). If the value of p is less than 0.05, then the observed differences are considered to be non-random or "statistically significant". This means that the differences are "real".

Table 22: Distribution of Participants who Complete Both the Pre- and Post-Assessments by Country

Country	No. of Participants
Antigua & Barbuda	10
Grenada	11
St. Lucia	15
Jamaica	4
Trinidad and Tobago	16
Belize	2
Total	58

The mean and standard deviation for these 58 participants were found. These are presented below in Table 23.

Table 23: Mean & SD for the Matched Score on the Teachers' Democratic Belief Scale

Country	Time of Administration	Dimensions		
		EQUALITY	FREEDOM	JUSTICE
Antigua & Barbuda (n = 10)	Pre-Assessment	40.7 (5.2)	50.8 (4.5)	27.7 (2.5)
	Post-Assessment	44.7 (4.9)	55.5 (5.6)	29.0 (3.8)
Grenada (n = 11)	Pre-Assessment	42.7 (4.5)	54.3 (4.0)	28.2 (2.3)
	Post-Assessment	44.9 (4.0)	59.2 (2.3)	30.5 (1.8)
St. Lucia (n = 15)	Pre-Assessment	42.3 (6.1)	56.1 (7.9)	27.6 (4.2)
	Post-Assessment	44.4 (4.6)	58.7 (5.2)	29.1 (3.2)
Jamaica (n = 4)	Pre-Assessment	35.8 (8.1)	51.3 (5.9)	24.5 (2.6)
	Post-Assessment	43.0 (8.1)	55.3 (8.8)	28.0 (3.5)
Trinidad and Tobago (n = 16)	Pre-Assessment	41.6 (3.9)	53.4 (5.7)	26.1 (4.8)
	Post-Assessment	44.1 (5.6)	56.6 (5.3)	28.1 (4.1)
Belize (n = 2)	Pre-Assessment	36.5 (4.9)	55.5 (10.6)	29.5 (2.1)
	Post-Assessment	40.5 (3.5)	58.0 (2.8)	25.5 (3.5)

For all the countries except Belize, there was an increase of the means for the post-assessment scores over the ones for the pre-assessment. This suggests that for these teachers, positive changes in beliefs were recorded over the duration of the online component of the course. For Belize, there was a decrease of the mean of the post-assessment scores. The non-parametric Wilcoxon test was used to determine if these changes in means were significant. The results of those tests are shown in Appendix 9.

The results indicate significant changes in beliefs for the participants from Antigua and Barbuda on the Equality and Freedom dimensions; on the Freedom and Justice dimensions for the Grenadian participants; and on all three dimensions for the participants from Trinidad and Tobago. **These findings suggest that for some of the countries, exposure to the course material was accompanied by significant positive changes in the beliefs of the participants, though the changes were not consistent across the three dimensions measured by the scale.**

Another attempt to gauge the impact of the course on the participants was made by the use of **scenarios**. These scenarios were designed to assess the practices of the participants in situations in which democratic values should operate, as well as gauge their reaction to practices that do not reflect democratic ideals. Examples of the scenarios given are:

Patty and Jamal are both claiming ownership of a rag doll that they found discarded in a school cupboard. You must step in to help resolve the dispute. What would you do? (From Pre-assessment)

In a discussion in a religious education class, a boy expresses the opinion that he sees nothing wrong with two men living together in a relationship. He argues that they should be allowed to get married if they wanted to. Many of the other students in the class become angry. How do you handle this situation? (From Post-Assessment)

The responses offered by the participants were analysed to ascertain the extent to which they applied democratic practices in their classrooms and/or value these practices BEFORE and AFTER completing the course. The scenarios were rated on a scale of 1 (Does not reflect democratic ideals at all) to 5 (Definitely reflects democratic ideals). Two experienced educators<sup>13</sup> read the responses and rated them using the scale. These two experienced educators were not told whether the responses they were rating were submitted at the start or end of the online course. Examples of responses that were rated 1 to 5 for one of the scenarios are given in Appendix 5. The mean was found for the ratings and this score was used as a measure of the extent to which they applied democratic practices in their classrooms, and/or value such practices. Ratings for 140 participants were included for the pre-assessment while those for 49 participants were included for the post-assessment. The mean ratings and standard deviation for the two groups of participants are shown in Table 24 below.

Table 24: The Mean Ratings (and SD) Obtained by the Sample

<b>Country</b>	<b>Time of Administration</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
Antigua & Barbuda	Pre-Assessment (n = 23)	3.1	.42
	Post-Assessment (n = 7)	3.8	.35
Grenada	Pre-Assessment (n = 24)	3.3	.53
	Post-Assessment (n = 7)	4.2	.32
St. Lucia	Pre-Assessment (n = 23)	3.2	.34
	Post-Assessment (n = 12)	4.0	.29
Jamaica	Pre-Assessment (n = 23)	3.4	.54
	Post-Assessment (n = 4)	4.3	.36
Trinidad and Tobago	Pre-Assessment (n = 45)	3.1	.45
	Post-Assessment (n = 15)	4.0	.34

<sup>13</sup> One of these educators is an experienced teacher trainer who specialises in Social Studies and History. He has a special interest in democratic values and principles. The other educator is a former teacher trainer who currently holds the post of Curriculum Officer at the Ministry of Education in her country. Her experience in language and literacy, along with her understanding and support of democratic principles and values in the classroom were considered assets for this exercise. Both of these educators hold graduate degrees in education, are teacher trained and have over 20 years experience in the field.

Belize	Pre-Assessment (n = 2)	3.3	.08
	Post-Assessment (n = 2)	3.9	.00

**The results indicate that for each country, the mean ratings for the post-assessment scenarios were higher than those for the pre-assessment ratings. This suggests that the responses submitted on the post-assessment were considered to better reflect democratic ideals than did the ones submitted on the pre-assessment. The implication here is that exposure to the course had an impact on the participants' knowledge and views relating to democratic principles in the classroom.** Again, to determine whether the differences observed represented real rather than random differences, the Mann Whitney U test was applied. The results are shown in Appendix 11.

**These findings indicate that for all of the countries except Belize, the post-assessment means were significantly higher<sup>14</sup> than those for the pre-assessment. This could be taken as an indication that there was a significant change in the course participants' awareness and valuing of democratic practices in the classroom.**

Indeed, changes in the nature of the responses of the participants did reveal some growth. For example, in one scenario, the participants were required to say how they would deal with two students who were quarrelling over a toy. Following are the responses of one participant.

