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Abstract

The Implementation of the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Secondary Schools in Trinidad and Tobago: Teachers’ Perspectives.

Sharmila Harry

The Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) replaced the Cambridge Advanced Level Examination in 1998 in sixteen Caribbean territories and in Trinidad and Tobago in 2003. However, there has been meagre attention paid to how any of the CAPE syllabi, one of which is Communication Studies, has been implemented. The purpose of this study is to explore teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in secondary schools in Trinidad and Tobago. It also seeks to investigate how teachers are implementing the innovation in their classrooms and the factors that impede and facilitate the implementation of it.

To address the study’s overarching purpose, research objectives, and research questions, a qualitative approach was utilized. A case study design was employed, using interviews, documents and classroom observations.

The findings revealed that there are gaps between the intended curriculum and how teachers are actually implementing it in the classroom. Teachers were not implementing many aspects of the innovation although they had positive orientations towards it. The CAPE Communication Studies innovation is still facing many obstacles which undermine its success. The challenges that teachers face in their implementation of it are due to several factors. However, school-contextual and external-contextual factors had the most profound influence. The findings pointed to a few factors that facilitated teachers’ implementation. Unfortunately, there are more barriers working against implementation than for it. The study suggests that careful attention needs to be paid to the implementation stage by policy makers and that the assumptions of the innovation must be compatible with the local context. Well-intentioned curriculum innovations cannot achieve their intentions if the curriculum process is not effectively planned and managed.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAPE</td>
<td>Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination</td>
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<tr>
<td>GORTT</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEC</td>
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<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
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<tr>
<td>SEMP</td>
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<tr>
<td>USE</td>
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<tr>
<td>UWI</td>
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## Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialect</strong></td>
<td>“A dialect can be defined as any variety of a language characteristic of a particular group of the language’s speakers.” (Rochford, 2011, p. 72).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caribbean Standard English</strong></td>
<td>“An accepted standard of English developed in the Caribbean” (Caribbean Examinations Council, p. 39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creole</strong></td>
<td>“A native language which has its beginnings in situations of contact where groups of people who did not share a common language were forced to communicate with each other” (Caribbean Examinations Council, p. 39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Official language</strong></td>
<td>“A language used in official situations for legal, educational, government, and other formal communication purposes” (Caribbean Examinations Council, p. 40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard language</strong></td>
<td>“The dialect of a language that is generally used for education and other formal or official purposes. It is generally held to be the most prestigious of the dialects of a language” (Caribbean Examinations Council, p. 40).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background to the research issue

Many countries including Trinidad and Tobago spend millions of dollars on policy development to provide quality education. However, the focus of policymakers is on planning and development, ignoring the challenges that arise during the implementation stage (Fullan, 2016; Markee, 1997; Orafi, 2008). The issue then, is “not the formulation of policy but the implementation” (Ogar and Opoh, 2015, p. 145). It doesn’t matter how well-designed, well formulated and laudable a curriculum innovation is, it will remain “virtually inert” (Ogar and Opoh, 2015, p. 146) if attention is not focused on the implementation stage where the problems occur. As such, this stage must be focused on since it is not an extension of the planning or adoption process (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977). In fact, the process of implementation has been visualized in terms of a “black box” (O’ Sullivan, 2002). Therefore, exploring what is happening during the implementation phase may allow “stakeholders to determine if any change has actually occurred and to discover the reasons why change was either impeded or facilitated” (Wang, 2006, p. 33). Unfortunately, there is a lack of interest about what has happened to an innovation between the time that it was developed and how it is put in to practice in the classroom (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977). It is anticipated that the actual use is congruent to the intended use (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977). As such, reform efforts are unsuccessful due to the failure of policy developers to plan for implementation (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977) and the challenges that ensue.

Similarly, in Trinidad and Tobago “policies are sound, but implementation is problematic” for several reasons:

The externally driven initiatives are working against rather than with, the existing culture in Trinidad and Tobago and in schools. The policy makers are not providing the requisite resources, and support to implement policies effectively. Often teachers are not
trained to implement the new curricula, and this is affecting teaching and learning in the classrooms (James, 2008, p. 8).

The Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (hereafter referred to as CAPE) also followed the same path where the focus was on development, ignoring the implementation stage. It seemed that the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) was enamoured with the design of the CAPE initiative. The introduction in 1998 of the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination curriculum innovation to the Anglophone Caribbean islands was a response to the call by Caribbean Community (CARICOM) various education ministries for a post-secondary curriculum change that would supersede the Cambridge Advanced Level Examination, and also be more extensive in terms of its theoretical premises (Spence, 2004). Many educationalists demanded an Advanced Level examination that was more amenable to the socio-cultural realities of the Caribbean (Griffith, 1999).

The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago (GORTT) took up the gauntlet much later than the other Caribbean regions to introduce the CAPE curriculum. Initially, it was first piloted in several secondary schools in 2003. However, by September 2006, the Government mandated that all secondary schools which taught the General Certificate of Education (GCE) Advanced level curriculum must commence with the implementation of the CAPE innovation, Communication Studies being one.

The CAPE Communication Studies innovation serves a significant need and is creditable. However, despite these benefits it must be implemented effectively by teachers or else the desired results would be unattainable. To my knowledge, no empirical research study thus far that has come to the fore to shed light on teachers’ perspectives about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, how teachers are actually implementing it in their classrooms or the factors that influence their implementation of it in the Trinidad and Tobago context.
1.2 Situating the research context

This section discusses the contextual background of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. As Carless (2001) points out, innovations are “shaped by social and cultural forces which affect the extent to which they will be accepted, modified, implemented faithfully or institutionalized” (p. 60) and failure to consider the total context would hinder the implementation efforts. It is therefore pertinent to give a succinct history of the education system in Trinidad and Tobago, one of the regions of the Caribbean, where the teaching and learning of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation takes place.

This section also gives a succinct history of the process of development by which the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) came into fruition, since it is the regional body that governs the CAPE curriculum initiative in several Caribbean territories, one of which is Trinidad and Tobago. Additionally, the justification and underlying philosophy of the overarching CAPE curriculum initiative is discussed. Furthermore, the specific rationale, aims, structure and modules, resource materials and modes of assessment of CAPE Communication Studies, one of the syllabi of the CAPE curriculum, are then discussed.

1.2.1 The education system of Trinidad and Tobago

Trinidad and Tobago, a twin island Republic, is situated at the southern end of the Caribbean archipelago north-east of Venezuela (George and Quamina-Aiyejina, 2003) with a population of approximately 1.3 million. Amerindians inhabited the islands in the past and Spain, France and Britain declared ownership of the islands at various intervals during the country’s colonial history. In 1797, Trinidad came under British control. Under British rule slaves from Africa came to work in the sugar cane, cocoa and coffee plantations. However, when the African
slave trade was abolished in 1834, East Indian indentured servants were hired to work on the sugar cane fields and plantations, which ended in 1917. The Chinese, Syrians and Portuguese also arrived over the course of its history. Trinidad and Tobago is considered a multi-racial and multi-cultural society because of different groups of people came from all over the world and settled here. Hindus, Christians and Muslims make up a major part of the population. Indeed, all ethnic groups in Trinidad and Tobago have influenced the culture of the nation and have left their stamp in their music, song, dance, clothing, religion, festival and food.

Trinidad and Tobago gained independence from Britain in 1962 and became a Republic in 1976. As such, in the field of education the focus was on pursuing new curriculum directions that would emphasize a reconsidering of the education system instead of retaining the colonial form of education (Campbell, 1992). In this vein, education was “fundamental to the overall development of Trinidad and Tobago”, as espoused in the Education Policy Paper (EPP) 1993-2003 (MOE, 1993, p. xvii). The independence period in the Commonwealth Caribbean showed some evidence that it had started its own educational liberation by beginning to decide the path of educational reform based on its own agenda (Miller, 1991). To this end, the government of Trinidad and Tobago’s focus was on building a nationalist education system to bring about, “social integration and economic development, the former chiefly by bringing youths of different races and classes into the same schools, and the latter by down-playing the colonial grammar school type of secondary education” (Campbell, 1992, p. 71). Other initiatives included massive expansion of secondary schools with an array of new junior secondary and senior secondary schools, to achieve the goal of equal opportunity for all in education (Campbell, 1992).

The ongoing series of education reforms initiatives, to a large extent, continued to turn its attention to the secondary sector which
included the establishment of Universal Secondary Education (USE) in the year 2000, and other significant curriculum reforms in order to be relevant to the globalised world and to decolonize the curriculum. One of these included the Secondary Education and Modernization Programme (SEMP) which started in 1999. Another curriculum reform involved the introduction of the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) curriculum innovation in 2003, which is inextricably linked with one of the government’s objectives to continue with its effort to make the curriculum applicable to the needs of the country. However, these efforts were perceived negatively and more in terms of superficial avenues “to adapt curricular and examinations to the realities of the West Indian life” (Burnham, 2008, p. 318).

As a former British colony, the education system of Trinidad and Tobago, is patterned after the structure of the British model of education. As such, echoes of the British model are still evident in the country’s education system. The structure of education in Trinidad and Tobago involves four levels (George and Quamina-Aiyejina, 2003). The Early Childhood Care and Education (ECCE) level consists mainly of students between the ages of three to five. Schooling at the primary level comprises of a seven-year program of study. Students at this level are approximately five to eleven years old. The culmination of primary education means that students must write the Secondary Entrance Assessment (SEA) examination which would allow them a place in one of the secondary schools. Students then spend five years of compulsory schooling at the secondary level from ages eleven to sixteen. This ends with students pursuing the Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) examination or the National Examination Council (NEC) examinations, which is a separate examination available for secondary students who are registered in the technical-vocational programme. Following this, there are two years of voluntary advanced secondary education from ages sixteen to eighteen that lead to students writing the
Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE). The final stage is at the tertiary level that accommodates students who want to pursue university education.

The education system in the Caribbean is still examination-dominated where results are published which makes teachers accountable for the performance of their students in the classroom (Miller, 1991). Thus, pedagogy is used mainly for helping students pass ‘high-stake’ tests (Miller, 1991). In fact, “secondary education at its best [is still] classical” (Campbell, 1992, p. 52). The state controls education through the Ministry of Education, which is bureaucratic and top down (De Lisle, 2012a).

There are eight educational districts in Trinidad and Tobago (see Figure 1). All the districts are led by a School Supervisor 3 (SS3) and for secondary schools, assisted by a School Supervisor 2 (SS2) (Brown and Conrad, 2007). Moreover, the School Supervisors (SS3) “report to the central office of the MOE (Ministry of Education), which is headed by the permanent secretary (the chief administrative officer responsible for the overall functioning of the ministry) and the chief education officer (the chief technocrat responsible for educational matters)” (Brown and Conrad, 2007, p. 184). Across the education districts the SS3 would administer standardised curriculum and policies for operation of secondary schools from the central office. The districts also have the same standardised curriculum for students from forms one to five and at the sixth form level, which is the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) in the various specialist discipline areas. Moreover, the schools in each of the districts would have students from different socio-economic status, religions and ethnicities. Additionally, all education districts have the two major types of public secondary schools: Government and Government–Assisted or denominational schools.

In Trinidad and Tobago, administration of public schools is either “fully owned” by the state or “managed by a private body” (George
Government-assisted or denominational schools are managed by religious denominations but given monetary support by the state. They are administered jointly by the Ministry of Education and the respective denominational church boards and the government pays salaries and personal benefits of all teachers in these schools (George and Quamina-Aiyejina, 2003). These schools are closely aligned with the British Grammar school model, “with an intake of high performing students from the [Secondary Entrance Examination (SEA)]” (De Lisle, 2012a, p. 66). This school type is in demand by stakeholders (De Lisle, 2012a) and the “top twenty percent of students in this examination [is] placed in the prestigious traditional grammar [denominational] schools which, over the years, had developed reputations of high performance and entry into which had thus become very competitive” (Mitchell, 2012, p. 27). In contrast, government schools are controlled and managed by the state and co-exist with the denominational schools (George and Quamina-Aiyejina, 2003). In the government secondary schools “student intake mean scores are lower than the grammar school” (De Lisle, 2012a, p. 68).
Figure 1: Map of educational districts in Trinidad and Tobago

Source: Adapted from The UWI Trinidad and Tobago research and development fund project maps (2016).
The next section (1.2.2) discusses the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) since an exploration of the CAPE curriculum innovation necessitates an understanding of Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC), the examining body that governs the CAPE examinations.

1.2.2 The Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC)

The Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) came into fruition in 1972 by an agreement among sixteen English speaking Commonwealth Caribbean Countries and Territories (see Appendix 1) as the regional examining body to replace the Cambridge Syndicate of Examinations that served as the examining body from 1863 (Griffith, 1999). The establishment of CXC was perceived as a germane effort of Caribbean territories that wanted to create institutions that would be representative of the interests of Caribbean people (Griffith, 1999). The main motive of CXC therefore was to develop “syllabuses…with objectives and content that were suitable for and responsive to the changing developing needs of the region” (Griffith, 1999, p. 5). As such, several examinations were developed under CXC, one of which was the Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) for students who have finalized “five years of secondary education” and the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) (see section 1.2.3) for students at the Advanced Secondary Level (Griffith, 1999, p. 5).

The CXC examinations which are based on standard regional curricula, have been a driving force for instilling awareness and understanding among students of the importance of the Caribbean in the increasing global world (Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat, 2009). On the international arena CXC examinations are accepted by universities in the United States of America, Canada and the United Kingdom. In fact, Griffith (1999, p. 21) notes that CXC has gained
recognition from the University of the West Indies and from “[t]he United Kingdom National Recognition Information Centre (UK NARIC).

The following section (1.2.3) discusses the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) innovation and one of its syllabi, Communication Studies.

1.2.3 The Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) Innovation and the Communication Studies syllabus

The Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) emerged based on a directive since 1979 from “the Ministers of Education of the participating countries of the region to design a post-secondary examination suited to the developmental needs of the region” (Worrell, 2002, p. 99). Educators at Secondary schools, Advanced Level and Tertiary Institutions were of the opinion that students graduating from the sixth form level were deficient in basic life skills they deemed necessary for success in life at work or in career building (Worrell, 2002). Furthermore, these groups concurred that it would be more desirable that the CAPE innovation include subject matter that revolved around Caribbean issues, Caribbean events and Caribbean realities (Worrell, 2002). This meant that the CAPE innovation targeted a wider range of the students at the Advanced Level as it drew “within a single system of certification, subjects traditionally regarded as academic and those traditionally viewed as technical/vocational” (Griffith, 1999, p. 7).

The CAPE syllabi therefore incorporated some innovative features (CAPE Scheme Document, 1995). Firstly, the CAPE syllabi are structured as one-unit or two-unit courses. A one-unit foundational course such as Communication Studies is completed in one year and consists of three modules and a hundred and fifty credit hours that included contact time and time spent on projects and other assignments (CAPE Scheme
Another innovative feature is that the CAPE syllabi included content that is representative of the Caribbean region, which enabled “students to acquire the central concepts and skills of their chosen disciplines using subject matter that reflected the Caribbean region’s cultural identity, social and historical experience and developmental concerns” (Worrell, 2002, p. 100). Additionally, innovative types of assessment were introduced by CAPE such as performance assessment and internal assessment (CAPE Scheme Document, 1995). The internal assessment was not an aspect of the Cambridge Advanced Level examination which means that it was new to students as well as teachers who taught at the sixth form Advanced Examination level (Worrell, 2002, p. 101).

Communication Studies is one of the core subjects which replaced the General Certificate of Education (GCE) Advanced Level General Paper, the other being Caribbean Studies. The rationale that undergirds the syllabus is cogently stated:

The ability to communicate thoughts, emotions, ideas and attitudes is a critical factor in the management of our physical and social environment. Communication Studies builds students’ awareness of the centrality of language to the normal functioning of human beings and facilitates their ability to operate in the Caribbean linguistic environment and beyond. It also provides students with the confidence to respond appropriately and creatively to the implied challenges of that environment through the development of their language awareness and communicative competencies (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 1, italics in original).

Students are also expected to develop skills in comprehension, language awareness and use, and expression (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). Moreover, they must be able to manipulate the techniques of language communication such as, listening, speaking, reading, writing and visually representing (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). These skills are supposed to augment the communicative skills that they have developed in their creole languages (Caribbean Examinations Council,
The CAPE Communication Studies syllabus therefore aims to (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 2):

1. develop an understanding of the nature of language and its various functions in social, aesthetic, work-related and other contexts.

2. develop an appreciation of speech and writing as mental and social processes.

3. enable students to use language varieties and registers accurately, appropriately and effectively in a range of contexts.

4. provide an understanding of the use of technology and its impact on communication.

5. develop an appreciation of the role of language in shaping Caribbean culture identity.

6. develop an appreciation of the complex process of communication within a wide range of discourse contexts.

7. encourage students to use communication strategies appropriate to specific discourse contexts.

The structure of the syllabus consists of three modules, namely “Gathering and Processing Information” (Module 1), “Language and Community” (Module 2) and “Speaking and Writing” (Module 3), each requiring fifty hours (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). These modules may be studied simultaneously or in any order that the teacher deems relevant to his or her classroom context (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010).

In all three modules, the general and specific objectives are delineated by detailing the teaching and learning activities as well as the resources. The content areas of Module 1 include developing capability in oral and written expression, comprehension, summary skills, current issues and evaluating the reliability and validity of sources, as well as mastering both oral and written organizational skills (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). Seventeen different suggested teaching and learning activities are aimed at facilitating students’
attainment of this Module’s objectives. Some of these encompass the development of general study skills such as listening and analysing using visual cues, and the ability to select main ideas towards the proficiency in speech and aptitude (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). Other activities include, students’ engagement in the “practise [of] mock interviews” and the selection of “samples of different types of writing [to] discuss in groups” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 9-10).

In Module 2 the content areas include oral and written expression, defining language, salient characteristics of English Creole languages, language in society and technology, culture and communication (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). The module includes about sixteen suggested teaching and learning activities that teachers are advised to engage students in to achieve the objectives of the module. For example, students are required to create “a project in which they differentiate Caribbean Standard English from another Standard English” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 17). They must also “identify a passage which represents informal, conversational Creole...[and] translate the passage to a formal standard written version of Caribbean Standard English” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 17, italics in original) working in various groups. Attention must be paid to “vocabulary and semantics, grammar, sentence structure and idiomatic expressions” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 18).

In Module 3, content areas of emphasis are: Oral and written expression, the process of communication, forms of communication, the various contexts of communication, types of speaking and writing and organizing skills (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). Teaching and learning activities (about eleven) also suggested for this module include: “practical projects like class or group magazines to help develop [students’] writing skills”, “editing groups where students can use checklists to check grammar and mechanics in each other’s writing” and the use of “semantic mapping to help students organize ideas in useful

A careful analysis of the syllabus reveals that it is more open-ended rather than carefully controlled. The classroom is supposed to be characterized by student-centered activities and many learning opportunities other than memorization of factual data, didactic instruction and teacher-dominated situations. These aspects are explicitly highlighted through suggested teaching activities in all the modules in the Communication Studies syllabus. The activities highlight a learner-centred approach to the teaching and learning process. The role of the teacher is that of a co-learner with students and not an authoritarian figure as with traditional school practices.

Resource materials of the syllabus reflect students’ cultural experiences and interests and include a range of authentic texts and artefacts from the students’ society and culture. Some of the West Indian resources identified in the modules include, various textbooks written by Caribbean writers, audiotapes and videotapes by eminent Caribbean performers and a dictionary based on Caribbean English (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). However, teachers are urged to access other relevant sources to complement the resources provided.

Two modes of assessment are used in the Communication Studies syllabus: an external (a final written examination) and an internal assessment (portfolio). The external assessment accounts for eighty percent of the total assessment and the internal assessment accounts for twenty percent (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 27). The internal assessment organized under three areas, expository, reflective and analytical, consists of a portfolio of students’ work. Students are required to “compile a portfolio on a theme selected, determined by the candidate and approved by the teacher” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 29). The theme that is chosen by each student must reflect “how it relates
to the [his or her] academic, work-related and personal interests” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 29).

As espoused previously, the syllabi developed within CAPE now include content that is synonymous with the Caribbean culture (Worrell, 2002). In fact, language awareness is significant and a necessary dimension of the content of any curriculum (Craig, 1999). It can provide opportunities for Creole speakers to confront the differences and relationships between Creole language and cultures and the dominant European languages (Craig, 1999). The CAPE Communications Studies syllabus emphasises the “development of advanced competencies in Standard English”, an appreciation of “language awareness” and the “linguistic diversity of the Caribbean” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 1).

1.3 Statement of the problem

The Communication Studies syllabus like the other syllabi under CAPE sought change and innovation in education. However, these innovative aspects required teachers to make a complex set of changes in their content knowledge, teaching resources, belief system (Fullan, 2016) and their classroom practice:

The use of ongoing performance assessment, the new configurations of subjects, with the resultant demands for new designs of instructional materials ...were all elements of a complex set of changes which the new examinations demanded (Worrell, 2002, p. 101).

Teachers were expected to adopt a student-centered approach to teaching and learning, promote students’ active engagement and encourage independent learning. They also had to facilitate more communicative activities in the classroom. However, this was very challenging as it demanded a change in roles and behaviours that were not in tandem with the existing norms expected of teachers in the Trinidad and Tobago context. Moreover, it meant a movement away from their “existing attitudes to knowledge” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 324) as
memorization of facts, which involve teaching to the test. Implementation challenges are inevitable when the demands of the innovation are incongruent with the local contextual realities (Luke, 2011; Wedell, 2009). Several studies internationally also illuminate the barriers and challenges that influence teachers’ implementation of curriculum innovations (Carless, 2001; Grassick and Wedell, 2018; Guro and Weber, 2010; Song, 2015). Teachers’ behaviours, therefore, could be due to a multiplicity of interactive factors at the classroom and school levels, the education system and the wider society (Fullan, 2016; Kavanoz, 2006; O’Sullivan, 2002; Tudor, 2001; Wedell, 2009).

In many cases, curriculum planners and developers do not perceive the implementation process “through a context-sensitive lens” (Katyal and Fai, 2010, p. 39), as such, fail to effect appropriate strategies to support teachers during implementation. Furthermore, the change process involves far more than top-down directives to implement from the Ministry of Education (MOE) and other officials, where implementation is conceived as a one-way process instead of a “continuous, negotiated, contested, [and] unpredictable process” (Guro and Weber, 2010, p. 246). The messiness of change and the demands that it makes on the teachers to implement the CAPE Communication Studies innovation should not be overlooked (Fullan, 2016). It does not matter how sound a curriculum innovation is, if the challenges that arise at the implementation stage are not considered and addressed, then success will be elusive.

There is a paucity of research on teachers’ perspectives about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, how teachers are implementing it in their classrooms and the factors that influence their implementation of it. Therefore, this study seeks to fill this gap by providing data on curriculum implementation in the Trinidad and Tobago context.
1.4 Research motivation

The impetus and motivation for this study were nurtured since 2004 when I had to implement CAPE Communication Studies in a secondary school in central Trinidad. In my effort to understand and make sense of what was happening to my colleagues and me, I began reading widely on implementation of curriculum innovations in different contexts from teachers’ perspectives. This sparked my interest further as some of what was stated in the literature seemed to undergird practice. Furthermore, conversations with other colleagues implementing the CAPE Communication Studies innovation revealed that some of them felt alone during the implementation process, without support from the school and the wider education society, which they perceived as an egregious error. There were a few who had a nonchalant attitude to change, while others, like myself, were uptight and felt that the change seemed too complex. We believed that we lacked the understanding, training and skill to implement the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation as intended as it was a radical departure from the British Cambridge Examinations, which we were comfortable with. It was evident from these informal dialogues and my experience that the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies was more complex than anticipated and fraught with problems, which seemed to stymie our efforts during implementation.

Moreover, the initial workshop which was held at the Rudranath Capildeo Resource Learning Centre in central Trinidad for secondary teachers throughout the island implementing CAPE Communication Studies, remained nebulous on strategies for addressing several of the problems that teachers were experiencing in the classroom, especially in relation to the portfolio assessment and the “Language and Community” Module 2. In fact, one of the curriculum officers after the workshop eagerly retorted to us “say no more, now go and implement!” Obviously, they failed abysmally to comprehend the change process, as exemplified
in one teacher’s immediate reply, “you expect us to implement overnight?” On a personal level, the Curriculum Officer’s response was important to me for two reasons; firstly, it highlighted the fact that our voices were negated and secondly, implementation was perceived a ‘one-time’ event (Hall and Hord, 2011). On the other hand, the simple yet profound statement by the teacher alludes to the underlying crux of educational change that we were experiencing, that change is certainly a process (Hall and Hord, 2011; Fullan; 2016; Wedell, 2009).

After the workshop I engaged in further introspection and inner dialogue. I began to probe even deeper in an effort to find answers to nagging questions: Why have so many curriculum innovations failed? What are the factors that influence teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation? In attempting to address these questions I realized how important it was to garner a deeper understanding of the implementation process. Various research studies internationally (Carless, 2001; Fullan, 2001; Wang, 2006; Wedell, 2003) provided the initial opportunity for me to connect the threads of practice with theory, as there was an absence of local literature on the implementation process. In other words, the adage that “theory undergirds practice” does have merit. These studies influenced my thinking about the change process and provided a gateway into further illuminating the factors that influence implementation of curriculum innovations.

As an educator in the Trinidad and Tobago context I believe that understanding curriculum implementation particularly as narrated from the experienced eye of the teachers is a worthy field of study, as it is through their lenses discerning judgments can be made about the implementation process. In Trinidad and Tobago there is practically no attention to the implementation of innovations, as the Government and policy makers are more concerned with policy development. However, a lot of “work on implementation issues needs to be done in [Trinidad] if
the promises of [innovations such as CAPE Communication Studies] are to make any impact in schools and start to provide the next generation with a better education” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 1173).

In fact, the literature also posits that if implementation is not considered it will be impossible “to determine if any change has actually occurred and to discover the reasons why change was either impeded or facilitated” (Wang, 2006, p. 33).

1.5 The purpose of the study

This qualitative case study explores teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in secondary schools in one educational district in Trinidad and Tobago. It also seeks to investigate the views that teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and how they are implementing it in their classrooms. Specifically, my research focuses on the factors that impede and facilitate teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

1.6 Research objectives and research questions

In order to explore the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in secondary schools in Trinidad and Tobago, this research study sought several objectives.

1.6.1 Research objectives

The objectives of the research are to explore:

- The views that teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.
- How teachers are implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.
• Teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

• Teachers’ perspectives of the factors that facilitate the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

1.6.2 Research questions

To address these objectives, my research study examined the following research questions:

1. What perspectives do teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
2. How are teachers implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
3. What are teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
4. What are teachers’ perspectives of the factors that facilitate the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

1.7 The significance of the study

This research is the only comprehensive study on teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. The present study captures the complexity of curriculum implementation by examining its most salient aspects; hence, it contributes to the scant local literature that exists on curriculum implementation and change. Traditionally, there has been a reliance on foreign literature and research
to understand what obtains in the local context in the field of curriculum. This is borne out by London (2002, p. 60) who argues:

In the era of curriculum ferment in industrialized societies, decisions taken in respect of schools in Trinidad and Tobago drew from the universe of ideologies prevailing in those countries…[T]he general direction of transfer (from metropole to colony) is a trajectory that has continued to the present day.

Curriculum policy makers had no option previously than to be guided by what foreign countries used and attempted to modify it to fit into their local context in the “absence of literature produced locally” (Mitchell, 2012, p. 139). However, applying modifications of foreign literature to the local context are not without challenges. Strong dependency on metropolitan ideas have resulted in “difficulties which an independent Trinidad and Tobago now faces in its attempt to develop and implement curricular that are responsive to the emergence into a modern nation state” (London, 2002, p. 53).

What is more apt is fostering research within the local context to understand curriculum implementation. It is important to note that historically in the Anglophone Caribbean the weakest phase in the policy cycle has been curriculum implementation (Jones and Schoburgh, 2004). Moreover, at present there is paucity of literature on the factors that are affiliated with the implementation gap in the Anglophone Caribbean and this hinders successful implementation (Louisy, 2004). This study therefore seeks to fill this gap that exists in indigenous knowledge by presenting evidence-based research in the domain of curriculum implementation in Trinidad and Tobago. To date, although the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation was introduced in sixteen Caribbean territories since 1998, there is a dearth of research about the implementation process in any of the CAPE syllabi in secondary schools. Furthermore, there are no in-depth empirical studies on the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum
innovation and the factors that influence teachers’ implementation of it in the Trinidad and Tobago context.

My study is also significant because it can provide insights on international implementation and change theory by examining how teachers are implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. It can also add novel perspectives to the already existing factors that impede or support implementation in the international literature. This can then contribute to a greater understanding of implementation and change theory. My study can further corroborate the corpus of literature about the implementation process.

This study also has practical significance in that it can generate guidelines to local policy makers, staff developers, change facilitators and educators on the management of curriculum implementation in the education system of Trinidad and Tobago. As such, it can help them effect relevant strategies and develop appropriate interventions for successful implementation of curriculum innovations so that the factors that impede teachers’ successful implementation can be addressed. In this vein, it will eliminate uncertainty on “how best to lead, implement and manage the process of change” (Cooper, 1998, p. 2). Additionally, this study can be a catalyst for other studies locally and regionally.

My study is also significant because it presents insights about curriculum implementation from teachers’ perspectives. It un/silences teachers’ voices and considers their opinion about the implementation process. It therefore gives power to the voiceless by recognizing and validating teachers’ perspective about the implementation process, instead of being “powerless pawns in a system that treats [them] either with indifference or disdain” (Dombart, 1985, p.71). Until teachers are perceived as critical members of the change process, they “retain the aura of powerlessness and invisibility” (Dombart, 1985, p.72).
1.8 Researcher’s positionality: “Who am I?”

Researchers’ positionalities are a critical aspect of “the ways in which researchers are read and interpreted by research participants” (Hopkins, 2007, p. 387). Significantly, a researcher’s positionality as Mullings (1999) notes influences all facets of the research including, the collection of data, data analysis, findings of the study and even permission to be granted an interview. Researchers enter upon research with “maps of consciousness” (Haraway 1991 cited in Mullings, 1999, p. 337). It is therefore pertinent that researchers understand who they are in the study since:

[T]he multiple, interweaving and intersecting ways in which… various positionalities and identities are revealed, negotiated and managed in research encounters are crucial to the conduct of ethical research (Hopkins, 2007, p. 388).

As a researcher I am not disconnected from this research but as Kincheloe, McLaren and Steinberg (2011) argue subjectively intertwined. My background and link to this study are deep-seated. I have dedicated over twelve years to the field of secondary education as an English Language teacher. I spent two years implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and based on my experience in the Trinidad and Tobago context, preference was given to the development of it. This became even more evident at the first CAPE Communication Studies training workshop that I attended in 2005, which was organized by Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) and the Ministry of Education (MOE) in Trinidad and Tobago where implementing change was perceived as an event. After this workshop I had a presage that the challenges and problems that teachers encountered in their implementation of CAPE would perhaps be ignored. Internationally, the issue of implementation of curriculum innovations from teachers’ perspectives seemed to me to be a burgeoning field, but unfortunately it has remained parsimoniously elucidated in the context of Trinidad and Tobago. Therefore, for my Master of Education (M.E.d)
thesis I investigated “Teachers’ Concerns about the Implementation of a curriculum innovation” using the theoretical framework of Hall and Hord’s (2011) Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) dimension, the Stages of Concern (SOC).

This dissertation (PhD) builds on my Master of Education thesis about curriculum implementation however; the focus has changed to teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Curriculum implementation from teachers’ views then is “[my] impulse behind all research” (Stenhouse, 1975, p. 14) or a “bias” (Wolcott, 1995 p. 186). A bias then is a “thought-about position from which the researcher as inquirer feels drawn to an issue… and seeks to construct a firmer basis in both knowledge and understanding” (Wolcott, 1995, p. 186). This is further foregrounded by Grugulis (2003, p. 146) who indicates that the qualitative researcher’s task, “is not to eliminate bias (either in themselves or in others) but to acknowledge and explore it, providing a rich and full picture of the pleasure and pains.”

In this study therefore, I sought to illuminate the teachers’ perspectives while also acknowledging my positionality. An aspect of positionality is recognizing relationships with other people and being cognizant of ethical issues pertaining to my positionality. This was acknowledged by providing participants with in-depth information about my connection to the research study and my context, since as Stanley and Wise (1993, p.161) warn it “cannot be left behind.”

As I started my teaching career in secondary education, it means that I am no stranger to several academic staff. Given that I share collegial relationships with several Heads of Department, Vice-Principals and Principals of secondary schools, access to these schools and teachers that are implementing CAPE Communication Studies was easily granted. However, Busher (2002) warns that gatekeepers can “restrict or select the
range of participants with whom researchers can work” (p. 4). Notwithstanding this, my association with gatekeepers acted as “guides” to my domains of research (Burgess, 1985, p. 91).

As a Trinidadian, like the participants of the study, I share language and cultural familiarity with them which assisted me to “better understand many nuances of participants experiences which [I] could identify and explore further” (Das, 2010, p. 18). The CAPE Communications Studies curriculum innovation includes a significant Caribbean content which encapsulates the dynamics of the Caribbean languages and linguistic diversity. During the classroom observations teachers used poems such as “Trini Talk” (see Appendix 2) and other reading materials that included at times dialect from Trinidad as well as from other Caribbean islands, which I am familiar with. Similarly, during interviews teachers used on occasions Creole words and phrases which were easy for me to decipher and deconstruct given that Trinidad Creole is our first language. This helped in “correctly analysing and interpreting the data and taking it further” (Das, 2010, p. 19). Moreover, I concur that when researchers and participants share cultural familiarity, then it is easier to understand their verbal communication as well as their non-verbal behaviour (Johnson-Bailey, 1999).

I am also a Teacher Educator at the University of the West Indies (UWI), St Augustine where I teach in the Master of Education (M.E.d.) programme (Curriculum Concentration) and the Foundation area (Curriculum Plenary) of the Postgraduate Diploma in Education programme. Although I am not involved in the teaching practice component of the Postgraduate Diploma in Education programme, initially one teacher in my study perceived that my position at UWI meant that my observation of him was in the capacity of an assessor and this resulted in the teacher feeling very uncomfortable. My positionality as a Teacher Educator therefore influenced the power dynamics of the
interaction between the participants and myself. It raises the issue of power in the relationship between the researcher and the participant. Presser (2005 cited in Das, 2010, p. 20) confirms that macro-level factors of status and social position yields power. This difference “may stultify dialog”, therefore it was critical for me to seek spaces where trust can be established (Mullings, 1999, p. 349). This meant working collaboratively with participants and being respectful to their views and feelings. Participants were allowed to choose the place most convenient to them for the interview since as Elwood and Martin (2000, cited in Das, 2010, p. 15) note:

Locations can be perceived as micro-geographies which can have an effect on the quality and content of the interviews. Interview locations provide a material place for enactment and constitution of power relations and can help to understand the interviewer better and provide participants more control, resulting in better rapport and richer data.

Finally, my position as a previous English Language teacher who was involved in the initial implementation of CAPE Communication Studies in 2004 in a secondary school could inevitably influence the data collection, interpretation process and interactions. Sharing participants’ professional experiences in terms of the challenges of implementation and background knowledge could be advantageous as well as pose potential complications. On one hand, it allowed me to more easily relate, connect and empathize with the teachers rather than someone who is oblivious to the issue. Conversely, prior knowledge and experience could make teachers feel that there is no need to go in-depth about the issue because I would understand. It could also influence my judgement of the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies especially since I would have my own perspectives of how it is being implemented and the facilitators and barriers that influence the implementation of it. In this case, I refrained from acting on assumptions without double checking.
Furthermore, a few of the teachers that I had worked with at secondary level as well as others that I shared a relationship with as a past CAPE Communications Studies Examiner were participants in my research. This resulted in better rapport and participants willingly giving their time and sharing information as they regarded me as a “temporary insider” (Mullings, 1999, p. 340). As such, it was easy to contact them through telephone or e-mail to clarify questions which enhanced the trustworthiness of the study. My professional relationship and experiences with these teachers allowed for “theoretical sensitivity” which is “a personal quality of the researcher” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 42). It also “indicates an awareness of the subtleties of meaning of data” as well as “the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand and the capability to separate the pertinent from that which is [not]” (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 41-42). In contrast, there were other teachers that I had encountered for the first time who initially did not regard me in the same way. As such, they did not give information freely until trust was established. My unique situation shows that “the dynamism of positionalities in time and through space” (Mullings, 1999, p. 340) cannot be negated as it inevitably influences one’s research. It makes problematic, as Mullings (1999, p. 340) recognizes, the binary that is implied in “the insider/outsider” debates since it seeks to “freeze positionalities in place” and being an “insider” or “outsider” is a predetermined trait.

My positionality therefore means that I must be conscious and attentive about my own predispositions, ethnocentricities, motives and epistemological stance in an effort not to influence data collection, data analysis and findings of the study. However, this is very challenging as it denotes self-reflection, self-understanding, and self-questioning, “an ongoing examination of what I know and how I know it” (Patton, 2002, p.64), and re-visiting the field work data for further interpretations. It also means really articulating the conceptual framework that I use to interpret
data (Rossman and Rallis, 2003, p. 36). Notwithstanding this, reflexivity is an asset in “both fieldwork and analysis” (Patton, 2002 p. 64). For me then, throughout this study I took heed of Khan’s (2012, p. 57) dictum that:

Acknowledging the bias that one is aware of in one’s work and writing does not make the work more suspect but attunes a researcher-scholar as to things of which to be [more] attentive.

1.9 Organization of the thesis

This thesis consists of six chapters. This chapter provides the contextual background, the nature of the research problem, purpose of the study and the research questions of the investigation of teachers’ perspectives of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Trinidad and Tobago. It also includes the research motivation, significance and the researcher’s positionality. Chapter 2 presents a comprehensive review of the related literature on curriculum implementation and change pertinent to my study. Based on the literature reviewed and in line with the purpose of the research, the chapter outlines the conceptual framework to guide the study. Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology and design adopted and provides a justification for the philosophical stance taken. The chapter also provides a rationale for choosing the case study approach, the sampling strategy and data collection methods. The data analysis procedure is also explained, and the issue of trustworthiness also provided. Chapter 4 reports the findings of the study based on qualitative data: semi-structured interviews, documents, classroom observations, follow-up interviews and field notes. The findings are presented using themes based on the research questions. Chapter 5 presents a discussion of the main findings of the study in relation to the research questions and linked with the relevant literature reviewed in chapter two. Chapter 6 concludes the research by providing a
summary of the main findings of the study, outlining the contribution of the study, its limitations, implications and recommendations and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 2:
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I engage in a critical review of the literature on the implementation of curriculum innovations in the classroom, the context being general education and English Language education in both developed and developing countries. I also reviewed, where possible, literature on implementation in the local context with emphasis on the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation since there is a paucity of research in this area. This comprehensive review of the literature was done to interrogate concepts, issues and theories relevant to the study. It is through this exploration that insights can be derived and any existing gaps in the literature unravelled, to provide the avenue to extend the significant body of knowledge that is currently available on the issue.

I start by discussing key concepts related to curriculum innovation. Then I discuss the change process with emphasis on the implementation phase. Specifically, I examine how the implementation process has developed to be a significant issue and the rationale for conducting implementation research. Next, I critically assess two theoretical models of implementation: Fullan’s (2016) model in the context of a North American developed country, and Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) model in South Africa in a developing country context, as well as their relevance to the local context and my study on the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Following this, I explore teachers’ implementation of the curriculum innovation and the factors that facilitate and hinder their implementation of it in the classroom. The next section outlines the conceptual model of implementation I developed for the study from the
literature reviewed to understand the implementation process, specifically the factors that influence the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Finally, I conclude the chapter by providing a summary of the main issues and suggest how the gaps in the reviewed literature will be addressed in the current study.

2.2 Literature review search strategy

For the purpose of this study I engaged in a thorough literature search of several databases. These included Education Resources Information Center (ERIC); PsycINFO; EBSCOhost; Scopus; Elsevier Emerald; British Education Index (BEI); JSTOR and Science Direct. Using my research questions (see section 1.6.2) as a lens I created several search phrases (see Appendix 3).