Pre-Assessment Response	Post-Assessment Response
Take the doll from the person in possession. Listen to both sides of the story and afterwards get third party evidence to ascertain the truth of the matter.	Take the students to a different, more comfortable location. Have students discuss the matter with a view to both students sharing the toy.

<sup>14</sup> The p value is less than 0.05.

The pre-assessment response (Rated 2) suggests that initially, the participant would have settled the matter, relying on the evidence from a third party. The post-assessment response (Rated 5) indicated a more democratic approach of allowing the students to resolve their conflict through dialogue. This is somewhat different from the action initially suggested which involved acting on the students rather than including them in the seeking of a solution. This shift in approach may be linked to the participant's exposure to the course content.

To investigate differences for individual participants, the ratings for 49 participants were matched (pre-assessment with post-assessment). These were not disaggregated by country. The mean ratings for these participants on the two assessments are shown in Table 25 below.

Table 25: Mean Ratings (& SD) for the Matched Pairs of Participants (n = 49)

	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.
Pre-Assessment	3.3	0.44	2.2	4.3
Post-Assessment	4.0	0.34	3.1	4.6

As with the group data, the evidence here indicates that the mean rating obtained for the post-assessment was higher than it was for the pre-assessment. To determine if the observed difference was significant, the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was run. The results are presented in Appendix 10.

The results indicate that the difference between the pre- and post-assessment was statistically significant ( $z = -5.664$ ;  $p < 0.0005$ ). This suggests that for the 49 participants in this sample, the mean ratings for the post-assessment

increased significantly over those for the pre-assessment. This positive change, as before may be linked to exposure to the course content.

**In this section, evidence of changes in beliefs, viewpoints and practices that may be attributed or at least linked to exposure to the course were sought. Data collected from the course participants and their students at the start and end of the course were analysed. Findings indicate variable outcomes. Though there were no sweeping positive changes, there was enough to suggest that the course had some impact on the viewpoints, beliefs and practices of the course participants. Whether or not these changes are sustainable could be ascertained in a follow-up study.**

## **4. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATIONS**

### ***4.1 Findings***

This report presents findings of the evaluation of the Education for Democratic Citizenship in the Caribbean online course. It examined the data to answer five questions, namely

- ***To what extent was the course implemented as intended?***
- ***What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course?***
- ***To what extent was the online course material being used by the course participants?***
- ***To what extent did the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?***
- ***Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course?***

Major findings of the study will be presented using the research questions as guides.

***To what extent was the course implemented as intended?***

- Generally, the conditions necessary for the successful implementation of the course were in place: the technology, the course content, the online tutoring, supervision and support for the participants.
- While the general consensus of participants was that the quality of the resources provided was excellent, it was apparent that initially, the quantity was somewhat overwhelming for some participants. Despite this initial concern, participants who continued in the programme found the content interesting and valuable. It can therefore be concluded that the chosen content was appropriate and adequate for the course.
- Even though the practicum component was implemented with success, next editions of this course should consider more innovative and concrete ways of providing support for the participants on-the-ground.
- The provision of the forums for discussion was successful in many ways and provided an avenue for the course participants to interact with their e-tutors as well as with each other. The fact that the discussions were primarily asynchronous was problematic to some of the participants. Thus, some of the participants suggested that discussion could have been enhanced if there were synchronous video lectures or at least a provision for all participants to be online at the same time for discussion.

***What factors facilitated or impeded the implementation of the online course?***

***Factors that facilitated the implementation of the online course:***

- Participants found course content to be relevant, informative and interesting and this motivated them.
- The availability of the technical support to assist the participants with technology-related challenges facilitated the successful implementation of the course.
- Apart from the support of e-tutors in relation to the course content, adequate technological support was also identified as crucial to the success of the course.
- Participants appreciated the training received to acquire the needed skills to learn how to use the online platform.
- The availability of trained e-tutors who were charged with assisting the participants contributed to the success of the programme.

***Factors that impeded the implementation of the online course:***

- The late addition of individuals to meet country quotas resulted in some participants joining the course while it was in progress, and correspondence from some of them suggested that they felt somewhat “lost” having joined the course late.
- Certain factors such as too challenging course content, unreliable connectivity and participants’ inadequate skills with the technology posed problems for some participants.
- The characteristics of the virtual platform and the lack of adequate activities to make this platform friendlier to participants. This led to a negative perception of the learning environment as it made them feel sometimes de-motivated and lonely.

- Some of the participants felt forced to take the course. They were selected without their knowledge or consent. This affected their participation in the course.

***To what extent was the online course material being used by the course participants?***

- The course learning resource pages were visited with varying degrees of frequency, while the pages containing the lessons (course content) for each unit visited most frequently. In addition, when the participants visited the pages used for communication, they mainly viewed content, rather than posted messages
- The pages that presented the goals and introduction for each unit were visited fewer times than any of the other pages, while the pages with the lessons (course content) were visited more often than the other pages.
- Posting to the personal journals was more frequent. Participants posted comments to the personal journal an average of two to three times, more frequently than they did to any other forum. This may have been because the personal journal was part of the assessment for the course.
- Participants viewed the discussion pages more often than they posted comments.

***To what extent did the observed and reported practices of the participants reflect the ideals espoused in the course?***

- Though students showed a few undemocratic behaviours in their classrooms at the start of the course, large proportions of them from all six countries generally reported several behaviours and activities that reflect democratic principles. In the two countries where comparisons

could be made (Trinidad and Tobago and St. Lucia), the changes in classroom behaviours reported by the students were slight.

- Even though the proportions of participants reporting that they use activities that reflect democratic values was high at the start of the course, by the end these proportions remained high and in some cases, increased. However, by the end of the course, the participants were still weak at giving the students choices in the classroom and promoting interaction among the students in the classroom<sup>15</sup>. This finding can contribute to explain the slight changes in classroom behaviours reported by students.

***Were there any changes in viewpoints, attitudes and practices evident among the participants of the course?***

- As a group, only the participants in Antigua and Barbuda and St. Lucia showed significant positive changes in their democratic beliefs over the duration of the course.
- As individuals, only participants from Trinidad and Tobago showed significant positive changes on all three dimensions of democratic beliefs (Equality, Freedom and Justice) over the duration of the course. Participants from Antigua and Barbuda showed changes on two dimensions (Equality and Freedom), as did Grenada (Freedom and Justice).
- On the scenarios<sup>16</sup> designed to gauge practices and valuing of democratic ideals, participants demonstrated significant positive changes on all the

---

<sup>15</sup> Based on classrooms observations and online questionnaires (The participants completed the questionnaire at the start of the online course (Pre-assessment) and again at the end (Post-assessment)). For more information on data collection tools, please see page 41.