2.3 Defining curriculum innovation

An “innovation is a species of the genus ‘change’” and it can be defined “as a deliberate, novel, specific change” (Miles, 1964, p. 14), which draws on the view that an innovation is “any new policy, syllabus, method or organizational change which is intended to improve teaching and learning” (Nisbet, 1974, p. 2). Furthermore, an “innovation is multidimensional” with “at least three components or dimensions at stake in implementing any new program or policy” (Fullan, 2001, p. 39):

1. The possible use of new or revised materials
2. The possible use of new teaching approaches
3. The possible alteration of beliefs

In other words, “change has to occur in practice along the three dimensions in order for it to have a chance of affecting the outcome” (Fullan, 2001, p. 39). A teacher could use new curriculum resources but adhere to his or her traditional teaching strategy and underlying belief
system (Fullan, 2001), which will negatively influence the success of implementing the change.

Based on a synthesis of the concepts discussed in this study, curriculum innovation is used to refer to any new ideas or syllabi, which can enhance students’ learning and involve “a managed process of development whose principal products are teaching (and/or testing) materials, methodological skills, and pedagogical values that are perceived as new by potential adopters” (Markee, 1997, p. 46). This concept is used since it entails central aspects of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Firstly, the teaching of Communication Studies is guided by the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus, which is used to identify teaching approaches, content areas, and determine specific topics and skills to be taught throughout the school leading up to the examination (Mitchell, 2012). In other words, the syllabus dictates what should be taught and how it should be taught. The syllabuses then that is used “in classrooms are the curriculum” (italics in original Richards, 1998, p. 125). Moreover, the CAPE Communication Studies innovation entails innovative features (see section 1.2.3) such as the use of new textbooks and resources, new forms of assessment, new teaching approaches and changes in beliefs and practices. Significantly, these discussions mean that teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Trinidad and Tobago must be taken seriously, bearing in mind that implementation is a significant stage in conjunction with the interplay of various factors that influence its implementation.
2.4 Implementation and the change process

Figure 2: A simplified overview of the change process

Source: Fullan, 2016, p. 56

There are three stages of the change process as outlined in Figure 2: initiation, implementation and institutionalization (Fullan, 2016, p. 56). Initiation is the first phase of the change process and involves a decision to proceed with or to adopt an innovation (Fullan, 2016). Implementation, as the second phase, is the focus of this study and it “involves translating intentions (plans for change) into actual change efforts” (Hayes, 2014, p. 435). In other words, it is the “process of putting into practice an idea, program, or set of activities and structures new to people attempting or expected to change” (Fullan, 2016, p. 67). For my study I will use this conception of implementation. Institutionalization is the third phase of the change process where the innovation “gets built in
as an ongoing part of the system or disappears by way of a decision to discard or through attrition” (Fullan, 2016, p. 55).

Noteworthy, the change process is much more detailed and is described as a “snarled process” (Fullan, 2001, p. 50) as there are several factors operating at each phase. Moreover, the process itself is not unbent since “events at one phase can feed back to change decisions made at previous stages, which then proceed to work their way through in a continuous interactive way” (Fullan, 2016, p. 57). The smooth transition from one phase to another depends on the resolution of the challenges at each of these phases (Cheung and Wong, 2012). However, it is the implementation stage that experiences the most challenges and where the real problems of the change process lie (Fullan, 2016). It is this stage that determines if the innovation meets attrition or becomes institutionalized.

The metaphor of an implementation bridge is apt as it can be used to explain the complexity of the implementation stage as well as the connections needed to execute the implementation process effectively. Just as with real bridges, change and innovation necessitate support from different stakeholders, and in different ways and (Hall and Hord, 2011). As such, attempts at short cuts or jumping over the bridge will yield failure (Hall and Hord, 2011). Successful implementation therefore “takes a long time. It is an on-going process, not an event that takes place at a particular point in time” (Wedell, 2009, p. 18). Moreover, it occurs at “different speeds…[and] to differing degrees of conformity to the official documents” (Wedell, 2009, p. 31). In many instances though (Hopkins, Ainscow and West, 1994, p. 17):

Centrally imposed (or top-down) change implicitly assumes that implementation is an event rather than a process; that a change proceeds on auto pilot once the policy has been enunciated or passed. This perspective ignores the critical distinction between the object of change… and the process of changing—that is how schools and local agencies put the reforms into practice.

In the late sixties and early seventies research on the implementation process began to garner attention by researchers (Snyder,
Bolin and Zumwalt, 1992). Prior to that, implementation as a critical stage in the change process, had received scant attention. In fact, O’Sullivan (2002) notes that “[u]p to the 1980’s attention was focused on the inputs and outputs and the actual process of implementing reforms, the now infamous ‘black box’, was largely ignored” (p. 221). Most of the research studies focused on planning and policies which are the external elements of change in both developing and industrialized countries (O’Sullivan, 2002). The focus of politicians and policy makers emphasized “the ‘what’ of desired educational change, neglecting the ‘how’” (Rogan, 2007, p. 98)

In relation to educational change in Australia and USA, Porter (1980) contends that “the people concerned with creating policy and enacting the relevant legislation seldom look down the track to the implementation stage” (p. 75). An analysis of twenty-one world banks that supported educational change programmes in developing countries, revealed that the programmes ignored implementation and that the “low outcomes resulted from poor implementation of what was essentially a good idea” (Verspoor’s 1989 p. 133).

Dyer (1999), therefore, pleads for research that specifically emphasizes the implementation phase to understand and garner valuable insights on how the change process unfolds, the possible challenges that can arise and strategies to deal with them. Furthermore, Fullan and Pomfret (1977) rationalized that in an effort to understand why educational changes are unsuccessful, problems at the implementation stage should be examined.

These issues are specifically relevant to the current study and hold implications for it. For example, based on my experience the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago (GORTT) continues to introduce innovations after innovations in the school system. Many teachers are frustrated because at any given time they could be implementing the Secondary Education Modernization Programme (SEMP) innovation and the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination
(CAPE) innovation simultaneously. Also, some innovations such as the Health and Family Life Education (HFLE) and the Continuous Assessment Performance (CAP) were abandoned and hence were never institutionalized. Yet, the problems and obstacles affiliated with implementing these innovations in the classrooms by teachers are relegated to an inferior status and basically unexplored. Policy developers hastily assume that these innovations will automatically translate into classroom reality.

2.5 Consideration of Theoretical Models of Implementation and the Local Context

Several models of implementation have been developed by various researchers (Altrichter 2005; Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003) that unmask a multiplicity of factors that can influence curriculum implementation. However, Fullan’s (2016) implementation model in the North American context and Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) theoretical framework of implementation which is based in South Africa in a developing country were selected for discussion.

This was done as these models may have some relevance in terms of some of the factors that may hinder or facilitate curriculum implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. This does not mean that these individual models in their entirety and grounded in their own context can be applied entirely to the local context or can significantly explain the dynamics of implementation in Trinidad and Tobago, given the value of the local context in the implementation of curriculum change (Luke, 2011). In fact, although there are:

Cross-cultural continuities and indeed universals in educational thinking and practice, no decision or action which one observes in a particular classroom, and no educational policy, can be properly understood except by reference to the web of inherited ideas and values, habits and customs, institutions and world views which
make one country, or one region, or one group, distinct from another (Alexander, 2000, p. 5).

As such, “context matters” (Crossley, 1999, p. 256) as it can dictate whether an innovation is successfully implemented. For instance, the classroom and the teacher are vital to change (Hargreaves, 1994). The classroom does not exist as an independent entity, but it is “a socially defined reality and is therefore influenced by the belief systems and behavioural norms of the society of which it is part” (Tudor, 2001, p. 35). Therefore, these international models may fail to capture critical aspects of the Trinidad and Tobago context especially its history of colonialism and the examination-oriented system. As such, I argue that “[i]ndigenous evidence will certainly allow [developing] societies to achieve more effective context-relevant implementation and change” (Louisy, 2004, cited in De Lisle, 2012b, p. 134-135). Notwithstanding these arguments, I also agree with the view “that international benchmarking evidence has the capacity to shed light on education issues and solutions that would otherwise be hidden without the data” (Schleicher, 2009, cited in De Lisle 2012b, p. 134).

Fullan’s (2016) theoretical model of implementation in Figure 3 delineates nine critical factors organized into three main categories, which relate to: the characteristics of change of the innovation, local characteristics and external factors (Fullan, 2016, p. 69). The characteristics of change include need, clarity, complexity and quality (Fullan, 2016, p. 69). Local characteristics relate to the district, community, principal and teacher, which are part of the change and external factors include government and other agencies, which “place the school… in the context of the broader society” (Fullan, 2016, p. 76). However, these factors must not be thought of in isolation from each other and, “[i]f any one or more factors are working against implementation, the process will be less effective” (Fullan, 2016, p. 68).
Fullan’s (2016) model unmasks many of the factors that influence implementation of curriculum innovations in general education. The model suggests that successful implementation of change is a whole complex system-wide process. As such, it can provide a pathway for understanding the change process and illuminate some of the common problems associated with the implementation of innovations. Additionally, key factors that influence curriculum implementation may be useful for secondary schools in Trinidad and Tobago, faced with the challenges of implementing innovations. The significance of teacher characteristics, principals’ support and the school, external agencies and the characteristics of change may also be critical factors in the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. In
addition, Fullan’s (2016) notion as mentioned previously, that the factors influencing curriculum implementation are intricately interactive and interconnected, is significant in that it can guide more effective and successful curriculum change in various contexts including the Trinidad and Tobago context.

However, Fullan’s (2016) theoretical model is grounded in his own research in the context of a North American developed country. Indeed “a great deal of the theorization and literature on implementation has focused on the conditions in industrialized countries” (Guro and Weber, 2010, p. 246) and “not much attention has been paid to describing and analysing educational implementation policy in developing countries” (Dyer, 1999 cited in Guro and Weber, 2010, p. 246-247). Therefore, it is possible that Fullan’s (2016) model may not include all the factors that may be applicable to the Trinidadian setting, which deals with CAPE Communication Studies in a developing country. Indeed, Trinidad and Tobago, as Wang (2006) notes about the situation in China, “has displayed unique differences, in political system, social structure, educational system, ideological beliefs and value orientation, from those of the West” (p. 44). A case in point is delineated in Chang’s (2011) study of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Taiwanese College English classes. Findings from the study revealed that the local culture must be considered when applying CLT in Taiwanese colleges. Chang (2011) argued that CLT was developed in English as Second Language (ESL) settings, which means that English can be used outside classrooms. However, in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) environment teachers struggled to implement CLT since English is only used in “teacher-centred classrooms, [and] they do not have the opportunity to [even] speak English” (Chang, 2011, p. 11). Chang’s (2011) intent here is also supported by Sikoyo’s (2010) study that examined the challenges of implementing a learner-centred pedagogic innovation in Uganda. Findings revealed that implementation was unsuccessful because the innovation
was not in sync with the socio-cultural realities of Uganda. This study, therefore, gives credence to the notion that specific contexts and unique characteristics of individual innovations can influence curriculum implementation.

Therefore, “[t]ransporting educational ideas from one culture to another…can have negative implications if minimal attention is paid to the receptivity of the host context to the imported policy” (Dimmock, 1998, as cited in Carless, 2001, p. 54) Also there is the question of the suitability of the export of Western based learner-centred approaches, which may not be applicable to the traditional examination-oriented cultural context of the local classroom.

Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) theoretical framework of implementation draws on: literature from school development, science education and educational change (Rogan, 2007). Their theory develops three main interdependent constructs: The Profile of Implementation, Capacity to Support Innovation and Outside Influence for understanding curriculum implementation (Rogan and Grayson, 2003). These constructs and their relevant sub-constructs are significant at every phase of the implementation process for understanding how teachers implement curriculum innovations in their classrooms. The interconnectedness of these constructs and sub-constructs are illuminated in the theoretical framework in Figure 4.
The Profile of Implementation sub-constructs are the nature of classroom interaction, nature of science practical work, science in society, and assessment practices (Rogan and Grayson, 2003). These provide understanding of how teachers are implementing the intended Curriculum 2005 (C2005) in the classroom (Rogan and Grayson 2003, p. 1182). It presumes that while there may be multiple ways of implementing a curriculum and different levels at which it may happen, “broad
commonalities of what constitutes excellence will emerge” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 1181). To some extent this construct is useful to my study on the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation as it also focuses on teachers and their practices in the classroom. Moreover, the Profile of Implementation highlights gaps that may exist between the intended curriculum and what ensues in the context of the classroom. However, the Profile of Implementation for CAPE Communication Studies will be different from the C2005 curriculum which is context-defined in the theoretical model. For instance, the type of classroom interactions, forms of assessment and coverage of content areas for CAPE Communication Studies are different. Specifically, the CAPE innovation has its own unique features that are required to be implemented such as the portfolio or internal assessment, communicative skills and learner-centred activities (see section 1.2.3).

The next construct, ‘Capacity to Support Innovation’ explores the factors within the school that help or obstruct the implementation of curriculum innovations (Rogan and Grayson, 2003). These sub-constructs or factors such as physical resources, teacher factors, learner factors and school ethos and management (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 99), may also be applicable to CAPE Communication Studies which is also being implemented in a developing country. The model therefore takes into consideration the “conditions of a developing country” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 1173). For instance, in Trinidad and Tobago as Rogan and Grayson (2003) notes about South Africa, schools are diverse, and some may have better resources than others in their implementation of CAPE Communication Studies. As such, this may be a factor that can be a barrier in some schools or a facilitator in others.

The construct ‘Outside Influence’ deals with various types of support given by organizations not affiliated with the schools, such as Government and Education Departments, and in the case of CAPE
Communication Studies, the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC), in an effort to help with the implementation of the new curriculum. The factors under this construct include physical resources, professional development, change forces, monitoring, and support to learners (Rogan and Grayson, 2003). In terms of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation, support of external agencies such as the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) with resources and professional development to facilitate the innovation in the classroom seem critical, especially since there were changes, not only in subject matter content, but also in relation to pedagogy and assessment (see section 1.2.3).

Notably, a weakness in Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) model is its failure to consider the examination-oriented culture, a significant aspect of the Trinidad and Tobago context. Also missing from the model is the category consisting of some of the characteristics or attributes of the innovation itself such as need, clarity and complexity (Fullan, 2016), which may interact with other factors in the school and external context to influence implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation.

Furthermore, one of Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) propositions, the Zone of Feasible Innovation, which “suggests the possible relationships that might exist between or within the constructs” (Rogan, 2007, p. 100) bears relevance to this study. It may influence curriculum developers to plan professional training in more “manageable steps” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 1195) since “innovation is most likely to take place when it proceeds just ahead of practice” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 1195). However, given that each context is so different, all the broad constructs and their sub-constructs identified by Rogan and Grayson (2003) may not fit neatly into what ensues in the Trinidad and Tobago context and with the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.
These models have some relevance to this study in that they can provide insight into the factors that can facilitate or hinder how teachers implement curriculum innovations while also considering the micro and macro contexts. However, I argue that there is “no single blueprint [that] can be applied to the varied contexts” (Wedell, 2014, p. 14). This is evident in that both Fullan’s (2016) and Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) models fail to account for the influence of societal culture (Yin, Lee and Wang, 2014) within their construct of external or outside influence as pertinent in curriculum implementation. However, societal culture may have significance in the Trinidad and Tobago context and the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. This will be discussed further in section 2.6.1.6. Models of change based in different contexts cannot be transferred unquestionably to other settings. Therefore, I argue that we cannot rely solely on literature created in other contexts; instead what is needed is literature on curriculum implementation developed internally and which is based on evidence to add to the very sparse local knowledge base in this area. For too long issues related to curriculum implementation have been guided mostly by research from outside the region.

2.6 Factors influencing teachers’ implementation of curriculum innovations

This section presents a review of teachers’ implementation of curriculum innovations and the factors influencing the implementation of these innovations and links them to the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. The factors that are deemed most significant to the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation are emphasized. These include three categories with subcategories: Contextual factors that include external-contextual factors (the examination-oriented system, approaches to curriculum innovation, government funding and support and other agencies, professional development and training, extra-lessons and societal culture) and school-
contextual factors (school culture and leadership and class-size, time and syllabus demand); Teacher-related (teacher belief, and teacher willingness and commitment); and Innovation-related (need, clarity and complexity). These factors are presented separately “for clarity of exposition” however, “it is acknowledged that in many cases the factors interact or overlap” (Carless, 2001, p. 33).

2.6.1 Contextual factors

In this study contextual factors comprise the external-related factors and the school-related factors.

Curriculum change is complex, and unstable (Fullan, 2016; Markee, 1997). Therefore, context must be considered when implementing change (Luke, 2011) since change is not culture-free but interwoven in “the context in which it is to be implemented” (Hayes, 2012, p. 59). In this vein, Wedell and Malderez’s (2013) framework can provide a deeper examination of the contextual elements that might either impede or facilitate implementation. Their framework though does not interrogate all the features of context from all possible angles (Wedell and Malderez, 2013) due to the changing and interrelated nature (Fullan, 2001) of any given context. However, they identify Place, People and Time as central interrelated components of any context (see Table 1) which is crucial for understanding implementation and change from a holistic perspective (Wedell and Malderez, 2013). The framework suggests that implementation of curriculum change, and its success or failure is influenced by the context (Wedell and Malderez, 2013). Moreover, the framework illuminates Place as visible and invisible (Wedell and Malderez, 2013). The visible aspects of place include the micro-context such as the classroom, school and the institution (Wedell and Malderez, 2013). The visible aspects of the macro-context include the village, region, country, part of the world and the world and these layers constantly influence each other (Wedell and
Malderez, 2013). Some invisible aspects of place include group dynamics and institutional culture (micro-context), regional educational culture, national educational culture, and socio-political belief system, balances of power and philosophical tradition and human-ness (macro context) (Wedell and Malderez, 2013). The invisible dimensions influence what ensues in the classrooms and are “the result of meanings that unite people within these groups and within a society” (Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 26). For example, teacher and student behaviour in the classroom can be directly influenced by the institutional and education culture.

**Table 1: Context as Place: Visible and Invisible layers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visible aspects of the context of 'Place'</th>
<th>Invisible aspects of the context of 'Place'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>group dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/institution</td>
<td>institutional culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>village/Town/City/</td>
<td>local attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>regional educational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>national educational culture and socio-political belief system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of the world</td>
<td>balances of power and philosophical tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World</td>
<td>human-ness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 17

In other words, “what constitutes ‘appropriate’ classroom behaviour is itself a result of deeper and more widespread societal beliefs
at the level of the nation” (Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 16). Wedell and Malderez (2013) give the example of how “education cultures” can be different in their conceptualization of “knowledge” (p. 21). Based on how knowledge is perceived, it can “affect attitudes to learning approaches that are most common within the different levels of the education system” (Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 21).

Other dimensions of the context are Time and People. Time for planning and historical time are critical. It is imperative to position any curriculum change based on the point in time:

It takes place in the history of a class, an institution, an educational system or a country, as well as when it occurs with regard to the personal histories of the individuals (Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 25).

The framework also acknowledges the key role of People in implementing change in the classroom at a specific period.

Wedell and Malderez’s (2013) framework is useful as it captures the complexity of context. In such a context, the influence of the visible and invisible layers on teachers’ classroom must be considered to understand ‘how people actually experience change’ (Fullan, 2016, p. 9). Consideration of the different layers of context with interconnectedness among them and their influence on implementation are central in postcolonial contexts such as Trinidad and Tobago that has a history of colonialism and an education system that remains bureaucratic, hierarchical and centralized.

2.6.1.1 External-contextual factors

External-contextual factors also have a major influence on implementation of curriculum innovations. These factors are “external to the classrooms and the schools in which teachers operate” (Humphries and Burns, 2015, p. 240). They include the wider systemic and cultural
contexts that influence curriculum implementation, such as an examination-oriented system, approaches to curriculum development, government funding and support and other agencies, professional development and training, extra-lessons, and societal culture.

2.6.1.1 The examination-oriented system

Examinations have an influence on teachers’ classroom practices (Alderson and Wall, 1993; Prodromou, 1995). The impact of examinations or tests is referred to as “washback” and “can be powerful determiners” either in a useful or negative way, of what occurs in teachers’ classroom environment (Alderson and Wall, 1993, p. 41). In other words, the impact of examinations can be visualized when:

Teachers take on instructional strategies that align with the type of performance elicited by public examination particularly when this assessment provides a basis for important decisions about students and schools. In this case, immediate pressures of instruction win out over change initiatives (Darling-Hammond, 1990 cited in Sikoyo, 2010, p. 249).