<sup>16</sup> These scenarios were designed to assess the practices of the participants in situations in which democratic values should operate, as well as gauge their reaction to practices that do not reflect democratic ideals. For further information on how these scenarios were set, please see page 69.

three dimensions of democratic beliefs (Equality, Freedom and Justice) over the duration of the course.

- Even though the classroom practices of some participants prior to enrolling in the course may have reflected democratic values and principles, being a part of the course renewed commitment to upholding these values and principles<sup>17</sup>.
- For some participants, there was a positive change in the way they viewed their students and how they interacted with them.
- Based on the comments from the participants, there were some positive changes in students who were part of classrooms in which participants applied the democratic principles and values to which they were exposed.

## **4.2 Conclusion**

The findings of this evaluation suggest that there were several positive aspects to the online course. For example, the course was designed to meet an identified need and therefore was relevant to the participants who, even though they found some of the content challenging, also found it interesting and informative.

Another positive aspect was the technological support. The use of technology to reach such scattered audience would have been lacking if such support were absent. In this case, participants had access to personnel who responded well to the technical challenges that were within their (the technicians') control. Challenges outside of their control (difficulties associated with the Internet service providers) did however take a toll on some of the participants. This had an adverse effect on the successful delivery of the course to some participants.

---

<sup>17</sup> Based on online questionnaires for the course participants, administered at the start and end of the online component of the EDCC course, and on questionnaires for students, also administered at the start and end of the online course. For more information on data collection tools, please see page 61

The success of the course also had much to do with the support and guidance of the e-tutors. Generally, these individuals provided adequate support for the participants. This was laudable since some of them were performing this role for the first time and had to learn new skills. A positive side effect of the project is that there are now several more individuals in the region who are trained to support learners in an online learning environment. This is an asset to a region in which pursuing education via this mode is becoming increasingly popular. The levels of praise directed at these e-tutors by participants suggest that they generally did a commendable job of providing support. Of note is that even though they may not have been “on-the-ground” for the practicum sessions, the e-tutors were praised by participants for the role they play in providing encouragement, comfort and advice to those who moved on to this component of the programme.

Of some concern is the rate of attrition observed for the course. It is true that the literature indicates that online courses are globally plagued by high dropout rates, but there were some conditions that may have exacerbated the dropout rates for this course. Future offering of this programme in an online environment should devote some resources to minimising the factors such as involuntary enrolment, incorrect contact information, being overwhelmed by the volume of course content and discouraged when unable to find the time to engage with it, and feelings of isolation. The participants of this programme were generally new to this mode of learning, but it is anticipated that as online learning becomes more widespread, the impact of some of these factor will be reduced.

Finally, the course appeared to have had an impact on the practices and viewpoint of the participants, as well as on those of their students. The extent of this impact varied in degree as well as across countries. The participants in some countries seemed slow to manifest any observable change. However, the change process takes time, and perhaps the true impact of the course may be

seen later when participants have had more time to come to terms with their new knowledge, and when their students have been exposed to the type of learning environment promoted in the course for a longer period. The extent to which this is so may depend on the follow-up activities that are planned. One of the failings of funded programs is that when the project phase is over, little else is done to help the participants to internalise and incorporate into their practice the knowledge and skills to which they were exposed.

The outcomes of the programme suggest that it is worthwhile for classroom teachers. For some participants the concepts may not have been new since they may have met them in their teacher training programmes and previous staff development activities. Thus, for some it was a renewal of knowledge but, based on some of their responses, the course gave some of them a new perspective from which to view the concepts. As mentioned in the opening section of this report, teachers in the region are being trained in the use of student-sensitive practices in the classroom, but these are linked to content areas.

This course may be the first time they may have had the opportunity to see the connection between such practices and the promotion of democracy in the classroom; to see the importance of such activities for the development of the students rather than merely as good ways of delivering content to their students. Thus, for some of the teachers, participation in the EDCC course contributed to the renewal of their commitment to provide the best possible instructional methods to engage their charges and to ensure that their classroom experiences help to prepare the students for life after school.

### **4.3 Recommendations**

- The volume of the course content should be reviewed and edited down to make it more manageable for participants.
- Future offering of this course should focus more on helping teachers to acquire skills at classroom management strategies that promote student involvement in an orderly manner.
- The participants were generally new to this mode of learning. if the course is being offered online in the future, online tutors should provide participants with more support to facilitate their involvement in activities that require the participation in virtual discussions and debates, chats (with colleagues and/or tutors), etc.
- Consideration should be given to the requests for some synchronous sessions or instructional videos to be incorporated into the course.
- Consideration should also be given to providing more on-the-ground support for participants, especially during the practicum.

## 5. REFERENCES

Charles, R. A. (2010). *Report on OAS Democracy Online Course: "Education for Democratic Citizenship – A Distance Course for Caribbean Educators"*. A Report submitted to the Project Coordinator, Feb 07, 2010.

Flood, J. (2002). Read all about it: online learning facing 80% attrition rates. *TOJDE*, 3 (2). Online at <http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/tojde6/articles/jim2.htm>.

Frankola, K. (2001). Why online learners drop out. (Cover story). *Workforce*, 80 (10), 53. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Kesici, S. (2008). Teachers' opinions about building a democratic classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 35 (2), 192 – 203.

Mappiasse, S. (2006). Developing and validating instruments for measuring democratic climate of the civic education classroom and student engagement in North Sulawesi, Indonesia. *International Education Journal*, 7 (4), 580 – 597.

Shechtman, Z. (2002). Validation of the Democratic Teacher Belief Scale (DTBS). *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice*, 9 (3), 363 – 377.

Tyler-Smith, K. (2006). Early attrition among first time e-learners: A review of factors that contribute to drop-out, withdrawal and non-completion rates of adult learners undertaking e-learning programmes. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 2 (2), 73 – 85. Online at [http://jolt.merlot.org/Vol2\\_No2.htm](http://jolt.merlot.org/Vol2_No2.htm).

Williams, D. (2010). *Report on the "Education for democratic citizenship in the Caribbean: A distance course for educators" project*. Washington, DC: OAS.