Examinations then undermine more learner-centred approaches to teaching and learning (Li and Baldauf, 2011). In other words, a test will more likely induce washback, the higher the stakes are (Alderson and Wall, 1993). Washback extends to the teacher’s use of teaching materials and content of the syllabus where teachers focus “more attention to certain parts of the teaching syllabus at the expense of other parts because they believe these will be emphasized on the test” (Wall, 2012, p. 79). In other words, teachers align the content and instructional materials with the examination (Cheng, 2005; Choi, 2008; Madaus, 1988). Another negative effect of tests is on teachers’ type of instruction in the classroom. Tests may foster traditional approaches to teaching and learning. The classroom is then “a) teacher-centred; b) teacher-to–whole class oriented; c) focussed on the learning of discrete facts; d) product-oriented in that students are expected to repeat facts through recitation and written tests” (Gorsuch,
Conversely, tests may push teachers to be very innovative and produce teaching materials and resources. In fact, “positive washback is evidenced by teachers creating more authentic materials” (Lam, 1994, p. 95).

In terms of implementation of innovations, several researchers agree that examination-oriented systems, which entail high-stake tests can be a facilitator or barrier ((Biggs, 1995; Deng and Carless, 2010; Kwok, 2014). High-stake tests or examinations in this study are standardized measures of student competencies or skills, and they can be used for selection and certification (De Lisle, 2013). Advocates for high-stake tests argue that they minimize inequality, ensure accountability, and promote objectivity in assessment (Dreher, 2012). On the other hand, they encourage teaching to the test and performance-oriented schools (Parkay, 2006).

A salient example where high-stake examination is seen as negative is in Lam, Alviar-Martin, Adler and Sim’s (2013) qualitative study of teachers’ perspectives and implementation of an integrated curriculum in Singapore. Findings revealed that the high-stake examination was a major obstacle in teachers’ implementation of the curriculum. Although the teachers had a positive orientation towards the integrated curriculum and perceived that it could develop students’ life skills, they still did not see it as relevant or practical in Singapore given the examination system. Teachers in the study used the test as the focus which meant that examination subjects took precedence in terms of their time and program organization. This was since in the classroom context; examination was a reality.

This negative influence of high-stake examination on the implementation of curriculum innovations is also highlighted in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) research studies. Agrawal’s (2004) study, which examined the
implementation of an English curriculum innovation in secondary schools in the context of India, also reflects Lam et al.’s (2013) findings. The teachers focused on those skills that were based on the examinations, ignoring the oral skills stressed by the new English curriculum. Similarly, Gorsuch’s (1999) study of implementation of the EFL curriculum change in secondary schools in Japan revealed that teachers focussed on what was tested for the examinations, which was content in areas of grammar and vocabulary. Other aspects of the syllabus such as different language skills were ignored. This was also noted in Orafi and Borg’s (2009) study on the implementation of a communicative English Language curriculum in secondary schools in Libya. Teachers did not implement aspects of the syllabus as was intended due to various factors, one of which was the examination-oriented system (Orafi and Borg, 2009).

This disjuncture between the objectives of the curriculum innovation and the examination focus is also highlighted in Xianhan and John’s (2013) qualitative study that emphasize the washback effects of the National College Entrance Examination (NCEE) in four secondary schools in Mainland China. The teachers focused on knowledge and skills since a major part of the NCEE is based on these components. Moreover, although teachers perceived that oral skills are critical for students’ growth, most of them did not focus on improving students’ oral ability since it is not a requirement for the examinations. Getting a high grade in the NCEE was most significant, so students were taught the skills of how to analyse and answer examination questions accurately. For instance, teachers were dependent on the textbooks as they “provide[d] key points and difficult points in exam papers of the NCEE as well as orientation prediction for forthcoming exams” (Xianhan and John, 2013, p. 421).

Xianhan and John’s (2013) study reinforces the argument that the examination culture influences the choice of teaching strategies. Most of the teachers in the senior middle schools (Grade 3) employed more traditional methods, such as lectures and drills due to the extreme pressure
of the NCEE even though most agreed that role play, self-inquiry and student-centred methods are beneficial for students. Notably, while examinations deterred teachers from adopting more student-centred methods, other factors in concert such as preparation time, school culture, and students accounted for teachers’ failure to implement this approach.

There is also another angle where examination is linked to societal expectation. For example, Yin, Lee and Wang’s (2014) qualitative case study examined the dilemmas encountered by change leaders during their implementation of the Senior Secondary Education (SSE) national curriculum reform in four schools in the province of Guangzhou in Mainland China. Data strategies included semi-structured interviews and documents. Findings revealed that change leaders faced several dilemmas, one of which was the examination culture. Initially, the change leaders fully endorsed the new reform and were enthusiastic about it. However, the burden of college entrance examinations was perceived as “a stick with which to beat SSE. The higher the school’s prestige the greater the pressure school leaders experienced” (Yin et al, 2014, p. 303). Change leaders also indicated that there was a disconnection between the examination culture where the focus is on students’ excellence at the college entrance examination and the reform, which included traditional and portfolio assessment. As such, even though the change leaders concurred that teaching specifically for college examinations was unacceptable, they conceded considering the pressure forced on them by societal expectation of students’ success at the examination. Although the SSE, like the CAPE Communication Studies innovation, includes continuous assessment, the focus was still on preparation for the examination, which may also be the case with CAPE Communication Studies. This is because the Trinidad and Tobago education system, as the education system in China “is dominated by an examination culture in which all stakeholders in education place an extraordinary emphasis on students’ results in public examinations” (Yin et. al, 2014, p. 302).
There is also the argument that test–driven accountability influences classroom practices (Cuban, 2013). Research in the United States of America (U.S.) education system for the past three decades, revealed that due to test-driven accountability, teachers especially in “low-income, largely minority schools teach content and skills closely matched to what will appear on state assessments” (Cuban, 2013, p. 92-93). Teachers and schools are judged on the test scores of the students. In fact, report cards of students’ performance on tests must be published in every state. Even in the urban schools this fright and humiliation lead to the teaching of “content and skills that mirrored state standards in subjects being tested” (Cuban, 2013, p. 88). This means that teacher-driven practices intensified while there was a “narrowing [of] the curriculum toward the tested topics” (Cuban, 2013, p. 82-83). This may also be the case with CAPE Communication Studies, a high-stake examination, since teachers in Trinidad and Tobago are judged and held accountable if their students do not attain high grades (Maharaj-Sharma, 2007).

Test driven accountability therefore has a negative impact on teachers’ strategies in the classroom. This is also evident in Li and Baldauf’s (2011) research on the barriers that influenced English Language teaching in primary and secondary schools in China. Findings revealed that it was difficult for teachers to move away from the more teacher-centred approach which involved grammar-translation into the new Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in the classroom. Teachers felt that the shift to the new method of teaching was not practical since the examination system remained the same. The priority, as one of the teachers from the Junior Secondary Schools noted, was really to succeed at exams using “duck-feeding procedures, characterized by rote memorization and drilling” (Li and Baldauf, 2011, p. 802). Education was about: “Marks, marks, students’/teachers’ very life!” Li and Baldauf, 2011, p. 798). In fact, the very nature of the examination was more in sync
with the traditional method as highlighted by another teacher from a Joint Junior and Senior Secondary School:

The writing section in the testing paper is typically stereotyped, and creative writing is not “allowed.” So, teachers would tell students not to write long complex sentences with clauses. Although students know how to use *so that*, teachers would tell students not to write *I got up so early that I caught the first bus this morning* but write two simple sentences instead. *I got up early this morning. I caught the first bus.* It is easy not to make mistakes in examinations if you write this way. But is it the way of learning a language?! (italics in original, Li and Baldauf, 2011, p. 799).

Therefore, the examination system influenced the choice of teaching approaches adopted in the classroom and how teachers felt about the reform. It was a major hindrance to successful implementation of the new curriculum as the primary concern of students, parents, teachers and school principals, was on obtaining high test marks for students. This study draws some parallels with my study in that the CAPE Communication Studies innovation also includes more student-centred activities in its teaching and learning. However, given the same examination-oriented culture in Trinidad and Tobago (James, 2008), the ideals of active student participation may not be fully realized.

Conversely, Wang’s (2006) study which utilized a mixed methods approach and examined implementation of the College English Curriculum in a tertiary context in China revealed a different result. Findings based on teacher surveys uncovered five factors (external and internal) namely, ineffective professional development, limited resource support, inappropriate teaching methods, teaching experience, and language proficiency as “significant predictors that have more effect on teachers’ curriculum implementation than some other factors such as testing and textbooks” (Wang, 2006, p. 252). Significantly, Wang (2006) notes that although interviews from administrators and teachers in the study indicate the that testing had an influence on implementation, the teachers’ survey suggested that tests were not a significant factor. Her
findings, therefore, did not fully support the literature where testing is perceived as a factor influencing implementation. While Wang’s (2006) study unearths critical factors relating to the current study, the data have been collected in relation to a tertiary educational institution and a survey of 248 teachers. However, this study is focused on a secondary context. Moreover, while the questionnaire survey is an effective research method to garner relevant information from a larger number of persons (Alreck and Settle, 1995), it is limited in its design in eliciting in-depth data, in contrast to a case study design using interviews, which this current study utilizes.

In line with the above, there are other factors that influence teachers’ implementation of innovations in the classroom, in addition to examinations. Deng and Carless’ (2010) qualitative case study investigated the ways in which examinations have acted as a barrier to the implementation of Task-Based Language Learning (TBLT) in China. The study involved four teachers from two primary school classrooms at years, two, three, and four, purposefully selected. Empirical data were drawn from fifty-five videotaped classroom observations and several follow-up interviews. Findings suggested that traditional examinations are generally a factor obstructing the implementation of TBLT, an innovative pedagogy. However, the influence of examinations differs with everyone, contingent on teacher factors such as teacher belief and other contextual factors (Deng and Carless, 2010). For instance, one teacher (Jane) executed communicative activities with her students because she perceived that there was support in the school for innovative teaching strategies. Moreover, School B in the study had more resources, and set aside more time towards English lessons, hence, was identified as having a better disposition towards TBLT implementation. This motivated Jane to use more communicative teaching activities in the classroom. Conversely, School A:
Values traditional teaching and has policies that mandate the amount of time allocated for examination preparation. This school examination-oriented culture, however, does not occur in vacuum but is rooted in particular contextual factors, for example accountability pressures derived from the spectre of a lower position in school rankings and associated loss of status (Deng and Carless, 2010, p.299).

Also, the difference among the teachers was another factor. For instance, Jane had a better understanding and more positive attitude to TBLT. Deng and Carless’ (2010) study is pertinent to implementation and change literature and my study as it presents a divergent conclusion, in that examination itself is influenced by various factors such as resources, school support, beliefs and attitude. Their study therefore illuminates the importance of understanding implementation from more of a whole system approach (De Lisle, 2012a) as it brings to the fore how different systems and sub-systems interact to influence the success or failure of implementation. For instance, in School B where a culture of student-centred activities were valued, the teacher felt comfortable to shift from the more traditional approach adhered to in School A. However, in School A the wider cultural attitude that examination is important influenced classroom practice.

Additionally, Deng and Carless’ (2010) description of the Confucian-heritage context is like Trinidad and Tobago, where students and teachers are preoccupied with examinations (Maharaj-Sharma, 2007). Maharaj-Sharma (2007, p. 31) explains this further:

Teachers are hard-pressed by public opinion and school administrators to produce good examination results, as they are made to feel that their competence is reflected in these results. There is a perception among many teachers and administrators that students’ interests and desirable attitudes would be automatically nurtured through the application of the “correct” pedagogical principles of teaching for the test. Thus, teaching has been geared to ensuring that content is covered.
The education system then is elitist and “designed to filter, segregate and retain students based on perceived meritocracy, as defined solely by performance in public examinations” (De Lisle, Seecharan and Ayodike, 2012, p. 2). The “basic architecture of Trinidad and Tobago’s education system has persisted throughout the significant reform and expansion periods of the 1970’s and 1990’s” (De Lisle, et al., 2012, p. 9). Therefore, the education system remains centrally controlled and extremely competitive with high-stake tests that determine entry to secondary and tertiary institutions (De Lisle et al, 2012). Hence, examinations could also act as an inhibitor in the CAPE Communication Studies context; however, there may be a conglomeration of other interactive factors that are also significant. As such, there is need for a more comprehensive study that would unearth the factors constraining or facilitating teachers’ implementation efforts at the different contextual levels.

2.6.1.1.2 Approaches to curriculum innovation

Top-down and bottom-up approaches to curriculum innovation are critical to discussions about implementation (Clark, 1987). Significantly, these approaches to curriculum innovation exert a powerful influence on whether or not an innovation is successfully implemented (Clark, 1987; House, 1979; Kennedy, 1987) Schon’s (1971) Centre-Periphery Model, Havelock’s (1971) Research, Development and Diffusion (RDD) Model, House’s (1979) technological perspective and Bennis, Benne and Chin (1969) power-coercive strategy are representations of top-down approaches to curriculum innovation. As such, they encapsulate some common features. The top-down approach is affiliated with large-scale curriculum innovation, centrally controlled and developed and external to the school (Elliott, 1994). In other words, the government and quasi-government agencies (House, 1979) are the decision-makers and hence “derive the right to exercise authority based on
hierarchical positions they occupy in a bureaucratically organized institution” (Markee, 1997, p. 63). The innovation then produces a “teacher-proof” curriculum (Elliott, 1994, p. 54).

There are several limitations of the top-down approach. Teachers are relegated to a passive role and are responsible for implementing strategies based on the decision of others (House, 1979). It is assumed that teachers would implement the innovation as intended by policy developers (White, 1987) and implementation will be without problems. However, teachers are often hesitant (Stenhouse, 1975) to implement the innovation. In fact, it “is the common fate of externally imposed curriculum packages…that various internal constraints are allowed to reduce their effectiveness” (Clark, 1987, p. 47). Teachers are thus constrained by contextual issues which are “more determinate of the teacher’s behaviour than [are] new techniques and external agencies”, which prevent the whole scale adoption of new ideas (House, 1979, p. 8).

In other words, curriculum development necessitates a form of ‘household’ innovation as there can be “no curriculum development without teacher development” (Stenhouse, 1975, p. 68). However, teachers should not be trained “in order to produce a world fit for curriculum to live in” (Stenhouse, 1975, p. 68) but that curriculum development must allow for teachers’ growth. However, this is in contrast to the top-down approach where teachers do not have any input in the decision-making process, planning and development of the innovation which results in a wide gap between the ideals of the innovation conceptualized by planners (Stenhouse, 1975) and the realities of its implementation. If teachers do not actively participate in the development of the innovation then they don’t feel a sense of ownership to it (Clark, 1987). As a matter of fact, ownership of curriculum innovations by teachers is regarded as important for successful implementation (Rudduck, 1991; Kennedy, 1987).
In contrast, it can be argued that teachers will only implement change if it is based on a top-down approach centrally controlled by government in certain cultures (Smith, 1996). Moreover, top-down approaches such as mandates can work effectively since the objective is explicit and it is expected that the change will be implemented (Hall and Hord, 2011). However, this can only happen when it is “accompanied by continuous communication, ongoing learning, on-site coaching and time for implementation” (Hall and Hord, 2011 p. 15).

On the other hand, the bottom-up or “school-based” (Stenhouse, 1975) approaches such as the Social-Interaction Model and the Problem-Solving Model (Havelock, 1971) advocate the importance of the teachers and schools in curriculum development and change. Teachers or other members of an organization therefore tend to identify more readily with bottom-up innovations, which give them a greater sense of belonging (White, 1987). In contrast to the top-down approach, the teacher embraces a research and development role in relation to the curriculum (Stenhouse, 1975) and their participation and ownership of the innovation are validated in the bottom-up approach. Furthermore, since it is school based it allows the curriculum to be more relevant for the specific school by reducing issues associated with the conformity of aims and pedagogy often associated with curriculum that are developed outside the school (Nicholls, 1983). If the teacher’s voice is ignored, “the outcomes of new thinking on curriculum development may in fact be thwarted” (Carl, 2005, p. 228).

In the Trinidad and Tobago context education change and reform is top-down and managed from the outside by the central education bodies (James, 2008). Teachers are not consulted on these changes but are expected to implement them without understanding all that the change requires (James, 2008). As a result, the top-down approach to improve schools is unsuccessful (James, 2008). Therefore, it is crucial to allow schools greater autonomy to create and implement initiatives and
teachers and other stakeholders must be involved in the decision-making process (James, 2008).

On the other hand, the bottom-up approach to curriculum innovations has not been left unscathed. This approach assumes that all schools have teachers that are dedicated, experienced, eager and qualified. This is not always the case as school contexts vary. A case in point is Jennings (1993) empirical research, which examined several models of curriculum development used in the Caribbean in secondary and primary schools since the early 1970s. Findings revealed that the sixth form Geography Project in Jamaica, a bottom-up approach, “was not taken up by school teachers” (Jennings, 1993, p. 135). Teachers were supposed to develop their own teaching units that were affiliated to topics based on the Cambridge Advanced Level Geography syllabus. However, after a period of two years, “not one consortium had produced a single teaching unit” (p. 136). Several challenges that prevented the teachers from creating curriculum materials included their lack of commitment to the project, (Morrissey, 1984 cited in Jennings, 1993) and their feeling of incompetence in developing curriculum (Jennings, 1993). Therefore, Jennings (1993) proposed that curriculum development should be taken up by local experts in the Caribbean using a top-down approach. Wedell (2009) proposes another line of argument, which entails combining top-down and bottom-up approaches. In this framework teachers are involved in discussions at the initiation stage with policy makers developing policy at top structures. Ongoing collaboration, communication and consultation at local levels are pertinent to committed teachers and other key players.

These studies are germane to the CAPE Communication Studies innovation as they contend that the approach to curriculum innovation in concert with other factors can hamper or facilitate implementation based on the context.
2.6.1.3 Government funding and support and other agencies

An important factor for successful implementation of curriculum innovations is government funding and support in terms of adequate resources (Rogan and Grayson, 2003; Fullan, 2016; Song, 2015; Taole, 2015). Significantly, any curriculum innovation presupposes new equipment and materials, training and skills as “change is ‘resource-hungry’ because of what it represents – developing solutions to complex problems, learning new skills, [and] arriving at new insights” (Fullan and Miles, 1992, p. 750).

South Africa provides salient examples of resource constraint. A case in point is Orodho, Waweru, Ndichu and Nthinguri’s (2013) study which reveals that implementation was impeded due to several factors, one of which was inadequate instructional and learning resources. The government’s monetary allocation to the Ministry of Education was inadequate to provide enough textbooks. The negative influence that insufficient resources has on implementation is also illuminated in Ajayi’s, (2016) study on teachers’ perspectives of the English Language Arts Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Southern California. Findings revealed that the instructional materials were insufficient to implement the new standards. The curricular materials were not of a high quality and the textbooks did not assist teachers with the relevant learning strategies necessary to promote students’ participation in class. Due to the “Great Recession” that had occurred in December 2007, funding was curtailed, which negatively affected implementation. Another issue was that the materials provided showed no evidence of leading to successful execution of the curriculum as they did not “draw from a broad range of American and world cultures and genres” (Ajayi, 2016, p. 15). Ajayi’s (2016) study is useful in that it highlights how “outside influence” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003) such as the recession can impact on classroom
practice and so point to the importance of understanding change based on the whole context.

This trend is also apparent in developing countries like Trinidad and Tobago. For example, O’Sullivan’s (2002) case study examined, within the framework of teachers’ objective and subjective ‘classroom realities’, the factors for the non-implementation of the English Language Teaching reforms in Namibia. Findings indicated that policy developers did not take into consideration the ‘classroom realities’, which led to teachers’ failure to implement the reforms. One of the ‘classroom reality’ factors which acted as a barrier was lack of resources, such as textbooks and various teaching resources and materials. This further restricted teachers’ ability to implement certain features of the reform especially students’ written skills as espoused in the syllabus. Significantly, the “successful implementation of the English syllabus presupposes a specially designed environment, with space, resources and small classes, all of which were lacking in the research context” (O’Sullivan, 2002, p. 231). The wider context then influences what occurs in schools and classrooms. This is reinforced in Cheung and Wong’s (2012) research, which examined key supporting and hindering factors during the first phase of a curriculum reform (2001-2006) in schools in Hong Kong using in-depth interviews and survey questionnaires. Findings revealed that financial support and the provision of human resources from the government were significant facilitating factors that propelled the curriculum change onward. Teachers indicated that the government funding allowed the school to employ assistant teachers and special teachers to alleviate the demanding workload which helped them in their implementation effort.