## 6. APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1 Student Questionnaire

# WHAT WOULD YOU SAY?



**LISTEN CAREFULLY TO THE INSTRUCTIONS THAT WILL BE READ TO YOU. Then read EACH STATEMENT and say whether it is TRUE or FALSE.**

**Circle** your answer from the choices next to the statement.

Statements	Responses	
	TRUE	FALSE
1. I feel free to share my ideas in class.	TRUE	FALSE
2. The teacher allows us to choose some of the activities we do in class.	TRUE	FALSE
3. When we get a test, we always have to give the teacher's answer or we don't get marks.	TRUE	FALSE
4. I am free to disagree with the teacher's views.	TRUE	FALSE
5. The teacher spends most of the lesson time with the bright students.	TRUE	FALSE
6. The teacher is usually fair when disciplining children in the classroom.	TRUE	FALSE
7. Only certain children are asked to be in charge if the teacher has to leave the classroom.	TRUE	FALSE
8. If two children are arguing over something, the teacher usually just shouts at them and tells them to sit down.	TRUE	FALSE
9. The teacher sets the classroom rules.	TRUE	FALSE
10. We hardly ever get the chance to choose who we work with in class.	TRUE	FALSE
11. The teacher makes sure that all the children get a chance to answer questions in class.	TRUE	FALSE
12. The teacher sometimes says unkind things to children who cannot get the work done.	TRUE	FALSE
13. Sometimes the teachers tells you 'no' if you ask to go to the toilet.	TRUE	FALSE

<b>Statements (Cont'd)</b>		<b>Responses</b>	
14.	Sometimes the teacher punishes a student for doing something but then lets another student get away with doing the same thing.	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>
15.	The teacher usually tells us the different things we are going to learn about at the start of the lesson.	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>
16.	If we don't understand something when it is done the first time, the teacher finds other ways of teaching it.	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>
17.	If any of the students do not understand something after many lessons, the teacher finds time to work with them individually or in small groups.	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>
18.	The teacher sometimes allows us to present our assignments in any way we choose (e.g. in writing; in art; orally in power point).	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>
19.	The teacher does not get upset if we make mistakes in class.	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>
20.	The teacher deals with all the children in the classroom with care and respect.	<b>TRUE</b>	<b>FALSE</b>



# WHAT WOULD YOU SAY?



Read each statement carefully then say whether you agree with it or not.

**Circle** the response that shows your answer.

Statements	Responses	
1. Children who come from other countries to live in ours should have the same rights as all the other children.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
2. Men and women should be paid the same salary if they are doing the same tasks.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
3. Students who speak out against the school should be punished.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
4. Students chosen to be form captain should be able to do whatever they like in the classroom.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
5. If the teacher takes a student to the principal for doing something wrong, the student should be punished without wasting time.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
6. All students should be made to attend morning worship in the school hall, no matter what their religion is.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
7. Children with disabilities should not be allowed to be in the same classroom as the rest of us.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
8. If a decision has to be made as to whether a student from a poor family or one from a richer family should be made house captain, the richer student should be chosen.	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree
9. It is alright for the teachers to always make decisions about where to go on field trips because they are the adults?	 I Agree	 I DO NOT Agree

# ABOUT YOU! 🙋😊

1. Are you a girl or a boy?

Girl



Boy



2. What class are you in? \_\_\_\_\_

3. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Is your teacher male or female?

Female



Male



## APPENDIX 2: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE



### SECTION A: TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF?

1. At which level do you teach?

- Primary (Go to No. 3)
- Secondary (Go to No. 2)
- Tertiary (Go to No. 2)

2. What is the MAIN subject that you teach?

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Into which of these categories do you fall?

- Trained Graduate
- Trained Non-graduate
- Untrained Graduate
- Untrained Non-graduate
- Other (Please state): \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

\_\_\_\_\_ years

5. What is your sex?

- Female
- Male

6. Into which age group do you fall?

- Under 25 years
- 25 – 34 years
- 35 – 44 years
- 45 years or over

7. In which territory do you teach?

\_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION B: WHAT WOULD YOU

DO?



**Instructions:** Read each scenario carefully and then tell us what you would do. Enter your responses in the spaces provided.

1. Patty and Jamal are both claiming ownership of a rag doll that they found discarded in a school cupboard. You must step in to help resolve the dispute. What would you do?
2. ;It is the opening of the new academic year and you have a new class. What procedure do you use to set class rules?
3. The Ministry of Education has introduced a policy that teachers should not administer corporal punishment to students. After a term, the teachers are complaining that the absence of this option for disciplining students is causing chaos. They say that corporal punishment is the best way of controlling the students and that now without it they feel powerless. What do you think?
4. A colleague is having a dispute with a child over a decision made in the classroom. Your colleague is upset, claiming that the student has no right to be challenging teachers in the classroom, and that the student is being disrespectful. What do you think?
5. Ayesha is a hearing impaired girl whose parents insist that she can cope in a regular classroom with a few small modifications. The school is planning to admit her, but your colleagues are saying that she should be educated among her own kind. What are your views on this issue?
6. In a discussion in a religious education class, a boy expresses the opinion that he sees nothing wrong with two men living together in a relationship. He argues that they should be allowed to get married if they wanted to. Many of the other students in the class become angry. How do you handle this situation?
7. Derek comes from a poor family living in a rural village. He takes the secondary school entrance examination and is awarded a place in one of the prestigious schools in the country. When he gets there, he approaches the coach about joining the cricket club. The coach tells Derek that he should not join the club because he would not be able to afford the gear. The coach points out that the school's funds are somewhat stretched and that the school would not be able to supply Derek with gear. What do you think of the coach's stance?
8. A primary school has a policy of streaming students according to their perceived ability. The idea is to help the weaker students by exposing them to a curriculum more suited to their ability. As a result, areas that are considered to be difficult are removed from the programme followed by these students. At a PTA meeting, a parent whose child is in a lower stream complains that her child should be exposed to the same topics as the students in the higher stream. She is insisting that the policy be revoked. What do you think?

9. A class trip is being planned. You have a venue in mind, but there is dissent among the students. In fact, one group of students has suggested one venue and other group wants to go somewhere else. What would you do to come to a decision about where the class should go?



## SECTION C: INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

**Instructions:** Below is a list of activities related to teaching and learning in the classroom. Please indicate the frequency with which you engaged in each activity during the last school term (Term 1, Sep – Dec 2008).