Support is also needed from other agencies, which are organizations in the context of the wider society, outside the school including regional bodies, Faculties of Education, donors and NGOs
These agencies can influence implementation of curriculum innovations by giving support and providing monitoring mechanisms and accountability on the status of implementation to help facilitate the change (Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003). A case in point is Edwards’ (2007) research in the Jamaican context, which revealed that the Caribbean Examination Council’s (CXC) focus was really on the development of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. However, they were uninterested in the implementation process and procedures. Findings showed that they were unconcerned about challenges teachers experienced given the contextual realities during implementation. Teachers felt that communication with CXC was inaccessible. Furthermore, CXC and the Ministry of Education (MOE) were viewed as responsible for the challenges experienced by teachers in implementing the innovation. These two external agencies needed to collaborate and plan for the implementation stage to effect quality education. However, as far as CXC was concerned, except for conducting a few pilot studies, the Ministry of Education is responsibility for implementation. This disconnect between the MOE and CXC led to the lack of continuity which was one of the reasons that implementation was hindered.

Additionally, this view is also accentuated in De Lisle’s (2012a) qualitative case study, which indicated that inadequate resources and a lack of support by external agencies stymied implementation efforts of the Secondary Education Modernization Program (SEMP) initiative in Trinidad and Tobago. Unlike the other studies, De Lisle’s (2012a) research analysed the facilitators and barriers of a whole system reform project, the SEMP reform from 1999 to 2009 using individual interviews, focus group interviews and documents. The analysis further revealed human resource constraints as a major barrier to change. The effectiveness of implementation was hindered due to insufficient human resources. For instance, some projects were completed without ever getting the required staff and training. Moreover, the monitoring and evaluation systems never
actualized as the requisite positions remained vacant. Even the professional development unit was affected due to shortage of staff. The study also indicated that the government and other agencies’ lack of connection to people, organizations and ideas hindered the implementation of the SEMP reform. There was a lack of collaboration and coordination between the “coordinating arm (SE MPCU) and the implementing units (various arms of the Ministry of Education) with roles and functions often unclear in the complex process of implementation” (De Lisle, 2012a, p. 73). This obstructed implementation especially as roles were seen on a superficial level. SEMPCU, for instance, perceived their role as merely to develop and deliver the innovation to the relevant units in the MOE. Furthermore, this lack of connection also occurred “across and within the agencies making implementation especially difficult” (De Lisle, 2012a, p. 73).

These studies are useful as they illuminate curriculum planners’ neglect of the physical, financial and human resources required to effectively implement change. In addition, they underestimated the significance of promoting effective lines of communication among persons involved in the change process.

2.6.1.4 Professional development and training

Curriculum innovations require teachers to acquire “new skills or knowledge and also involves changes in [teachers’] attitudes, beliefs and personal theories in order to reconstruct a personal approach to teaching” (Harris, 2003, p. 378). As such, teacher training and development are critical in assisting teachers in the successful implementation of curriculum innovations. Additionally, insufficient training and support can result in teachers, even those initially enthusiastic about the innovation, becoming frustrated by implementation problems and eventually turning against the innovation. (Gross, Giacquinta and Bernstein, 1971).
However, researchers argue that the one-shot training is ineffective (Brindley and Hood, 1990; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977) since it will not affect changes in classroom practice (Adey, Hewitt, Hewitt and Landau, 2004). Furthermore, if teachers must alter their practice, then this necessitates professional development training that would allow them to implement the innovation effectively, while simultaneously addressing the consequences of the change with other co-workers (Brindley and Hood, 1990). Moreover, since curriculum change means a change in culture, “the embedding of new practices in teachers’ existing professional culture will not be completed solely by the provision of a single brief in-service programme” (Wedell, 2003, p. 447).

Additionally, teacher training based on the transmission of knowledge may also be ineffective in influencing the required change (Adey and Hewitt, 2004). In this case teachers are passive recipients of knowledge transmitted to them by an authority that ignores their contextual realities (Orafi, 2008). Also, teacher training programs that fail to take into consideration the impediments to successful change, result in teachers’ inability to deal with problems that follow their efforts to implement innovations in their classrooms (Shamim, 1996). Shamim (1996) therefore recognizes that:

It is important for teacher trainers to encourage participants in teachers training programmes to discuss both overt and ‘hidden’ barriers to successful implementation of change in their own teaching/learning contexts. This will not only make trainees aware of potential sources of conflict, but it will also enable them to develop strategies and tactics to deal with anticipated problems in initiating and managing change in their own classrooms (p. 120).

Therefore, the way that teachers are supported is crucial. Training time must involve a balance between ‘theory’ and ‘practice’, using where teachers are in the implementation process as a starting point to dialogue about new approaches to teaching (Wedell, 2009). It is imperative that teachers are given the opportunity to “see the new practices in action and practise them themselves in their own classrooms” (Wedell, 2009, p. 36).
Moreover, given that formal training is usually short, it is critical that training commences by assisting teachers:

Identify some of the existing principles and practices that guide their work and the constraints that affect them, and to compare these to the principles and practices introduced by the change (Wedell, 2009, p. 36).

There is also the issue of the retraining of teachers so they would have the knowledge and skills to implement any new changes (Carless, 1999). If this is ignored then teachers who were originally keen about the innovation can become disenchanted with implementation challenges (Carless, 1999).

Empirical studies also reveal conflicting findings about the usefulness of teacher training and development during the implementation of curriculum innovations. Fullan and Pomfret’s (1977) analysis of fifteen research studies indicated that in seven of the studies teachers who received in-service training had a higher degree of implementation of innovations than those teachers who did not have in-service training. Similarly, Li’s (1998) survey of eighteen secondary school teachers in South Korea, who studied at a Canadian University indicated that teachers’ lack of in-service training was a major barrier that made it difficult for them to implement the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) innovation in their classrooms. Conversely, another qualitative research based on the barriers and facilitators to teachers’ implementation of a movement integration (MI) program, TAKE 10! in two elementary schools in the United States, findings revealed that teacher professional training was one of the factors that facilitated classroom implementation (Goh, Hannon, Webster and Podlog, 2017). Teachers felt that training enhanced their understanding and knowledge of the program. Preparation of lessons and acting in advance also helped with their implementation since:
the initial training included practical experiences for the teachers to lead and instruct their peers in performing the TAKE 10! activities. The practical experiences supplemented the theoretical knowledge of MI to enhance the effectiveness of the MI training. (Goh, et. al, 2017, p. 93).

Unlike the other studies, the findings from Goh et al’s (2017) research illuminate how initial training resulted in successful implementation as it included theory and practice, which is also relevant to CAPE Communication Studies innovation as it includes new content and teaching approaches. Their study is also useful as it revealed that although professional development facilitated implementation; it did not work in isolation as other factors together resulted in successful classroom practice.

In contrast, professional development in several postcolonial contexts seems to be tenuous in relation to curriculum implementation (Altinyelken, 2010; Chisholm, 2005) but can provide invaluable insights into implementation failure. Their experience can also provide pivotal lessons for Trinidad and Tobago on the urgent need for policy developers to plan and execute more effective professional development workshops to address the dynamics of change in postcolonial contexts. For example, Altinyelken’s (2010) research into teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the thematic curriculum in Uganda indicated that the majority of teachers in the study felt that the training was inadequate, in that it was too rushed and short-term. They also queried the standard of training that they experienced, alluding that the trainers were different in their knowledge of the curriculum. Moreover, instead of ten days of rushed training, where the trainers tried to deal with everything, more time was needed for teachers to understand and digest the curriculum. As a result, teachers were more confused, lacked understanding of it and were unconvinced of its necessity or importance. This caused them to have a negative attitude towards the curriculum which hindered its effective implementation.
From another perspective, attention is placed on the role of subject advisors in professional development and training. For example, Taole’s (2015) study of teachers’ experiences of the factors that impede or facilitate the implementation of the National Curriculum Statement (NCS) in classrooms in South Africa reinforce the views of Altinyelken’s (2010) but add a new dimension in terms of professional training. Importance is placed on the role of subject advisors. Teachers were only exposed to training workshops for about two to five days, which was quite inadequate as it did not help them understand or use the new methodologies, one of which was group work. Moreover, after the workshops teachers were left on their own, without any care or support from subject advisors. However, for successful implementation to occur, subject advisors should have made follow-up visits to schools after training to assist teachers with the implementation of relevant strategies suggested. Through direct liaison with their former trainees, the advisors would thus have played an integral part in buttressing them to face challenges in the classroom. Long-term training would also have facilitated effective implementation.

Another research provides a different angle on professional development. Ajayi’s (2016) study examined the perspectives of high school teachers of the English Language Arts Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in one district in Southern California. Teachers held positive views that the CCSS would be beneficial to students in their personal and professional lives, but they felt that they did not have the required knowledge and skills to implement it. Findings revealed that professional development was insufficient as it did not target specific areas of focus required by teachers such as “knowledge and skills to build upon their content knowledge and implement best teaching practices using effective materials and textbooks” (Ajayi, 2016, p. 13). Effective implementation of the CCSS requires excellent quality professional development. This means a model that shifts to a “creation, sharing and mastery of knowledge” (Ajayi, 2016, p. 16).
Most of these studies seem to suggest that professional development and training are ineffective as they fail to address the immediate needs of the teachers those who are required to change. Even after in-service training, teachers may resort to the traditional transmission approach to teaching although they had previously expressed positive attitudes toward the new approach (Morris, 1988).

In the context of Trinidad, Barrow and De Lisle’s (2010) small-scale qualitative study using focus group interviews examined twenty-four secondary school teachers’ concerns about the implementation of the lower science Secondary Education Modernization Programme (SEMP) innovation. The teachers’ levels of use of the programme were also analysed. Findings revealed that although teachers had high stages of concern about the SEMP innovation, their level of use in the classroom was low, which was at the mechanical level. This was because many of the teachers in the study did not have any pedagogical training where they were exposed to instructional designs and theory. As a result, many of them were unfamiliar with features of the curriculum that delved into the objectives, philosophy, and expected outcomes. Significantly, many of the teachers wanted more training in the “type of pedagogy that would empower them to make better decisions about what science content they should include” (Barrow and De Lisle, 2010, p. 13). The teachers’ request for training, development and design, mean that “the current SEMP training is not providing the teachers with all the critical skills they need to fully implement the new curriculum” (Barrow and De Lisle, 2010, p. 14).

Barrow and De Lisle’s (2010) study parallels the current study in several ways. Both studies are based on the implementation of a large-scale curriculum innovation in secondary schools in the Trinidad and Tobago context. One of the strengths of their study is that teachers were selected from both school types (see section 1.2.1) in Trinidad and
Tobago, which my study also includes. However, their study delved into the SEMP curriculum innovation and the research design only included focus groups. However, to elicit more in-depth credible data on curriculum implementation, triangulation of data using other methods is critical. For instance, observations could have also been employed in Barrow and De Lisle’s (2010) study as teachers’ classroom practice was significant. One of the strengths of this current study is that it utilizes several data collection techniques including observations.

In the domain of CAPE Literatures in English innovation in Jamaica, Tyson (2003) indicated that most teachers felt their schools did not organize training sessions for them. However, some indicated that they had on occasions participated in the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC) organized workshops for the curriculum, while others never participated in any. Significantly, most of the teachers contended that they did not participate in any Ministry of Education, Youth and Culture organized workshop for the CAPE Literatures in English. This resulted in teachers not being sufficiently trained in the new approaches that the new curriculum demanded, which is why teachers “seem to believe that they must directly pour knowledge into the students” (Tyson, 2003, p. 172-173). Hence, for the CAPE Literatures in English curriculum to achieve its intentions, it must provide ongoing training for teachers.

Similarly, the CAPE Communication Studies innovation also shares similar concerns with Tyson’s (2003) study about CXC’s workshops and coincides with some of the other studies about curriculum change and teacher training. The workshops arranged by CXC were lacking in quality as presenters did not address teachers concerns and lacked knowledge to clarify issues and questions posed (Edwards, 2007). Moreover, the only time CXC offered workshops was when the syllabus was revised (Edwards, 2007).
The contribution of these studies is that they provided a real platform for teachers to voice their problems and struggles with the process of curriculum implementation, namely the issue of teacher training and development. Significantly, this issue is also inextricably linked to the CAPE implementation process, which will be examined in this current study with other factors in the local context.

2.6.1.5 Extra-lessons

Extra-lessons (Brunton, 2002; Lochan and Barrow, 2008) have been referred to by various terminologies such as private supplementary tutoring and shadow education ((Bray, 2006). The thread that links these terms is that there is “additional teaching in academic subjects beyond the hours of mainstream formal schooling” (Bray, 2006, p. 516). The student also has a cost involved for obtaining extra-lessons (Bray, 2006). Extra-lessons which will be the term used in this study, then, involves “all teaching/learning activities outside of the normal school timetable that attempt to cover the formal school curriculum at a cost to the student or parent” (Lochan and Barrow, 2008, p. 46).

The practice of extra-lessons, which is rooted in the education system is a worldwide phenomenon in parts of Europe, North America, Africa and Asia (Bray, 1999; 2006; Kwok, 2004). Although there are numerous studies internationally and some locally on this phenomenon, they are not directly related to the field of curriculum implementation and change theory. In other words, based on the literature surveyed in this study, extra-lessons were not touted as a factor that directly influenced curriculum implementation in the classroom. Only in Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) implementation model was extra-lessons vaguely mentioned under the overarching construct “Capacity to innovate” and the sub-construct learner factors. In other words, if learners can afford extra-lessons given by their teachers, then it strengthens implementation. In this study extra lessons are not perceived of as a learner factor but as an
external-contextual factor influenced by wider cultural norms and the examination culture.

In the Trinidad and Tobago context, extra-lessons may be a factor that influences the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, given the “colonial heritage of an examination-driven school system, both at primary and secondary levels [which] feeds the demand for extra lessons” (Lochan and Barrow, 2008, p. 45). The practice has a long legacy in Trinidad and Tobago and “has become a permanent part of the informal schooling process” despite several reforms by the Government to make education more equitable and accessible to everyone (Lochan and Barrow, 2008, p. 45). In fact, the CAPE Communication Studies innovation is a high-stake examination and from my experience many students driven by a desire to excel academically, pursue extra-lessons in order to increase their chances of success. This is like the situation in Hong Kong secondary schools where students seek extra-lessons mainly due to examination pressure (Kwok, 2004). Extra-lessons provide the drills and practice necessary for better understanding of subject concepts.

There seems to be discordant views on the usefulness of extra-lessons. Some studies posit that extra lessons can assist “slow learners to catch up with their peers in class” (Yung and Bray, 2017), provide avenues for collaboration among peers (Bray, 1999), and provide an opportunity to cover more content areas and complete the syllabus (Stewart, 2015). Conversely, other studies view it as a corrupt practice for several reasons (Bray, 1999; Hallak and Poisson, 2002). The very idea of pursuing extra-lessons because classroom teachers fail to cover the curriculum is perceived as corrupt (Hallak and Poisson, 2002). Moreover, it “can distort the curriculum in the mainstream system, upsetting the sequence of learning planned by mainstream teachers and exacerbating diversity in classrooms” (Bray, 1999, p. 17-18).
The phenomenon of extra-lessons, the rationale for its existence and the consequences of it in the realm of teaching and learning are explored further in several empirical studies. For instance, Barrow and Lochan’s (2012) study on private supplementary tutoring at the primary school level in the Trinidad and Tobago context reveals that there was a high level of students taking extra-lessons, especially those in standard five classes. This was to ensure that they got into the ‘prestigious’ secondary schools. Other reasons were to improve students’ understanding in weak areas and because their parents wanted them to attend. Teachers also admitted that there was insufficient time for them to explore all the areas of the syllabus for students to excel in examinations, so they gave extra-lessons to their students after school. The efficiency of private tutoring is therefore questionable, since emphasis is placed solely on succeeding in the final examination. Teachers concentrate on those areas of the syllabus that are deemed important to the examination. Hence, the major impetus for private tutoring is linked to the pressure of excelling at examinations to gain a place in one of the ‘prestigious’ secondary schools.

In relation to the secondary school context in Trinidad and Tobago, Lochan and Barrow’s (2008) study of the extra-lessons phenomenon revealed that the very existence of students pursuing extra-lessons cast uncertainty about accountability and the efficiency of the school system to adequately prepare students. It raises issues of equity; as extra-lessons involve a cost. Similar to what was described in their later study (Barrow and Lochan, 2012) in the primary school context; examination drills were one of the reasons for extra-lessons in the secondary schools also. Teachers were judged as successful if they concentrated on past examination questions in class. Extra-lessons allowed them to use what they learned to answer examination questions.
Apparently, the more demands that are placed on public examinations, the more students pursue extra-lessons in Trinidad and Tobago (Brunton, 2002). Extra-lessons, therefore, mirror the patterns of the society’s education and social structure (Brunton, 2002). Furthermore, Brunton (2002) contend that students who attend secondary schools in the age category of fifteen to eighteen pursue extra-lessons three times more than those students under fifteen, which is of particular importance to my study since the students that are doing CAPE Communication Studies fall within that age group. Barrow and Lochan’s (2012) research in the primary school context and Lochan and Barrow’s (2008) work in the secondary school context are relevant as they provide in-depth understanding of the practice of extra-lessons that exist side by side with the formal education system in Trinidad and Tobago. In fact, extra-lessons seems to be an inherent aspect of the education culture (Barrow and Lochan, 2012). However, unlike these studies, my study positions extra-lessons within the realm of implementation and change theory and as a possible factor interrelated with other factors as influencing teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, given its long history in Trinidad and Tobago.

On a different note, in the regional context of Jamaica, Stewart’s (2015) study explores extra-lessons but using an “anti-colonial discursive framework (p. 30).” The methodology is based solely on the qualitative part of the data that emerged from a bigger study which also included quantitative data. Specifically, it focuses on the circumstances crucial for extra lessons to thrive from several perspectives including those of teachers, students and parents from three educational districts. Findings showed that deplorable conditions, particularly in schools with insufficient resources, as well as parents’ determination to give their children an advantage even if they belonged to traditional ‘prestigious’ schools, were the reasons that extra-lessons flourished. Extra-lessons then preserve social class inequities. The examination culture inherited from
the British also leads to a greater push towards examinations where “issues of curriculum, alignment, remediation and need for subject reinforcement became evident” (Stewart, 2015, p. 37).

Echoing the arguments of the other studies, Yung and Bray’s (2017) article also unearths the reasons, and modes for private supplementary tutoring in Hong Kong. Private supplementary tutoring is referred to as shadow education since it mirrors regular schooling and can ape its curriculum in some way (Yung and Bray, 2017). Moreover, shadow education involves tutoring for a fee, in academic subjects affiliated with public examinations (Yung and Bray, 2017). It also, “supplements the provision of schools and it is provided outside school hours” (Yung and Bray, 2017, p. 96). The backwash effect of shadow education is exemplified when “high achievers receive more tutoring than others” (Yung and Bray, 2017, p. 106). Moreover, teachers may focus more on their private lessons to promote it, which means that they may deliberately not cover all the subject matter required in mainstream schooling. Students as well may place more emphasis on shadow education rather than regular classes as they are paying a cost for it. Shadow education, therefore, has been condemned for promoting passive learning and stultifying students’ creative skills. Despite this, students may prefer tutors as they are perceived to be more helpful in satisfying their practical desire for examination strategies.

The findings from these studies are important to this study as they provide explanatory power suggesting that the examination-oriented system and socio-cultural beliefs, where value is placed on academic success, function as major reasons for extra-lessons. A deeper understanding therefore is needed to explore extra-lessons in concert with implementation and change.
2.6.1.6 Societal Culture

Educational systems are influenced by the larger societal culture. Culture in this sense is “the collection of values, beliefs, customs and attitudes that distinguish a society” (Fan, 2000, cited in Yin et al, 2014 p. 295). Therefore, it is critical that curriculum innovations are relevant to the cultural context where they are being implemented (Holliday, 1994). If this is ignored, then implementation of the innovation will face what Holliday (1994) coins “tissue rejection”. In other words, “without consideration of the socio-cultural structure of the society, conflict and resistance might arise” (Orafi, 2013, p. 18).

A significant example of how societal culture influences curriculum implementation is reflected in Yin et al’s (2014) study. Findings revealed that although the national curriculum reform in mainland China was perceived as beneficial to enhancing students’ holistic development, there were challenges with the implementation of it due to the cultural context and traditions in China. The new curriculum included “many concepts and practices that originated from Western countries such as curriculum integration, decentralization, portfolio assessment, constructivist teaching and self-regulated learning” (Yin et al, 2014, p. 304). However, this created tension with the cultural tradition in China where high performance at the public examination was most important for school principals. The new reform seemed antithetical to the cultural traditions of China. As such, school principals speculated as to the relevance of transferring ideas and pedagogies from Western contexts to China, without considering reform based on the whole context.