Activities	Never	Seldom (1 – 3 times)	Sometimes (4 – 6 times)	Often (7 or more times)	Unsure/Not Applicable
(a) Use didactic questions					
(b) Use demonstrations					
(c) Use guided methods (e.g. Guided reading)					
(d) Use shared methods (e.g. Shared writing)					
(e) Use journals					
(f) Use learning logs					
(g) Use research projects					
(h) Use learning centres					
(i) Use learning contracts					
(j) Use differentiated instruction					
(k) Use problem solving approaches					
(l) Use case based method					
(m) Use reflective discussions					
(n) Use simulations					
(o) Use field observation					
(p) Use role play					
(q) Use service learning					
(r) Use co-operative and collaborative learning					
(s) Use controversial discussions					
(t) Use debates					
(u) Use peer partner learning					
(v) Tell the students the objectives of an assessment activity					
(w) Allowed the students to rate their own work before you graded it					
(x) Allowed the students to engage in peer assessment activities					



## SECTION D: TEACHER BELIEF

### SCALE



**Instructions:** Read each statement below carefully. Indicate, by selecting the appropriate response, the extent to which you agree with the statement.

SA = Strongly Agree

U = Unsure

D = Disagree

A = Agree

SD = Strongly Disagree

STATEMENTS	RESPONSES				
1. The most important attributes of effective teachers are authority and power.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. School rules should be established by teachers, rather than students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. When a classroom conflict arises, the teacher should bring it to a successful resolution, which should be accepted by the students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Classroom seating in a circle is not advised, since it allows too many student interactions.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. School curriculum should be determined by teachers rather than students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. As students must respect professional authorities, criticism of textbook content should be discouraged.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. In order to avoid further discipline problems, teachers should never accept a student's refusal to take part in class activity.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Students should never doubt a teacher's honesty.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. In case of disagreement with the principal, it is advisable to keep your opinion to yourself.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Attractive girls who focus on their physical appearance cannot be seriously interested in academic achievement.	SA	A	U	D	SD

11. Criticism of the school should be censored since one should not 'spit into the well one drinks from'.

SA

A

U

D

SD

STATEMENTS (Cont'd)	RESPONSES				
12. Students' open criticism of each other should ultimately be stopped, since it threatens classroom harmony.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Male teachers are more successful at disciplining than their female counterparts, due to their physical strength.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Disclosing an individual's test scores in class is recommended as a motivational device, even though a few weak students may be hurt.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. Homosexual teachers should be denied teaching positions due to the detrimental effect that they have on young students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. Students should be discouraged from expressing divergent opinions because this negatively affects their social status.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. It is the teacher's responsibility to teach and the student's to learn; therefore, students should not participate in the conduct of lessons.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. Classroom committees should be selected by teachers, since, after all, teachers can best evaluate students' capacities.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. Students who get too emotional or personal during class discussions must immediately be stopped.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. When a faculty conflict arises, the principal should bring it to a successful resolution, which should be accepted by the teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
21. Some classroom time should be devoted to self-expressiveness, which is essential for the student's well-being.	SA	A	U	D	SD
22. Teachers should refrain from employing learning contracts and other similar teaching strategies, because they involve ineffective use of time.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23. Interpersonal communication skills should be taught in class even at the expense of intellectual achievements.	SA	A	U	D	SD
24. Students from well-to-do homes are less determined to work hard.	SA	A	U	D	SD
25. The student's self-evaluation is an inappropriate strategy because only the teacher is capable of providing accurate evaluations.	SA	A	U	D	SD
26. Students from religious homes are less disorderly than those from secular families.	SA	A	U	D	SD
27. 'Excellence in education' means focusing educational efforts on the bright students rather than the disadvantaged.	SA	A	U	D	SD

<b>STATEMENTS (Cont'd)</b>	<b>RESPONSES</b>				
28. Students should be taught to meet the teacher's requirements because they must learn to respect adults.	SA	A	U	D	SD
29. Too much autonomy in a world as free as ours is not advisable.	SA	A	U	D	SD
30. Students who live in government housing schemes are low achievers, especially in math.	SA	A	U	D	SD
31. The classroom should be conducted with clear and consistent rules.	SA	A	U	D	SD
32. Students should be free to leave the classroom when they need to (e.g., for a drink) without the teacher's permission.	SA	A	U	D	SD
33. Order, rules and obedience are more important in the long run than creativity and originality.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Adapted from Shechtman (2002)

### APPENDIX 3: The Democratic Classroom Observation Tool

The purpose of this activity is to ascertain the extent to which the observed teachers are implementing democratic practices in their classrooms. Read the instructions carefully before your observations.

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION

Before observing the classroom, carefully read through this document in its entirety and familiarise yourself with behaviours and activities listed below that are expected to be evident in a democratic classroom. *Study the descriptions of the various behaviours and activities carefully.*

Before the start of the lesson, examine the teacher’s plan and enter a rating for the items in PART A on the scale. **Refer to the rating guide below.**

During the lesson, note the activities that occur in the classroom. At the end of the lesson, go down the list of behaviours and activities on the instrument and enter a rating, **using the rating guide below.** If the listed behaviour or activity is one that would not have been applicable during the observation period, then record **NA** for “Not Applicable”.

In the **GENERAL COMMENTS** area, record any comments that would shed light on what occurred in the classroom. Record any events or activities not captured in the instrument but that are valuable additions to the data collected.

Before leaving the teacher, provide feedback on the lesson. As time permits, allow the teacher to talk about his or her impressions of how the lesson went. Relevant comments can be recorded in the General Comments area. Have the teacher initial the observation sheet.

**NOTE:** Initialling the tool is not an indication of agreement with the ratings. It is merely acknowledgement that the observation occurred.

#### RATING GUIDE

<b>PART A</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>NP</b>
	No Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Weak or Poor Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Good Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Excellent Reflection of the Characteristic in the Plan	Teacher had no plan
<b>PART B</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>NA</b>
	Behaviour or Activity not Observed	Behaviour or Activity Observed, but poorly executed	Behaviour or Activity Observed, fairly well-executed, but Improvements can be Made	Behaviour or Activity Observed, Appropriately Displayed or Carried Out	Behaviour or Activity not Applicable to the Lesson.

# **The Democratic Classroom Observation Tool**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of School: \_\_\_\_\_

Grade/Class: \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Students: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject: \_\_\_\_\_ Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Time Lesson Started: \_\_\_\_\_ Time Lesson Ended: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Observer: \_\_\_\_\_

## **GENERAL COMMENTS:**

Observer's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Teacher's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>PART A: Characteristics of the Lesson Plan</b>	<b>Ratings</b>				
1. Planned lesson is substantial and worthwhile	1	2	3	4	No Plan
2. Planned lesson reflects democratic ideals (e.g. opportunities for choice, interaction and self expression evident)	1	2	3	4	No Plan

<b>PART B: Behaviours and Activities</b>	<b>Ratings</b>				
3. Instruction executed in harmony with the planned objectives.	1	2	3	4	NA
4. Teacher demonstrated sound knowledge of the content.	1	2	3	4	NA
5. Teacher was respectful to the students.	1	2	3	4	NA
6. Students were respectful to the teacher and to each other.	1	2	3	4	NA
7. Teacher is caring, without being overly affectionate.	1	2	3	4	NA
8. Teacher demonstrates fairness in dealing with the students.	1	2	3	4	NA
9. Students could express their opinions freely.	1	2	3	4	NA
10. Teacher showed tolerance for the differences among the students.	1	2	3	4	NA
11. Students showed tolerance for each other's differences.	1	2	3	4	NA
12. Students allowed to make choices at appropriate times (e.g. activities, work partners, work place).	1	2	3	4	NA
13. Teacher provides opportunities for students to interact with their peers (e.g. in group work, class discussion)	1	2	3	4	NA
14. Teacher arranged the classroom to promote interaction.	1	2	3	4	NA
15. Teacher displayed a clear approach to discipline that emphasised responsibility and self-control.	1	2	3	4	NA
16. Teacher provided opportunity for students to reflect on what they were learning.	1	2	3	4	NA
17. Teacher created an environment that fostered interdependence (Students responsible for their own success and each other's).	1	2	3	4	NA

## Description of Behaviours / Activities

Planned lesson is substantial and worthwhile

In fairness to the students, the teacher should have spent some time planning lessons that are of educational value to them. The objectives and content of the planned lesson should therefore be age-appropriate, interesting and worthwhile.

Planned lesson reflects democratic ideals (e.g. opportunities for choice, interaction and self expression evident)

It should be evident from the planned activities that the teacher gave some thought to incorporating the ideals characteristic to democratic classrooms.

Instruction executed in harmony with the planned objectives

There is evidence that the teacher is conscious of the need to ensure that the students gain maximum benefit from the lesson. Hence, efforts are made to achieve the stated objectives, while not overlooking individual differences and needs. (Time on task?)

Teacher demonstrated sound knowledge of the content.

Fairness to the students dictates that the teacher does not expose them to incorrect information, or does not present concepts in such a way as to contribute to misconceptions among the students.

Teacher was respectful to the students.

The teacher shows respect to the students by addressing them by name or some other respectful title; by not making derogatory comments to them; by listening when they speak; responding respectfully to their comments and queries.

Students were respectful to the teacher and to each other.

Students show respect for the teacher by addressing him/her in an appropriate manner (by name; Sir; Ma'am); by listening when he/she speaks; by responding to instructions in a timely and appropriate manner. Students show respect for each other by refraining from name calling; by listening when one of them is speaking; by refraining from behaviour that would prevent others from benefiting from the instruction being offered; by being respectful of the opinion of others even when they do not agree with these opinions.

Teacher is caring, without being overly affectionate.

The teacher is mindful of the feelings of all the students; is not overly harsh, even when disciplining them; praises students who are doing well; encourages those who are experiencing challenges; is kind and thoughtful without being overly affectionate.

Teacher demonstrates fairness in dealing with the students.

When issuing praise to students, the teacher does not show favouritism, all students receive appropriate praise when merited. Praises boys and girls equally; praises and encourages both weak and more able students; praises without distinct based on such characteristics as ethnicity, race, and nationality.

The teacher also shows fairness by providing opportunities for ALL students to participate in the activities, when distributing learning materials and so on.

Students could express their opinions freely.

The teacher cultivated a safe environment for students to express themselves without undue criticism and harshness. Neither the teacher nor the students made efforts to silence anyone who was expressing an opinion.

Teacher showed tolerance for the differences among the students.

The teacher demonstrated knowledge of the students' differences and made efforts to cater to these differences without becoming impatient or uncomplimentary to students.

Students showed tolerance for each other's differences.

The students in the classroom demonstrated awareness of the differences among them, but were not unkind to each other.

Students allowed to make choices at appropriate times (e.g. activities, work partners, work place).

The teacher provided opportunities for the students to make choices. Where there were differences of opinions regarding the choices, the teacher promoted discussion and dialogue among the students to seek a resolution.

Teacher provides opportunities for students to interact with their peers (e.g. in group work, class discussion)

Rather than being the dominant figure during the entire lesson, the teacher provided opportunities for the students to interact with each other. The students, in class discussion and/or group work, were allowed to discuss ideas among themselves.

Teacher arranged the classroom to promote interaction.

The classroom is arranged, not in the traditional straight rows of desk manner, but in a way that allows the students to see each others' faces, speak to each other and work together with minimum movement. For example, the desks may be arranged in a circular fashion; desks could be arranged to facilitate small groups.

Teacher displayed a clear approach to discipline that emphasised responsibility and self-control.

The teacher disciplined students by refereeing to rules and their responsibility to adhere to them.

Teacher provided opportunity for students to reflect on what they were learning.  
The teacher questioned the students in such a way as to have them think about and talk critically about what they were learning.

Teacher created an environment that fostered interdependence (Students responsible for their own success and each other's).  
The teacher encouraged the students to work collaboratively rather than competitively. Students were encouraged to help each other with tasks and the faster students were encouraged to assist their slower peers.

**Appendix 4:**  
**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARTICIPANTS OF THE EDCC PROGRAMME**

**About the ONLINE Component**

1. How did you find the online component of the programme?
  - a. Learning Materials:
  - b. Support with Content:
  - c. Technical Support:
  - d. Anything Else:
2. What did you think about the length of time devoted to the online component?
3. What do you consider the **BEST** aspects of the online component of the programme? Why?
4. What do you consider the **WORST** aspects of the online component of the programme? Why?
5. Is there anything you would change about the online component of the programme? What and how?
6. Did the new knowledge and skills with which you engaged during the online component have an impact on your practice?  
If **YES**, how?  
If **NO**, Why not?

**About the PRACTICUM Component**

7. Did you get the classroom support you needed from your course advisor?  
If **YES**, in what way?  
If **NO**, what was missing?
8. Did you experience any challenges in relation to putting into practice in your classroom(s) the new knowledge and skill you acquired during the course?
9. Were there any conditions in your school / classroom that facilitated your putting into practice the new knowledge and skills that you acquired?  
If **YES**, what?  
If **NO**, what do you think needs to be done?
10. After this course, what next for you?