In the context of Trinidad and Tobago Yin et al’s (2014) study hold importance since principals in secondary schools where the CAPE Communication Studies innovation is being implemented may also place high expectations based on cultural norms on students’ performance at examinations. This may be so since those that hold the “positions of
power are likely to have been educated in the colonial mode and may find it difficult to understand why that which has worked in the past should be changed” (George and Lewis, 2011, p. 728). This line of argument is also supported by Allsop (1991) in relation to African and Asian countries. Cultural expectations from the wider society about teacher and student roles and practices govern the classrooms in these countries (Allsop, 1991). Therefore, researchers’ further question whether progressive pedagogies should even be transplanted to other contexts such as Africa, as it is not feasible given the contextual realities (Cross, Mungadi and Rouhani, 2002).

Expanding this idea of societal culture, Lim and Pyvis’ (2012) study of science teachers’ implementation of ‘Thinking schools, Learning Nation’ reform initiatives in a junior college in Singapore, revealed that the high-stake examination system undermined the education reform success. As such, teachers focused on training students for the national examination through practice tests, drills and mock examinations. More significantly implementation was impeded due to the examination system and the influence of societal expectations that good examination grades are important.

There is also another dimension where students’ resistance to student-centred learning is linked to societal culture. An example is Li’s (1998) study which, focused on the negative attitude and resistance of students towards the classroom activities affiliated with the Communicative Language Approach (CLT) in South Korea, which hindered the implementation of CLT. It is challenging for students to change from the lecture methods where they are passive recipients to a more student-centred approach to learning. In South Korea, students are familiar with the traditional settings where they mostly take notes and absorb information from the teacher. As such, it was difficult for them to take on a more active role. Li’s (1998) study gives credence to the
contentions of the other studies and Locastro’s (2001, p. 495) view that, “classrooms are social constructions where teachers, learners, dimensions of the local educational philosophy, and more general socio-cultural values, beliefs and expectations all meet.”

Other studies in developing countries also highlight this issue pinpointed in Li’s (1998) study. An ethnographic study of the implementation of an innovative process approach to English classes in five primary schools in Pakistan, revealed that students’ resistance to the new approach hindered the implementation of it in the classroom (Shamim, 1996). In Pakistan, students are traditionally exposed to more rote learning and memorization of content that are important for the examination (Shamim, 1996). Students’ resistance, therefore, was due to incongruity between their beliefs, perceptions and presuppositions about acceptable classroom behaviour and teaching and learning, influenced by the culture of the society and the assumptions of the innovation (Shamim, 1996). Shamim (1996, p. 119) explains this dilemma further:

The lack of ‘fit’ between the ‘users’ (learners) and the assumptions of the innovative methodology was largely a result of ‘value conflict.’ On the one hand, learners’ beliefs and assumptions about the norms of appropriate classroom behaviors shown to be entrenched in the culture of the community clashed with the assumptions of the innovative methodology. On the other hand, the affinity between their expectations of the etiquette of teacher/learner behavior in the classroom and the culture of the community made it easier for them to reject the innovation (Shamim, 1996, p. 119).

These studies also have similarities with the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, which also requires a student-centred approach to teaching, emphasis on communicative activities and the use of alternative forms of assessment. This means that students must take ownership of their learning in the classroom. However, these practices may be difficult to transfer to the Trinidad and Tobago context, which is steeped in the traditional paradigm of teaching and learning (London, 1997). As such, students in the CAPE Communication
Studies classroom, like those in Li’s (1998) study in South Korea and Shamim’s (1996) study in Pakistan, are accustomed to rote learning, memorization of facts and a modus operandi other than group or communicative activities. Therefore, their expectations and perceptions about their role in the classroom may also conflict with what is required of the CAPE innovation. As such, Shamim’s (1996) rationale for student resistance based on the overarching issue of societal culture is also relevant in the Trinidad and Tobago context.

Similarly, Grassick and Wedell’s (2018) discussion based on eleven teachers’ experiences of implementing TESOL curriculum change in ten different countries provide a strong case for policy developers and planners to plan for change considering the influence of the invisible dimensions of change, such as the existing norms, behaviours and attitudes of the institution, education and societal culture on curriculum implementation. Therefore, the interconnectedness within the various systems and sub-systems must be understood. A holistic approach was applied to comprehend change, which is based around three interconnected themes of “time, contextual confusion and risk” (Grassick, and Wedell, 2018, p. 322), to make sense of teachers’ implementation efforts. Their work is important to my study as it unearths teachers’ experiences of implementing learner-centred pedagogy. An innovative feature of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation also includes a student-centred approach to teaching and learning in the classroom. Moreover, like my study, teachers’ perspective of the implementation change process was given precedence to understand the factors that contribute to ineffective change. Findings indicated that years “after implementation began most contexts have had at best limited success in bringing such changes about” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 321). Although teachers were eager about the change, the myriad of challenges that they encountered during implementation prevented them from being able “to make the paradigm shift from existing practices to those expected
by the innovation” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 322). Failure of curriculum developers and planners to comprehend the difficulty of change, especially historical time for planning for the change and the time that teachers need to learn and adjust to the new change and change process, resulted in “temporal dissonance” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 323). This contributed to implementation happening in a state of “contextual confusion” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 335) which in turn made teachers believe that change was risky. It is important therefore to enforce and develop “structures and communication systems to enable shared learning as normal part of curriculum change planning” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 347).

The influence of societal culture (Shamim, 1996) or the invisible elements (Wedell and Malderez, 2013) on implementation have not received much attention but that “does mean that [they do] not exist, it may simply be that we do not recognize their existence” (Krasnick, 1988, p. 27). This study, therefore, intends to fill this gap by bringing this issue to the fore instead of hiding its pervasive influence.

2.6.1.2 School-contextual factors

School contextual factors are factors “within a teacher’s workplace” (Humphries and Burns, 2015, p. 240), or the micro context, which include the school and classroom contexts. The sub-factors are school culture and leadership as well as class size and time and syllabus demand.

2.6.1.2.1 School culture and leadership

The climate or culture “of a school has important repercussions on the way people work, whether teachers or support staff, students or governors” (Busker and Saran, 1995 p. 194). Furthermore:
The culture of an organization is the summation of the values, attitudes and beliefs which are widely shared amongst most of the people who work in it. It provides what some might describe as the natural way of doing things in a school, against which the actions of staff and students are judged (Busher and Saran, 1995, p. 194).

There are different types of teacher cultures (Hargreaves, 1992). In fact, one may question whether there is an isolated teaching culture that distinguishes the entire profession or if a variety of distinct teacher cultures stay together in harmony at the same time (Hargreaves, 1992). Individualism and collaborative cultures are the most prevalent types of teacher culture (Hargreaves, 1992). However, individualism and teacher isolation seem to permeate the teaching profession across the globe (Sarason, 1982). The analogy of teachers detached into a set of egg crate-like compartments (Lortie’s, 1975) is quite apt in describing the classroom isolation that ensues in educational contexts, of which the teaching context of Trinidad and Tobago is no exception.

As pertains to the domain of implementation and change, Hargreaves (2001) warns that “[t]eacher individualism, teacher isolation, teacher privatism…have come to be widely perceived as significant threats or barriers to professional development, [and] the implementation of change” (p. 162). Conversely, teacher collaboration is a critical factor in ensuring the successful implementation of an innovation (Cheung and Wong, 2012; Wang and Cheng, 2005). However, a collaborative culture is uncommon as it is troublesome to maintain and foster (Hargreaves, 1992) since most school organisational structures are still hierarchical and steeped in the “transmission-oriented education cultures” (Wedell, 2009, p. 177). This is exemplified in Yan’s (2012) study of English teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the new English curriculum in secondary schools in China, supporting the position of Hargreaves (1992). Findings revealed that teachers were unable to effectively implement the new pedagogical changes in their classrooms although they were exposed to teacher training, as administration supported the status quo, which is
the examination-oriented culture. As such, teachers’ collegial time for planning work focused on examination. This was reflected in repetitive exercises and revision of examination papers. Since teachers were judged by their students’ performance at examination, they felt pressured to teach to the test.

Undoubtedly, the principal’s leadership role is crucial in creating a culture of collaboration, especially in schools where people lack the willingness to work collaboratively (Harris and Jones, 2012). It is the principal’s duty to generate the conditions that will allow this “professional collaboration” or it will remain untapped (Harris and Jones, 2012). The main goal for principals that want to effect change in schools then is to establish circumstances for professional learning. This means (Jones and Harris, 2014, p. 481):

Establishing a culture of trust and respect where professionals can make their own collectively informed decisions about improving pedagogy. Ultimately, if schools’ transformation is the goal, the core job of the principal is to break down the barriers that maintain professional isolation and stand in the way of rigorous, authentic collaborative learning. To do otherwise is to accept that little can be done to transform the learning culture of the school and the quality of teaching therein.

Building on this issue, Harris, (2004, p. 12) argues for “leadership that can be distributed across many roles and functions in the school” as too much emphasis is placed on leadership of head teachers. The strength of this type of leadership lies with the realm of the “human potential available to be released within an organization” (Harris, 2004, p. 12). Teacher leadership practices are important in distributed leadership (Muijs and Harris, 2003). In other words, it is “a form of collective leadership in which teachers develop expertise by working together” (Harris, 2004, p. 14). However, cultural, structural and micro political barriers in school can militate against distributed leadership (Harris, 2004). The latter can also be a threat to the status quo, where the
traditional, formal leadership style will have to be given up. Moreover, the structure of school and the bureaucratic managerial style of leadership will inevitably create barriers to distributed leadership (Harris, 2004).

From another point of view, there is the argument that the principal must take on the role of instructional leader in the implementation process by coordinating the change (Virgilio and Virgilio, 1984). The principal is instrumental to the success of the change. This means creating staff development opportunities to help teachers understand the curriculum change, encouraging enthusiasm for the change and promoting better communication among staff members (Virgilio and Virgilio, 1984). Other researchers agree that principals are the ones who can interface at the place of change and communicate the importance of the innovation, which can result in positive attitudes towards the change (Fullan, 2016). A case in point is Taole’s (2015) empirical study in South Africa, which supports the important role that instructional leadership plays in successful implementation of curriculum innovations. Findings revealed that ineffective school leadership was a barrier to implementation. Additionally, the teachers felt that the principal’s support in terms of resources and communicating the curriculum change to teachers were not forthcoming. Principals must be able to comprehend the change so they can be successful managers (Taole, 2015). Hall and Hord (2011) reinforce Taole’s view (2015) that principals must help teachers buy in to the change, have ongoing communication with them and make them understand that they have their support. However, critics argue that instructional leadership is top down, first order and managerial, where the principal controls and coordinates organizational staff to their goals (Hallinger, 2003).

Others argue that transformational leadership is more effective in dealing with change as it “focuses in developing the organization’s capacity to innovate” (Hallinger, 2003, p. 330). Transformational leaders go beyond supervision, coordination and control (Hallinger, 2003). They try “to build the organization’s capacity to select its purposes and to
support the development of changes to practices of teaching and learning” (Hallinger, 2003, p. 330). Moreover, transformational leadership is a form of distributed leadership since it also emphasizes the creation of a “shared vision and shared commitment to school change” (Hallinger, 2003, p. 331).

These studies reflect the important role that school culture and leadership play in successful implementation of a curriculum innovation. However, this issue seems to be given less attention empirically in the realm of the implementation process. My study will address this gap by interrogating the influence that cultural norms, leadership and the education culture have on teachers’ implementation.

2.6.1.2.2 Class size, time and syllabus demand

Class size, which “refers to the number of pupils or students at a specific level taught together in the same environment by a single teacher” (Wadesango, Hove and Kurebwa, 2016, p. 176), can also influence curriculum implementation. Researchers argue that large classes present limited avenues to engage in quality teaching (Pedder, 2006). It can militate against prompt feedback as teachers may not be able to mark students’ work in a timely manner (Wadesango et al, 2016). Moreover, teachers can experience difficulties in promulgating creative activities and providing attention to students equally (Harmer, 2000). As such, learners that are perceived as weaker can be overlooked (Geffrey and Woods, 1996). Considering this, some researchers insist that small classes diminish disciplinary problems as teachers can detect these easily and deal with them immediately to curb disturbance (Miller-Whitehead, 2003). Additionally, small classes allow teachers enough time to cover the syllabus content and promote student-teacher interaction (Normore and LIon, 2006). In contrast, small classes may put students under more pressure to be active participants in the classroom since, “they are…more visible to the teacher and may be called upon at any time to answer
questions or to participate in a class activity” (Finn, Pannozzo and Achilles, 2003, p. 346).

An empirical study in Zimbabwe unmasks the impact of large class size on successful curriculum implementation (Wadesango et al., 2016). Questionnaires were used to collect data involving twenty teachers and five heads in primary schools. Findings revealed that the large class size, which had a student ratio of 1:40, was a barrier to implementation. Both the teachers and the heads agreed that the large class size was challenging to manage, which meant that teachers were unable to address individual differences and they had a heavy marking load, where they felt overworked and over-burdened. Classroom management, where the focus was more on fast learners and inadequate supervision of students, was also affected by the large class size. There was also the issue generally of quality education being compromised as students fought for inadequate resources.

In line with the above, a phenomenographic study of the implementation of Competence-Based Education (CBE) in higher education in Flanders and the Netherlands unveiled some barriers to implementation (Koenen, Dochy and Berghmans, 2015). Although the stakeholders (curriculum coordinator, students and teachers) had a positive orientation towards CBE and the constructivist approach to learning, the lecture method was still predominant. Moreover, stakeholders embraced the knowledge test as well as the portfolio. They felt that the portfolio assessment allowed students to take ownership of their learning and reflect on their learning. Yet, due to the time constraints and large class groups, CBE had only made “its entrance” (Koenen et al, 2015, p. 2) and was very far from being successfully implemented.

Time and syllabus demand are also factors that can impede or facilitate teachers’ implementation of innovations in schools (Darsih, 2014; Lim and Pyvis, 2012; Taole, 2015). These constraints can limit
teachers’ creativity in terms of lesson planning and curtail content to cover the syllabus (Cheng, 2008). The pernicious effect of time constraints and a demanding syllabus is also highlighted in language education studies. For instance, Zhang’s (2010) study explored eighty-five teachers view of the effectiveness of the new Chinese language curriculum using interviews. The findings revealed that teachers found difficulty with the entire teaching plan as their workload was too demanding. As such, they did not have adequate time to teach the required lessons thoroughly.

Similarly, a qualitative case study, which explored the implementation of the task-based pedagogic innovation in Hong Kong in three primary schools, using an attitude scale, classroom observation and interviews, revealed that a barrier to the implementation of the innovation was the pressure of time (Carless, 2003). This was with respect to the demands of completing the syllabus since some tasks were time consuming to prepare and to teach. There was also limited time to teach the content of the textbook. Moreover, in the case of one teacher, Gloria, who is also a middle-manager, there was the issue that time spent on training courses, and meeting the principal or parents meant missing some lessons and not enough opportunity for task-based activities. The issue of time also resonated with Cahn and Barnard’s (2009) study since they were mandated to complete the textbook in a specified time. As such, time constraints hampered teachers from utilizing more communicative activities. One of the teachers (Mo) explained that the number of tasks could not be completed in a forty-five-minute lesson.

The issue of insufficient time given to curriculum planning therefore, can hamper implementation efforts (Altinyelken, 2010). This can result in teachers just teaching those areas that are deemed important while spending less time on other areas or leaving them out completely (Altinyelken, 2010). Within the local context, Tyson’s (2003) study echoes similar problems experienced with time in the implementation of
the CAPE Literatures in English innovation. Teachers in the study contended that “the number of Internal Assessment (IA) pieces that they are required to present, the short time they have for adjusting the CAPE curriculum and preparing for the examinations in May at the end of year one (compared with two years for [The General Certificate of Education] G.C.E.)” (Tyson, 2003, p. 173) was a major challenge for them. These studies, based on various curriculum innovations in different contexts, influence the current study since they unveil time and a demanding syllabus as critical barriers to implementation.

2.6.2 Teacher-related factors

Teacher-related factors in this study are teacher belief and teacher willingness and commitment, which can also influence implementation. This category focuses on the personal level: the teacher who also is the most critical player in educational change (Fullan, 2016) since “what teachers do and think” directly influences implementation (Fullan, 2001, p. 117).

2.6.2.1 Teacher belief

Research studies indicate that teachers’ beliefs are a critical factor in the success or failure of implementation of curriculum innovations (Fullan, 2001; Hargreaves, 1998; Louden, 1991). If teachers’ beliefs are not taken into consideration as Handal and Herrington (2003) warn, “teachers will maintain their hidden agendas in the privacy of their classrooms and the implementation process will result in a self-deceiving public exercise of educational reform and a waste of energy and resources” (p. 65). Notably, any innovation “has to be accommodated within teachers’ own frame-works of teaching principles” (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver, Thwaite, 2001, p. 471-472). Moreover, teachers’ beliefs “may have the greatest impact on what teachers do in the classroom, the
ways they conceptualize their instruction, and learn from experience” (Brody, 1998, p. 25).

Teachers’ beliefs have been defined as “comprehensive of several dimensions relative to beliefs about learning, teaching, program and curriculum and the teaching profession more generally” which represent the “culture of teaching” (Ghaith, 2004 p. 280). These beliefs are based on the values, goals and concepts of teachers as pertains to their understanding of their roles and the content and process of teaching (Ghaith, 2004). In other words, teachers’ beliefs are “tacit, often unconsciously held assumptions about students, classrooms and the academic materials to be taught” (Kagan, 1992, p. 65). For Basturkmen, Loewen, and Ellis, (2004), beliefs are “statements teachers make about their ideas, thoughts and knowledge that are expressed as evaluations of ‘what should be done’, ‘should be the case’ and ‘is preferable’” (p. 244). Pajares (1992) goes further and contends that “beliefs cannot be directly observed or measured but must be inferred from what people say, intend and do – fundamental prerequisites that educational researchers have seldom followed” (p. 314). For the purpose of this current study, I use Wang’s (2006) notion of teachers’ belief as “their opinions and ideas about the [CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation] and its teaching and learning” (p. 3).

Several studies have linked teachers’ beliefs to their classroom practice (Borg, 2003; Fang, 1996; Kagan, 1992). With reference to primary teacher trainees in a teachers’ college in Trinidad and Tobago, Cain (2012) posits that the beliefs about teaching and learning which trainee teachers are exposed to in teacher training programmes play a crucial role in their classroom practice. This is echoed by Pajares (1992) who argues that there is a “strong relationship between teachers’ educational beliefs and their planning, instructional decisions and classroom practices” (p. 326).
In the realm of curriculum innovations, several studies have explored the influence of teachers’ beliefs on classroom implementation (Borg, 2006; Keys, 2007; Orafi, 2008; Song, 2015). The compatibility of teachers’ beliefs with their practice is illuminated in Fu and Sibert’s (2017) study that explored teachers’ perspectives of the factors that influence the implementation of the integrated curriculum (IC) in Ohio. Data were collected from forty-two K-3 teachers and ten school districts. Findings revealed that teachers had positive beliefs about the benefits of IC and had faith that they were skilled and knowledgeable to effect successful implementation. Their positive beliefs transferred to the classroom practice as most of them were using IC often in their classrooms.

While these studies reinforced the view that teachers’ beliefs are important to the implementation of curriculum innovations, they do not take into consideration that teachers’ beliefs and practice may not always be congruous, as Fang (1996) cogently notes. Inconsistencies between teachers’ beliefs and practice ensue, since “contextual factors can have powerful influences on their practice” (Fang, 1996, p. 53). This implies, as may be the case with some of the CAPE teachers, that although they may have positive beliefs about the curriculum innovation, there may still be a mismatch between what Orafi and Borg (2009) coined “intentions and realities” (p. 243), due to several factors. Therefore, teachers’ classroom practices cannot be understood in isolation of their teaching contexts since, “[t]he social, institutional, instructional and physical settings in which teachers work have a major impact on their cognition and practices” (Borg, 2006, p. 275). This is endorsed by Tyson’s (2003) study on the CAPE Literatures in English curriculum in Jamaica, which revealed that although all the teachers responded positively to operating a student-centred classroom, observations revealed otherwise, that not all teachers did so in reality Tyson, 2003, p. 172). This was influenced by unsuitable classroom facilities. Tyson’s (2003) research
is important in that it is one of the few studies in the context of CAPE curriculum that highlights implementation challenges that will be explored in this study. However, the focus of this study is on the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Trinidad and Tobago.