**Appendix 5: Examples of Responses to a Scenario that Illustrating the Award of Ratings from 1 to 5**

**SCENARIO**

A primary school has a policy of streaming students according to their perceived ability. The idea is to help the weaker students by exposing them to a curriculum more suited to their ability. As a result, areas that are considered to be difficult are removed from the programme followed by these students. At a PTA meeting, a parent whose child is in a lower stream complains that her child should be exposed to the same topics as the students in the higher stream. She is insisting that the policy be revoked. What do you think?

<b>1</b>	No. the lower students will distract academic students
<b>2</b>	She is fighting for her child not be stream labelled and create a situation where her child is stigmatized by other students and teachers etc. she can ask that more programmes be made available to have her child shine even while being streamed to develop the child talents, character and self-esteem.
<b>3</b>	I think that the students in the lower stream should cover the same topics but at their level. Some students are late bloomers and they can be placed at a disadvantage if they are denied the opportunity to study the same topics so that parent might really have a point. Streaming should not be permanent - if it is to be done, it should be to help pupils overcome or reduce their deficit and prepare them to take on a higher level of challenge.
<b>4</b>	They should not be exposed to less because they are slower. It means the method used to impart the programme of work to them should be revisited and quality teaching should be looked at.
<b>5</b>	All students, like any human, have different abilities and skills. However, though abilities and skills differ all students can learn the same material. The course content need not be different. What needs to vary is the teaching strategies and techniques used to deliver the content during classroom instruction.

**APPENDIX 6a: Profile of the Participants who Completed the Online PRE\_ASSESSMENT Questionnaire  
(START of the Course)**

	Antigua & Barbuda		Belize		Grenada		St. Lucia		Jamaica		Trinidad and Tobago		TOTAL	
	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2
<b>School Level</b>														
Primary	2	16	0	0	9	16	0	1	8	4	0	18	19	55
Secondary	0	3	0	1	0	8	9	22	1	18	5	26	15	78
Tertiary	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>Professional Status</b>														
Trained Grad	4	9	0	2	2	10	5	15	7	22	5	36	23	94
Trained Nongrad	0	8	0	0	6	11	4	8	2	0	0	3	12	30
Untrained Grad	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	10
Untrained Nongrad	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>Sex</b>														
Female	3	18	0	0	7	23	7	21	6	18	5	30	28	110
Male	1	1	0	2	2	1	2	2	3	5	0	15	8	26
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>Age Group</b>														
Under 25 yrs	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	0	0	0	1	3	9
25 - 34 yrs	1	9	0	0	5	6	4	5	5	8	0	13	15	41
35 - 44 yrs	1	8	0	2	4	13	0	6	1	5	2	13	8	47
45 or more yrs	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	3	10	3	18	10	39
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>Years Experience</b>														
Range (in yrs)	13 -28	4 - 23	0	18 - 23	5 - 21	3 - 29	4 - 30	2 - 32	1 - 24	1 - 31	10 - 29	1 - 39		
Average (in yrs)	22.8	13.7	0	20.5	14	15.7	12	17	10.9	12.2	21.2	16.3		

**APPENDIX 6b: Profile of the Participants who Completed the Online POST-ASSESSMENT Questionnaire  
(END of the Course)**

	Antigua & Barbuda		Belize		Grenada		St. Lucia		Jamaica		Trinidad and Tobago		TOTAL	
	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2	Coh 1	Coh 2
<b>School Level</b>														
Primary	0	9	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	21
Secondary	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	13	0	6	1	9	4	33
Tertiary	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Professional Status</b>														
Trained Grad	1	4	0	2	0	3	1	7	0	5	1	14	3	35
Trained Nongrad	0	4	0	0	3	4	2	6	0	1	0	2	5	17
Untrained Grad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Untrained Nongrad	0	1.0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Sex</b>														
Female	1	8	0	0	3	7	1	12	0	6	1	11	6	44
Male	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	7	3	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Age Group</b>														
Under 25 yrs	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
25 - 34 yrs	0	4	0	0	1	2	1	4	0	2	0	4	2	16
35 - 44 yrs	0	3	0	2	3	4	0	3	0	2	0	8	3	22
45 or more yrs	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	2	1	6	2	15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Years Experience</b>														
Range (in yrs)	31	3 - 22	0	19 - 23	6 - 21	10 - 29	4 - 13	5 - 35	0	2 - 24	28	4 - 32		
Average (in yrs)	31	10.8	0	21	14.5	19.4	7.3	17.5	0	14.5	28	14.2		

**APPENDIX 6c: Subjects Taught by the Participants who Completed the PRE- and POST-ASSESSMENT Questionnaire**

SUBJECTS**	PRE-Assessment	POST-Assessment
No Response	59	23
Agricultural Science	1	0
Assessment	1	0
Biology	1	1
Building Construction	1	0
Caribbean History	1	1
Chemistry	1	1
Communication Studies	1	1
Core Curriculum (Prim)	11	2
Early Childhood	1	0
English Language	10	4
English Literature	4	3
Food and Nutrition	1	0
French	1	0
Geography	4	2
Guidance and Counselling	10	1
Health and Family Life Education	4	2
History	4	0
Home Economics	1	0
Information Technology	3	2
Integrated Science	3	2
Language Arts	10	2
Literatures in English	1	1
Management	1	0
Mathematics	5	4
Music	2	1
Personal Development	2	1
Physical Education	3	0
Principles of Accounts	1	0
Principles of Business	2	0
Reading	1	0
Research Methods	1	1
Science	2	0
Science Methods	1	0
Social Studies	28	13
Sociology	4	0
Soft Skills	1	0
Spanish	2	2
Technology Education	3	0

\*\* Some participants taught more than one subject

**Appendix 7: Profile of Student Sample that Completed the PRE-ASSESSMENT Students Questionnaire (n = 2240)**

	% of Sample
<b>Cohort</b>	
Cohort 1	27
Cohort 2	73

<b>Country</b>	
Antigua & Barbuda	10
Grenada	22
St. Lucia	25
Jamaica	7
Trinidad and Tobago	34
Belize	3

<b>Sex</b>	
Female	52.5
Male	47.0
Unknown	.4

<b>Grade</b>	
Up to Grade 6	32
Grade 7 and Beyond	67
Unknown	2

<b>Age</b>	
Up to Gr 6 (n = 705)	Age range: 6 - 15; Ave. age: 10 years
Gr 7 and Beyond (n = 1489)	Age range: 10 - 36; Ave. age: 14 years

**APPENDIX 8: The Results of the Mann Whitney U Test Investigating the Differences in the Scores Obtained for the Pre- and Post-Assessments on the Democratic Beliefs Scale**