The inconsistency between teacher beliefs and classroom practice is further exemplified in Song’s (2015) study of primary school teachers’ implementation of child-centred pedagogy in two school districts in Cambodia using interview surveys and questionnaires. Noteworthy, Song’s (2015) findings were incongruent with Pajares (1992) and Fu and Sibert’s (2017) views that teachers’ beliefs strongly influence practice. Song’s (2015) study goes further and is useful to my research as it has the capacity to shed light on how context also influences implementation in developing countries like Trinidad and Tobago. In other words, it exposes the tensions inherent in the demands of child-centred pedagogy and local contextual realities. It is this mismatch that curriculum planners and developers overlook but which results in implementation failure. Although the teachers had positive beliefs about the principles of child-centred pedagogy, it did not materialize in their classroom teaching. This was as a result of impediments of the classroom environment such as large classes, lack of teaching resources, content overload and students’ ability. Although some child-centred activities began to take root, classroom practice remained more traditional and teacher-centred. Teaching was contingent on using textbooks and the blackboard. In fact, mathematical problems were put on the blackboard by the teachers for students to solve. Additionally, textbooks were used for classroom activities and homework. The teachers felt that the textbooks relieved the students from taking notes, which meant that they would have more time to work on practical exercises. This was conceived of as better than memorization of facts.

Song’s (2015) study therefore points to the various factors at the micro and macro-context that interact to influence teachers’ practice.
It provides a more realistic and comprehensive of the implementation change process, similar to the intention of this study. Additionally, the study contributes to implementation and change literature in developing countries like Trinidad and Tobago in its exploration of contextual factors, which can “lead to a better understanding of why some educational reforms succeed and others fail” (Montero-Sieburth, 1992, p. 151). Song’s (2015) research is also applicable to my study as it exposes the contradictions and challenges teachers experience when implementing a more learner–centred change that neglects the influence of the cultural norms and the capacity of the school. Moreover, the strength of Song’s (2015) study is that it valued the teachers’ voices by using interviews and questionnaires. However, observations (as in my study) could have also been included to understand teachers’ classroom practice as this would have added to the credibility of the study. In other words, it would have verified if what teachers said they were doing matched their actual practice.

2.6.2.2 Teacher willingness and commitment

Change involves “willingness to try out new ideas and practices to improve, to be exposed to uncertainty, and to collaborate with and support one another” (Rogan and Grayson, 2003, p. 1187). As such, teachers’ willingness and commitment are important factors for successful implementation (Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003). Their personality can influence their commitment and persistence to effect successful implementation (Fullan, 2016).

Empirical studies also support this view. For instance, Chang’s (2011) study on college teachers’ perspectives of the factors that facilitate or impede the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in Taiwan, supports Fullan’s (2016) and Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) views. Findings revealed that four of the teachers’ persistence and
willingness to use CLT despite the challenges encountered in the classroom, assisted in their implementation of it. Similarly, Rogan’s (2007) study of how Science teachers in one rural school implemented the outcomes-based curriculum in South Africa indicated that teachers’ dedication helped the implementation process. Teachers generally dealt with the challenges of implementation by trying various teaching strategies, doing extra work with students and creatively devising resources needed for the teaching and learning process. Edwards’ (2007) study also supported Chang’s (2011) and Rogan and Grayson’s (2003). Overall, teachers were dedicated and committed to offering students quality education despite the hindrances they faced in implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum. One strategy they used in the absence of support mechanisms at the school was their determination to network with other teachers.

Conversely, another study that investigated the challenges that impeded the implementation of the Basic Education curriculum in Kenya, revealed that teachers did not feel a sense of commitment and enthusiasm towards the new curriculum (Orodho, Waweru, Ndichu and Nthinguri, 2013). As a consequence of the economic restrictions that resulted in insufficient incentives and substandard remuneration, which negatively affected teachers’ commitment to implementation. Their lack of commitment is compounded even more as teachers are not equally compensated for professional development and there are limited opportunities available for teacher progression. What is insightful about the study is that it unearths the multiple voices and political agendas that are entangled in curriculum implementation (Chisholm, 2005). It is evident that the interplay of factors can negatively impact teachers’ enthusiasm and ultimately forestall implementation efforts. Therefore, contextual issues in the wider society can have a profound effect on what ensues in the classroom.
These studies highlight a significant factor that can influence implementation. However, only Edwards’ (2007) study focused on the CAPE Communication Studies innovation, but in the Jamaican context. Moreover, an instructive conclusion based on these studies is that several factors simultaneously influence teachers’ commitment and willingness to implement an innovation.

2.6.3 Innovation-related factors

The nature or characteristics of the innovation can also facilitate or hinder curriculum implementation in the classroom (Fullan, 2016; Rogers, 1995). The characteristics of the innovation can be perceived in relation to its need, clarity and complexity.

2.6.3.1 Need

Several “innovations are attempted without careful consideration of whether or not they address what are perceived to be priority needs” (Fullan, 2016, p. 69). However, for implementation to be successful the curriculum innovation must be recognized as relevant or needed by those involved in the implementation process (Fullan, 2016). In other words, the innovation must be perceived as responding to a need in society or the school (Jennings, 2012). The role of this perceived need though is not always that uncomplicated since it “is a question not only of whether a given need is important, but also of how important it is relative to other needs” (Fullan, 2016, p. 70). Moreover, people’s needs often become more explicit during implementation itself and “need interacts with other… factors to produce different patterns” (Fullan, 2016, p. 70).

Yunus, Nordin, Salehi, Embi and Salehi’s (2014) qualitative study of teachers’ perspectives of the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in the teaching and learning of language in secondary schools in Malaysia, provided insight into an
especially salient case of this perceived need. Semi-structured interviews with twenty-five English teachers were used. Findings revealed that generally teachers perceived ICT as a need and relevant since it has the potential to strengthen student’s language learning in the future. For instance, one of the teachers surmised that ICT as a pedagogical tool in education is useful in terms of “virtual learning and online conferences” (Yunus et al., 2014, p. 768) for students. Teachers had “a positive and encouraging dimension on the acceptance of the idea to integrate ICT in language learning, which includes the teaching of reading and writing” (Yunus et al., 2014, p. 768). Although ICT was an advantage, some of the teachers queried the practicality of it given the reality of the political, systemic and school contexts. This is captured by one of the teachers in a school in Kuala Lumpur (Yunus et al., 2014, p. 767):

ICT is definitely useful, but it has to go hand-in-hand with the curriculum…Some teachers are creative, you know, in using ICT but if they need to focus too much on exams, the creativity will be limited.

Yunus et al’s (2014) study present an important dimension in that although the innovation was perceived as a need, this is not enough for successful implementation because contextual factors such as examinations can inhibit implementation. This means that factors influencing change must not be seen in isolation from each other as other factors interact with teachers’ perceived need to facilitate or hinder implementation (Fullan, 2016). This study resonates with my research in that the CAPE Communication Studies innovation was a need and an advantage over what existed before (Spence, 2004), however, contextual and other constraints may also hinder effective implementation of it. Moreover, Yunus et al’s (2014) study does not explore the implementation process in-depth, especially how teachers are implementing it in the classroom through observations or a comprehensive exploration of both facilitators and barriers to implementation, which is a gap that this study will fill.
Similarly, Abdullah, Abidin, Luan and Majid and Atan’s (2006) qualitative and quantitative study of sixty-two teachers’ use of computers in the implementation of English in twelve schools in Malaysia, revealed that most of the teachers endorsed the use of computers to teach English. They felt that it was a significant tool that would enhance students’ motivation in the teaching and learning process. In other words, they saw it as a need because of the benefits that it can have on students’ learning. However, several systemic and school barriers such as insufficient resources, ineffective training and teachers’ limited skills in using computers, deterred them from incorporating it often and in-depth in their teaching. This study alluded to the fact that perceiving an innovation as a need does not mean that it will be implemented successfully because several interrelated factors from the classroom, school and society were more significant.

In the regional context, Edwards (2007) explored the views of stakeholders about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Unlike the other studies, both the students and teachers’ impressions about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum were investigated. Findings indicated that teachers and students agreed that the curriculum innovation was relevant to the needs of students in several ways. The inclusion of the Internal Assessment (IA) was perceived as relevant to enhancing students’ language skills for different purposes. Teachers and students also agreed that the CAPE innovation was relevant for students’ preparation for tertiary education. This was illuminated by one of the teacher’s comments:

I think it is even better than General Paper in the sense that it prepares students for university and college level writing and critical thinking. The issues of critical thinking and critical analysis are absolutely essential at the tertiary level (Edwards, 2007, p. 134).
Furthermore, the genesis of the CAPE innovation instilled a feeling of pride as it was regionally based. Notwithstanding this, reservations were expressed in relation to the focus on the varieties of language instead of Standard English. There was consensus that emphasis should be turned to the conventions of Standard English by the teachers especially since students that moved from Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC) English are perceived as “still not proficient in Standard English” (Edwards, 2007, p. 134). Like the other studies, this curriculum innovation experienced several challenges, in this case, ineffective workshops, time constraints, examinations, limited resources and lack of support from external agencies, which hindered implementation.

These studies further underscore the challenges involved in the implementation process, that just perceiving a curriculum innovation as a need does not mean that it will get implemented. In fact, this may also be the case of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. Noteworthy, “although the Caribbean has been presented with a new curriculum with untold potential, that potential may remain unrealized” (Edwards, 2007, p. 148) due to several barriers.

2.6.3.2 Clarity

The clarity of the innovation, which refers to the implementers’ understanding about the “goals and means” of the innovation, is also essential for its successful implementation (Fullan, 2016, p. 70). “False clarity” then is when “change is interpreted in an oversimplified way”, which would result in superficial implementation (Fullan, 2016, p. 70). Therefore, it is critical that implementers not only understand the theoretical underpinnings, but more importantly the classroom applications of the innovation (Carless, 1998). However, this is not always a straightforward case as the “language and complexity of policy cause further difficulties”, especially when “the goals are large and lofty, they are also at times incomprehensible” (Schweisfurth, 2011, p.
Significantly, teachers’ misunderstanding of the intentions and conceptions of curriculum developers have been cited as a factor in the non-implementation of innovations (Brindley and Hood, 1990).

A case in point is illuminated in Humphries and Burns’ (2015) study of teachers’ perspectives of the factors inhibiting the implementation of new communicative textbooks in Japan at an engineering college (kōsen). It was found that teachers misunderstood the strategy needed to implement the activities in the textbook. Instead of encouraging communicative activities such as listening and pair work, classes were dominated by teacher-led activities such as providing answers to exercises in the textbook orally to students. Additionally, teachers did not allow the students “to listen for comprehension”; instead “they used the transcripts and translated the content for them” (Humphries and Burns, 2015, p. 243). Moreover, “[e]nglish language production was limited to repetition and written gap-filling exercises” (Humphries and Burns, 2015, p. 242). Also, some of the subject matter content was omitted and Daiki and Banda, two of the teachers, admitted that they lacked the understanding of teaching approaches. Therefore, students did not have opportunities to express their views, develop problem-solving skills and to be more interactive in the classroom. Teachers’ lack of understanding was one of the barriers to successful implementation of the new textbooks.

Another study that also underlines a similar issue was conducted in fifty secondary schools based on four Scottish innovations (Brown and McIntyre, 1978). It was found that teachers’ interpretations were not in tandem with the policy planners understanding, apparent in the curriculum document. This resulted in the unsuccessful implementation of the innovation. Therefore, when

Planners have not made their interpretations explicit…there is danger that either teachers will have no idea what was intended and
ignore some aspects of the innovation or they may misunderstand their intentions and react with disfavour (Brown and McIntyre, 1978, p. 19).

The negative influence of teachers’ misunderstanding in relation to curriculum innovations is also illuminated in English language education. For example, Karavas-Doukas’ (1995) study, which explored fourteen teachers’ implementation of the communicative approach to English Language teaching in Greek secondary schools, found that teachers misunderstood the innovation which they were implementing. This resulted in teachers’ negative perspectives of the innovation. They therefore acted as an “authority, transmitter of knowledge and evaluator of students’ language” (Karavas-Doukas, 1995, p. 57). Hence, the implementation of the communicative approach by all fourteen teachers was unsuccessful (Karavas-Doukas, 1995).

Research in the regional context have also explored the influence of teachers’ understanding and classroom practice. Jennings’ (2012) study focused on principals’ and teachers’ perceptions of the implementation of Research and Technology (R & T) innovation in the Reform of Secondary Education [ROSE] in Jamaica. It examined how the characteristics of the innovation influenced implementation. Interviews, questionnaires and in-depth observations were used to collect data. Teachers reported that they understood how to use the thematic approach, but observations showed that the teachers were not using the themes accurately to link aspects of R & T, which was a barrier to successful implementation. They misunderstood the content as well as the methods needed to teach R & T. Although R & T was a subject where practical activities were essential, this was limited in the classroom. For instance, one of the lessons based on “timber technology” was more theoretical, using the blackboard to teach rather than introducing students to the practical dimensions using practical materials. The classroom was predominantly teacher-centred, with the teacher functioning as a role
The lecture method followed by group work characterized a pseudo-type of classroom practice, as there was no evidence of the promotion of critical and problem-solving skills and students’ collaboration.

Similarly, a lack of clarity may also influence the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. In fact, Kouwenberg (2007) pointed to a lack of clarity in Module 2 of the innovation in terms of “Comparative Analysis of English and Creole” (p. 215). The number of various features to include is unclear since “teachers are not provided with detailed instructions of background materials and may well wonder what counts as ‘defining characteristics’ of languages” (Kouwenberg, 2007, p. 215).

A more in-depth analysis of how various levels of understanding influence curriculum implementation is also highlighted in Kirkgoz’s (2008) case study. This study investigated the influence of 32 teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the Communicative Oriented Curriculum (COC) in English Language teaching in 22 different Turkish primary schools, to young learners. Classroom observation was the main data collection method used with follow-up interviews to ascertain how these teachers were implementing COC. Findings revealed that teachers’ understanding was a factor that influenced their implementation of COC. Moreover, teachers had different levels of understandings of the curriculum innovation. Teachers who were transmission-oriented (16) had limited understanding the principles of COC, which meant that implementation of COC was basically unsuccessful. The eclectic-oriented teachers’ (10) understanding included giving direct instruction of the linguistic structure so that students could learn the language effectively, as well as, enhancing their interest in it. As such, they were able to implement more features of the COC. The interpretation-oriented teachers, however, had positive orientations
towards COC which motivated them to put into practice several the main features of COC (Kirkgoz, 2008).

These studies indicate that when an innovation is not made clear to teachers it hinders curriculum implementation, which is considered in this current study. In the CAPE context in Trinidad and Tobago, some teachers’ misunderstanding of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation may undoubtedly affect their implementation of it. There may be key areas such as the internal assessment component, the language and linguistic component and the shift to also include more learner-centred activities that some teachers could find difficult to understand and hence, implement. However, this could be due to several interactive factors such as ad hoc workshops instead of effective training and support and closed channels of communication between the various levels of the education system (Wedell, 2009) during the implementation stage (Edwards, 2007). As such, a new approach to teaching and assessment would inevitably present challenges.

Furthermore, Karavas-Doukas’ (1995), and Kirkgoz’s (2008) empirical studies, hold implications for this current study, in that although they emphasized curriculum innovations in their own contexts, these innovations promote more communicative activities in the teaching and learning process, as in the case of CAPE. However, whereas observations were the main data collection strategy in their studies, interviews will take precedence in the current study. The main intention is to unmask through the voices of teachers, the factors from the different layers of the system that influence the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies.

### 2.6.3.3 Complexity

Complexity is “the difficulty and extent of change required of the individuals responsible for implementation” (Fullan, 2016, p. 71). The
more complex teachers perceive an innovation, the more difficult it will be to implement (Brindley and Hood, 1990).

Effective implementation of a curriculum innovation may be challenging to obtain if complex changes are needed in teachers’ classroom practice (Brindley and Hood, 1990). However, “while complexity creates problems for implementation, it may result in greater change because more is being attempted” (Fullan, 2016, p. 72). This can only happen if policy developers don’t “underestimate the criticality of at least considering contextual reality in their planning” (Wedell, 2009, p. 115).

A notable case of an innovation that was considered as complex but was unsuccessful is illuminated in Darsih’s (2014) qualitative study of teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the English curriculum in Indonesia. Too many dimensions and new features of the curriculum made it very challenging to implement. These included developing assessment rubrics, applying the authentic revolution and teaching using the new learning revolution. It was difficult for teachers to apply authentic assessment in their classroom as they had to evaluate students’ competency through observation. This meant that they had to create an assessment rubric for all assignments, and this was a complex task for teachers who were not exposed to this form of assessment. Additionally, teachers had to employ the new learning revolution which requires a scientific approach to teaching and learning. This also entailed the use of multimedia to assist with their teaching, which made it even more challenging. Moreover, the scientific approach meant that teachers had to be creative and technologically competent. It was evident that the teachers had to implement a complex set of changes with the new curriculum, which they were not trained to implement. Darsih’s (2014) study is significant, as it contributes to an understanding of implementation failure of innovative changes such as new assessment methods and teaching approaches. Policy developers and planners fail to
understand the complexity of change (Fullan, 2016), focussing still on “the technicality of change” (Goodson, 2003 cited in Wedell, 2009, p. 44) and ignoring the influences of the education and national culture (Wedell, 2009).

Another possible negative influence of the complexity of an innovation on teaching strategies is reflected in Okoth’s (2016) study that examined teachers’ challenges in implementing a revised integrated English Language curriculum. Findings showed that the complex nature of the new curriculum was a barrier to implementation. Teachers found it difficult to integrate grammar in literature, for the teachers’ grammar was expansive “and covered all rules governing words, word formation, sentences and sentence formations. Due to the complexity, it requires a systematic form of learning and study” (Okoth, 2016, p. 174). As such, they taught them separately, which negatively impacted on implementation.

Both studies therefore support Brindley and Hood’s (1990) view that if complex changes require too many changes in teachers’ behaviour, without the necessary planning and support by curriculum planners then implementation would be hindered. These studies resonate with the CAPE Communication Studies innovation, as it also requires that teachers implement new forms of assessment, promote group and pair activities in the classroom and acquire new subject content knowledge.
2.7 Conceptual Framework

**Figure 5:** Conceptual framework of interrelated factors influencing implementation

**Source:** Need, Clarity, Complexity, (Fullan, 2016); Teacher belief (Fang, 1996; Kirkgoz, 2008; Pajares, 1992, Rogan and Grayson, 2003, Song, 2015); Teacher willingness and commitment (Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003); Time and syllabus demand and class size (Lim and Pyvis, 2012; Wedell and Malderez, 2013; Wadesango, Hove and Kurebwa, 2016); School culture and leadership (Fullan, 2016, Hargreaves, 1994; Harris and Jones, 2012, Rogan and Grayson, 2003, Wedell and Malderez, 2013); Examination-oriented system (Alderson and Wall, 1993; Deng and Carless, 2010, Prodromou, 1995; Yin, Lee and Wang, 2014); Approaches to curriculum innovation (Kennedy, 1987; Stenhouse, 1975, Wedell and Malderez, 2013); Government funding and support and other agencies (Fullan, 2016; O’Sullivan, 2002; Rogan, and Grayson, 2003); Professional development and training (Brindley and Hood, 1990; Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003, Taole, 2015; Wedell, 2003); Extra-lessons (Bray, 1999,
As this study sought to understand the implementation process and unearth the factors that hinder and facilitate the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in secondary schools in the Trinidad and Tobago context from teachers’ perspectives, I developed a conceptual framework (see Figure 5) based on a synthesis of those factors deemed useful in the literature review. The framework, therefore, provides a lens through which I can examine how the innovation is being implemented, from a holistic perspective. In this way I can garner a more authentic picture of the various gaps between the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and the actual practices in the classroom and the factors that influence implementation.