Country	Time of Data Collection	Mean Rank			Test Statistics			
		EQUALITY	FREEDOM	JUSTICE		EQUALITY	FREEDOM	JUSTICE
Antigua & Barbuda	Pre-Assessment	15.0	15.4	16.5	z =	-2.712	-2.363	-1.395
	Post-Assessment	25.4	24.5	21.8	p =	0.007*	0.018*	0.163
Grenada	Pre-Assessment	19.7	18.5	18.7	z =	-2.529	-3.634	-3.398
	Post-Assessment	31.0	34.6	33.8	p =	0.011*	<0.0005*	0.001*
St. Lucia	Pre-Assessment	22.1	21.6	23.2	z =	-1.709	-2.008	-0.891
	Post-Assessment	29.4	30.2	27.0	p =	0.088	0.045*	0.373
Jamaica	Pre-Assessment	18.6	19.6	18.4	z =	-1.145	-0.181	-1.390
	Post-Assessment	24.3	18.8	25.3	p =	0.252	0.857	0.164
Trinidad and Tobago	Pre-Assessment	32.4	32.2	33.8	z =	-1.490	-1.616	-0.488
	Post-Assessment	40.4	40.9	36.4	p =	0.136	0.106	0.625
Belize	Pre-Assessment	2.0	2.5	3.3	z =	0.439	1.000	0.221
	Post-Assessment	3.0	2.5	1.8	p =	0.667	1.000	0.333

\* Statistically significant at  $p < 0.05$

**APPENDIX 9: Results of the Wilcoxon Test Investigating the Differences in Means for the Pre- and Post-Assessment Scores for a Matched Sample of Course Participants**

Country	Dimensions		N	Mean Rank	Test Statistics
Antigua & Barbuda	EQUALITY	Negative Ranks	8	5.44	z = -2.494  p = <b>0.013*</b>
		Positive Ranks	1	1.50	
		Ties	1		
		Total	10		
	FREEDOM	Negative Ranks	9	5.00	z = -2.716  p = <b>0.007*</b>
		Positive Ranks	0	0.00	
		Ties	1		
		Total	10		
	JUSTICE	Negative Ranks	6	6.75	z = -1.338  p = 0.181
		Positive Ranks	4	3.63	
		Ties	0		
		Total	10		
Grenada	EQUALITY	Negative Ranks	6	6.33	z = -1.846  p = 0.065
		Positive Ranks	3	2.33	
		Ties	2		
		Total	11		
	FREEDOM	Negative Ranks	10	6.45	z = -2.805  p = <b>0.005*</b>
		Positive Ranks	1	1.50	
		Ties	0		
		Total	11		
	JUSTICE	Negative Ranks	9	5.61	z = -2.377  p = <b>0.017*</b>
		Positive Ranks	1	4.50	
		Ties	1		
		Total	11		
St. Lucia	EQUALITY	Negative Ranks	10	7.80	z = -1.027  p = 0.305
		Positive Ranks	5	8.40	
		Ties	0		
		Total	15		
	FREEDOM	Negative Ranks	10	7.95	z = -1.699  p = 0.089
		Positive Ranks	4	6.38	
		Ties	1		
		Total	15		
	JUSTICE	Negative Ranks	8	8.94	z = -1.200
		Positive Ranks	6	5.58	

		Ties	1		p = 0.230
		Total	15		
Jamaica	EQUALITY	Negative Ranks	4	2.50	z = -1.826
		Positive Ranks	0	0.00	
		Ties	0		p = 0.068
		Total	4		
	FREEDOM	Negative Ranks	3	2.83	z = -1.289
		Positive Ranks	1	1.50	
		Ties	0		p = 0.197
		Total	4		
	JUSTICE	Negative Ranks	4	2.50	z = -1.841
		Positive Ranks	0	0.00	
		Ties	0		p = 0.066
		Total	4		
Trinidad and Tobago	EQUALITY	Negative Ranks	11	9.09	z = -2.279
		Positive Ranks	4	5.00	
		Ties	1		p = <b>0.023*</b>
		Total	16		
	FREEDOM	Negative Ranks	14	7.50	z = -3.310
		Positive Ranks	0	0.00	
		Ties	2		p = <b>0.001*</b>
		Total	16		
	JUSTICE	Negative Ranks	11	8.09	z = -2.300
		Positive Ranks	3	5.33	
		Ties	2		p = <b>0.021*</b>
		Total	16		
Belize	EQUALITY	Negative Ranks	2	1.50	z = -1.342
		Positive Ranks	0	0.00	
		Ties	0		p = 0.180
		Total	2		
	FREEDOM	Negative Ranks	1	2.00	z = -0.447
		Positive Ranks	1	1.00	
		Ties	0		p = 0.655
		Total	2		
	JUSTICE	Negative Ranks	0	.00	z = -1.000
		Positive Ranks	1	1.00	
		Ties	1		p = 0.317
		Total	2		

Negative Ranks      Pre < Post  
Positive Ranks      Pre > Post  
Ties                    Pre = Post

**APPENDIX 10: Results of the Mann Whitney U Test Investigating the Differences in Means for the Pre- and Post-Assessment Scores for the Sample**

Country	Time of Administration	Mean Rank	Test Statistics
Antigua & Barbuda	Pre-Assessment	12.72	z = -3.158
	Post-Assessment	24.64	p = <b>0.002*</b>
Grenada	Pre-Assessment	12.88	z = -3.551
	Post-Assessment	26.71	p = <b>&lt;0.0005*</b>
St. Lucia	Pre-Assessment	12.37	z = -4.515
	Post-Assessment	28.79	p = <b>&lt;0.0005*</b>
Jamaica	Pre-Assessment	12.33	z = -2.635
	Post-Assessment	23.63	p = <b>0.008*</b>
Trinidad and Tobago	Pre-Assessment	24.09	z = -2.635
	Post-Assessment	49.73	p = <b>&lt;0.0005*</b>
Belize	Pre-Assessment	1.50	z = -1.633
	Post-Assessment	3.50	p = 0.102

**APPENDIX 11: Results of the Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test to  
Compare the Matched Ratings for the Scenarios**

		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
PRE-Assessment – POST-Assessment	Negative Ranks	43	25.55	1098.5
	Positive Ranks	4	7.38	29.5
	Ties	2		
	Total	49		
	Negative Ranks	pre_vlue < pos_vlue		
	Positive Ranks	pre_vlue > pos_vlue		
	Ties	pos_vlue = pre_vlue		