The Conceptual Framework in Figure 5 above therefore proposes three main categories: Contextual factors (external-contextual factors; school-contextual factors); Teacher-related factors; and Innovation-related factors. Each of these main categories pulls together related sub-categories of factors, which comprise a group of thirteen interrelated factors. This strategy is helpful in representing the spectrum of factors that influence the implementation of curriculum innovations in the classroom. It is critical to bring awareness “to the total context of education during curriculum reform in developing countries emphasizing that curricula should not be perceived in isolation but should rather be seen as part of a whole spectrum of related factors” (Montero-Sieburth, 1992 cited in Sikoyo, 2010, p. 249). Complex change such as the CAPE Communication Studies innovation necessitates an understanding of change from a holistic perspective that considers the interrelation of societal culture, the education system, schools, teachers and the innovation characteristics that influence implementation.
The category contextual factors include external and school contextual factors. External-contextual factors refer to the factors in the wider systemic and cultural context that influence curriculum implementation. These include the examination-oriented system (Alderson and Wall, 1993; Deng and Carless, 2010, Prodromou, 1995; Yin, Lee and Wang, 2014), approaches to curriculum innovation (Kennedy, 1987; Stenhouse, 1975, Wedell and Malderez, 2013) government funding and support and other agencies (Fullan, 2016; O’Sullivan, 2002; Rogan, and Grayson, 2003), professional development and training (Brindley and Hood, 1990; Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003, Taole, 2015; Wedell, 2003), extra-lessons (Bray, 1999; Brunton, 2002; Lochan and Barrow, 2008; Yung and Bray, 2017) and societal culture (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, Shamim, 1996; Tudor, 2001, Wedell and Malderez, 2013). School-contextual factors include factors within the school and classroom contexts. These sub-factors are; school culture and leadership (Fullan, 2016; Hargreaves, 1993; Harris and Jones, 2012, Rogan and Grayson, 2003, Wedell and Malderez, 2013); and class size and time and syllabus demand (Lim and Pyvis, 2012; Wedell and Malderez, 2013; Wadesango, Hove and Kurebwa, 2016). Teacher belief (Fang, 1996; Kirkgoz, 2008; Pajares, 1992, Rogan and Grayson, 2003, Song, 2015); and teacher willingness and commitment (Fullan, 2016; Rogan and Grayson, 2003), are under the category teacher-related factors which can also influence implementation. Innovation-related factors deal with the attributes or characteristics of the innovation that can hinder or facilitate implementation. These fall into three sub-factors, need, clarity, and complexity (Fullan, 2016).

Significantly, the framework also illustrates that the factors influencing curriculum implementation are not linear but interconnected and interactive. They overlap and are not independent. The arrows highlight the interconnectedness of categories and factors. While some
factors may have a more pervasive influence on the implementation process, the framework does not assume hierarchical relationships of these factors. For instance, teacher beliefs may be a factor influencing curriculum implementation, but beliefs may not always be consistent with teachers’ practice. In other words, there may be a mismatch between what Orafi and Borg (2009) coined “intentions and realities” due to a combination of other factors such as examinations, large classes and time. Furthermore, cultural norms and beliefs in the wider context and societal expectations of teacher and student roles in the classroom may have a great influence on their behaviour. The conceptual framework then can better explain how the CAPE Communication Studies innovation is being implemented as it moves away from the archaic models that envision change as technical (Grassick and Wedell, 2018) and teachers yoked in mechanical implementation (Peurach, 2011). Moreover, given Trinidad and Tobago’s unique context with its bureaucratic traditional structure and an examination-oriented culture, this conceptual framework is relevant as it considers the whole context.

Additionally, the framework illuminates that factors can be either facilitators or barriers to implementation depending on the context or situation. In other words, factors such as principal support, professional development and time may be facilitators to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies in one school but barriers to the implementation in another school.

Generally, the conceptual framework pinpoints several issues in the realm of curriculum implementation which are important to my study:

- Teachers are central to the implementation of curriculum innovations. They are the ‘frontline’ implementers (Fullan, 2016) and are crucial to how it is implemented in the classroom.
• Implementation is a significant phase in the change process where most of the challenges arise, yet it is overlooked especially in developing countries (Dyer, 1999). Unless it is examined, it would be difficult to ascertain if the intended curriculum is congruent with the actual use. In fact, implementation is the “bedrock of any plan’s success or failure.” (Ogar and Opoh, 2015, p. 145).

• Globally, many innovations are developed in to improve the quality of education and students’ learning. However, these innovations “often fail to achieve the intentions of those who initiated and planned” (Orafi, 2013, p. 14), due to various factors. In fact, “beautifully planned and worthwhile curricula have crumbled and failed to produce the intended output due to improper implementation” (Ogar and Opoh, 2015, p. 146). This results in are gaps or mismatches.

• Many curriculum innovations are perceived as beneficial to students’ overall development. In other words, teachers in different contexts have a positive orientation towards several innovations, yet, this does not always filter into the classroom since contextual and other factors impede implementation (Montero-Sieburth, 1992). It is important therefore, to examine the interrelated factors in the whole context that influence the gaps between the intended curriculum and actual implementation in the classroom.

• Factors, (barriers and facilitators) that influence teachers’ implementation of curriculum innovation, need to be investigated to help manage and plan effectively for change.

This study intends to provide a whole, in-depth picture of the implementation process in relation to the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. The main research questions emanated from the conceptual framework above, which relates to the implementation of the
CAPE curriculum innovation. The framework, therefore, provides an avenue from which to comprehend the factors within the entire system that facilitate and hinder implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

2.8 Summary

This chapter discussed the literature pertinent to my study on the implementation of curriculum innovations and illuminated the research gaps. Notably, except for Tyson’s (2003), Edwards’ (2007) and Kouwenberg’s (2007) research studies, none of the literature reviewed illuminated the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Moreover, to date there is no comprehensive empirical research on the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. The current study hopes to address this gap.

The next chapter discusses in detail the research design, approach, methods and analysis that are used to examine teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Additionally, I discuss the ethical issues that I faced.
Chapter 3: Research design and methodology

3.1 Introduction

Based on purpose of this study and a review of the literature on teachers’ perspectives of the curriculum implementation process, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. What perspectives do teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
2. How are teachers implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
3. What are teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
4. What are teachers’ perspectives of the factors that facilitate the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

Thus, the aim of this chapter is to discuss and provide justification of the research design, approach, methods and analysis that is used to examine teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in one education district in Trinidad and Tobago.

In the first section I discuss the rationale for selection of the interpretive paradigm. This is followed by an explanation of the case study approach and justification for its choice. I further provide a detailed discussion of credibility, generalizability, confirmability and dependability issues and ethical considerations connected to the study. The sampling strategy as well as data collection tools are explained and rationalized. Finally, I explained the data analysis strategy.
3.2 Paradigm rationale: theoretical perspectives of this study

A paradigm is “the entire constellation of beliefs, values and techniques shared by members of a given scientific community” (Kuhn, 1970, p. 75). Guba and Lincoln (1989) further add that a paradigm is “a basic set of beliefs, a set of assumptions we are willing to make which serves as touchstones in guiding our activities” (p. 80). In other words, paradigms or world views organize how people perceive the world as well as how they act within it (Duffy and Chenail, 2008). Moreover, as Bryman (2008) points out paradigms do not only have an influence on what should be studied and the way in which research should be done but also how results should be interpreted. Therefore, “the research paradigm…will specify the domain of study, the legitimate modes, and the methods of inquiry open to a researcher within a discipline” (Munhall, 2001, p.45). It “provides both openings and closings,” in that it “opens up frameworks for investigating certain kinds of questions and problems and closes down possibilities for investigating others” (Duffy and Chenail, 2008, p.26). In light of this Guba and Lincoln’s (1994) warning is critical that:

Paradigm issues are crucial; no inquirer…ought to go about the business of inquiry without being clear about just what paradigm informs and guides his or her approach (p. 116).

Although there are multiple paradigms (Kuhn, 1970), however, within social science research there are two main paradigms, the positivist paradigm and the interpretive paradigm (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000), which have important implications for the how research will be conducted, as well as how findings will be explicated (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). Each of these paradigms has different philosophical assumptions that undergird them. These philosophical assumptions are epistemology, ontology and methodology (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 99):
Epistemology asks, how do we know the world? What is the relationship between the inquirer and the known? Ontology raises basic questions about the nature of reality. Methodology focuses on how we gain knowledge about the world (Denzin and Lincoln 1994, p. 99).

Therefore, rationale and specific “use of methodology and methods is something that reaches into the assumptions about reality” which in turn interrogate “our theoretical perspective” (Crotty, 1998, p. 2).

The positivist paradigm focuses on “objectivity, standard procedures and replicability” (Johnson, 1994, p.7). It adheres to the notion that the researcher can unearth the truth that is out there by using objective research methods (Muijs, 2004). Conversely, the interpretive paradigm emphasizes the procedures of how “meanings are created, negotiated, sustained and modified within a specific context of human action” (Schwandt, 1994, p. 120). The central endeavour is to comprehend the scientific world of human experience by attempting to understand the person from within (Cohen et al. 2000). Therefore, any “imposition of external form and structure is resisted, since this reflects the viewpoint of the observer as opposed to that of the actor directly involved” (Cohen et al, 2000, p. 22). As Yanow (2000) points out where the social world is characterized by many interpretations there is no place for “brute data” where “meaning is beyond dispute” (p.5).

In relation to ontological questions about the nature of reality, the positivist paradigm assumes that reality is out there so it can be understood and studied (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Reality is thus objective and can be captured through scientific methods, devoid of those who experience it (Cohen et al, 2000). However, the interpretive paradigm assumes “relativist ontology,” in that multiple realities exist (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p.24). There isn’t any objective reality to be observed since reality is constructed by individuals and by their observations (Muijs, 2004). Hence, reality is a “product of individual consciousness” (Cohen et al, 2000, p. 5), and emerges during investigation. Interpretivists therefore
hold steadfastly to the notion that the empiricists picture of reality leaves out intersubjective meanings, which are most significant (Schwandt, 1994, p. 120). Consequently “the social world is constituted by the intentions and meanings of the social actors” (Pring, 2000, p. 96). It can be argued therefore, that in any study which emphasizes individual lived experience, it is impossible to understand human actions without grasping the meaning that are attributed to these actions by participants (Marshall and Rossman, 2016). Moreover, human action “has to be interpreted and understood within the context of social practices” (Usher, 1996, p. 18). The ontological assumptions that undergird the interpretive paradigm, is summed up by Guba (1990):

> Realities exist in the form of multiple mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific, dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them (p. 27).

Epistemological assumptions that undergird the positivist paradigm require the researcher to stay detached from the research participants in order to limit possible researcher bias, as such; only knowledge evidence that has been established from a rigorous scientific study can be considered (Duffy and Chenail, 2008). Knowledge therefore “consists of verified hypothesis that can be accepted as fact or laws” (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 113). In contrast, under the interpretive paradigm, “the investigator and the object of investigation are assumed to be interactively linked so that the ‘findings’ are literally created as the investigation proceeds” (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p.111). Ongoing interaction between the participants and the researcher is where meanings are created. Moreover, to create knowledge, the lived experience of an event is critical as all knowledge emerges from lived experiences (Duffy and Chenail, 2008, p. 30).

These research paradigms represent different avenues of looking at the world (Babbie, 2001, p.43-44). Significantly, selection of a paradigm has to do with its relevance for the type of research undertaken.
This study examined teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in secondary schools in one educational district in Trinidad. As such, it is placed within the interpretive paradigm since with the positivist paradigm “[t]oo many local (emic) case-based (idiographic) meanings are excluded by the generalizing (ethic) nomothetic, positivist position” (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994, p. 100). Moreover, Cohen’s et al (2000) argument about the challenges of positivism as it pertains to human behaviour bear relevance to this study:

Where positivism is less successful however, is in its application to the study of human behaviour where the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomena contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of the natural world. This point is nowhere more apparent than in the contexts of classroom and school where the problems of teaching, learning and human interaction present the positivistic researcher with a mammoth challenge (Cohen et al. 2000, p. 9-10).

In the case of this study, the positivist paradigm is limited where complex issues such as the curriculum implementation and innovation are involved in research. The process of curriculum implementation is the focus of this study and not the outcome as it aims to understand the research participants’ perspectives of curriculum implementation in the classroom. For instance, the views teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, how they are implementing it and the factors that influence their implementation of it. The research aims and questions are therefore congruent with the underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions of the interpretive paradigm. This study is informed by ontology where multiple realities can be constructed. It examined the issue of teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and the factors that facilitate and hinder their implementation of it precisely by understanding their subjective experiences of implementing it. It is their perspectives that provides meaning, rather than
an external meaning or one that exists prior to investigation. Reality, therefore in this study is “the meaning or consciousness resulting from the embodied engagement” (Duffy and Chenail, 2008, p. 30) of the teachers’ implementation of the innovation in the classroom. Gall, Gall and Borg’s (1999) view is therefore applicable, that “any social phenomenon,” in this case, curriculum implementation, cannot have an independent existence devoid of its participants, “rather, it will have different meanings for the individuals who participate in the phenomenon or who subsequently learn about it” (p. 289).

In relation to epistemology, this study addresses knowledge in a different way from the positivist paradigm. Knowledge surfaces from lived experience and therefore includes the perspectives of the teachers implementing the CAPE curriculum innovation, which do not constitute objective or abstract knowledge. Hence, teachers can ‘know’ through consciousness. In an effort to understand the specific research questions which mainly focused on the views that teachers hold about CAPE Curriculum Studies innovation, how they are implementing it and their perspectives of the factors that influence the implementation of it, the researcher has to have close and constant interaction with participants (teachers) in a natural setting. It is only through this intense interaction and collaboration between the researcher and the teachers, that knowledge about teachers’ perspectives of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation can be elicited. In other words, teachers were allowed to tell their stories (Crabtree and Miller, 1999; Baxter and Jack, 2008).

This study then is basically about teachers’ perspectives of curriculum implementation in secondary schools in one educational district in Trinidad and Tobago, therefore the interpretive, theoretical stance is relevant. Furthermore, the researcher’s “weltanschauung” or “worldview” (Rossman and Rallis, 2003, p. 10) is congruent with the
interpretive understanding regarding reality and knowledge. The researcher’s philosophical orientation is therefore a fundamental consideration since as Cohen et al (2000, p. 6) argue, “[h]ow one aligns oneself” with a particular paradigm influences “how one will go about uncovering knowledge of social behaviour.”

3.3 Justification for Qualitative Research

This study explores teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in one educational district in Trinidad and Tobago. As such, qualitative research was an appropriate approach for understanding this issue since it necessitated an in-depth understanding of human experience and “studying things as they exist, rather than contriving artificial situations or experiments” (Lichtman, 2013, p. 20). Furthermore, it allows the researcher to unearth how teachers make sense of their social world (Bogdan and Biklen, 2016) and provides the opportunity for them to reveal their stories (Lichtman, 2013). The researcher then can comprehend the issue of curriculum implementation from the perspective of the teachers.

Denzin and Lincoln (1994) describe qualitative research as “multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive naturalistic approach to its subject matter” (p. 2). Creswell (1998) adds that it is “an inquiry process of understanding based on a distinct methodological tradition of inquiry that explores a social or human problem” (p. 15). Additionally, several researchers concur that a major strength of qualitative research is that it provides a complex and holistic picture that can unravel the complexity of an issue in the real context (Creswell 2013; Miles and Huberman, 2014). Significantly, qualitative research provides understanding and observation of the process of how people try to understand what they experience (Stake, 1995). Notably, qualitative procedures allow access of unquantifiable facts and qualitative data
analysis give the researchers the avenue to several social contours and processes participants use to create their realities (Berg, 2009).

The aspects of qualitative research discussed are compatible with this study’s research aims and research questions. For instance, the techniques afforded the researcher the opportunity to share in the perspectives and understandings of the teachers, as well as examine how they interpret of their lives (Berg, 2009, p. 8). In other words, it allowed the researcher to capture the voices of teachers in its true form and probe or “look deeply at a few things rather than looking at the surface of many things” (Lichtman, 2006, p. 13).

Noteworthy, qualitative research gave the researcher a deeper understanding of the complex issue of teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies, through the process of collecting rich, thick description (Geertz, 1973), of the teachers’ point of view. Furthermore, survey research may be a suitable methodology for many research questions; however, for the research questions of this research, it does not provide the intensity of meaning important in comprehending the social world (Silverman, 2010, p. 120). In order to understand implementation from the teachers’ perspectives it is necessary to “get closer to the data” (Silverman, 2010, p. 120).

The emphasis of this study is based on teachers’ perspectives of implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, which cannot be measured or reduced to numbers. For instance, Pajares (1992) contends that beliefs can only be deduced from what people “say, intend and do” (p. 316). Hence, qualitative research is most suitable in this study.

Since I am the primary instrument of data collection and analysis (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016), I was able to relay the teacher’s story from a mediated perspective of an active learner instead of as an
expert that judges the teachers (Creswell, 2013). Moreover, qualitative research provided me with the opportunity to work with teachers in their classrooms, develop ongoing relationships with them and enact the feeling of being there (Guba and Lincoln, 1989).

3.4 Research Design

Having located myself within the interpretive paradigm and qualitative research method, I employed a case study approach as it was appropriate to the study. The research design “situates the researcher in the empirical world and connects him or her to specific sites, persons, groups, institution and bodies of relevant interpretative material including documents and archives” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 25). In this section therefore, I discussed my rationale for choosing a case study approach and trustworthiness issues were also examined.

3.4.1 Case Study Approach

In this study I choose a case study approach to address my research questions as I wanted to garner deeper understanding of a single or holistic case (Yin, 2014). The case itself is curriculum implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. The unit of analysis is the teachers implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in one educational district in Trinidad and Tobago. The rationale for a case study approach was strengthened since it is “well suited for complex social phenomenon” (Baskarada, 2014, p. 4) in this case, curriculum implementation of an innovation.

Case studies are differentiated in terms of types (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). Stake (1995) for instance refers to three types: intrinsic, instrumental and collective, while other researchers discuss evaluative case studies (Patton, 2015); life history (Bogdan and Biklen, 2016); exploratory (Yin, 2014); and descriptive (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2014). This study falls within the realm of the descriptive type case-study.
as the emphasis was on providing a realistic and detailed picture of curriculum implementation from teachers’ perspectives regarding how they are implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the classroom and the inhibiting and facilitating factors that influence their implementation of it. In other words, “the end product... is a rich, “thick” description of the phenomenon under study” (Merriam 2009, p. 43). Research on curriculum implementation therefore can benefit from a case study approach in that it allows in-depth exploration of the complexities of this process and unmasks the “multiplicity of factors which have interacted to produce the unique character of the entity that is the subject of study” (Yin, 1989, p. 82) by using multiple data collection methods. The various data collection methods facilitate the richness of research (Yin, 2014).

Furthermore, “case study is a particularly appealing design for applied fields of study such as education”, (Merriam, 2009, p. 51) and have “proven particularly useful for studying educational innovations” (Merriam, 2009, p. 51), such as CAPE Communication Studies. The case study approach is therefore well-suited to this study since the emphasis is on understanding teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the natural setting of classrooms. Hence, it fits into a significant aspect of a case study in that it:

Investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the case) in-depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident (Yin, 2014, p. 16).

For instance, in this study understanding the contemporary phenomenon of curriculum implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation from teachers’ perspectives is crucial; however, such understanding entails significant contextual conditions (Yin, 2014) and could not be considered without the schools in the educational district or more specifically the classroom settings where teachers are
implementing communication studies CAPE. Case studies therefore allow “interpretation in context” (Cronbach, 1975, p. 123), and insights gained, from “real cases” (Stake, 2006, p. 3) can have an influence on practice and policy (Merriam, 1998, p. 19). Hence, findings from this study can influence practice in the area of curriculum implementation of CAPE Communication Studies and add to the existing body of knowledge in the field (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2014).

Another aspect of a case study is that it is an exploration of a “bounded system” (Creswell, 2013, p. 97). Merriam and Tisdell (2016, p.39) warn that “[i]f the phenomenon you are interested in studying is not intrinsically bounded, it is not a case”. The discussion above highlights the justification for selecting a case study approach in this study, since it investigates curriculum implementation conducted in seven-year public secondary schools in one educational district in the subject area of the CAPE Communication Studies.

In addition, Merriam’s (2009, p. 44) view that case studies are heuristic in that they shed light on “the reader’s understanding of the phenomenon” reinforces the importance of it to the proposed study. It is hoped that this case study will provide insights on the curriculum implementation process as it pertains CAPE Communication Studies in the Trinidad and Tobago context from teachers’ perspectives. This can lead to a “discovery of new meaning” and “[i]nsights into how things get to be the way they are” (Merriam, 2009, p. 44).

There are however several drawbacks of a case study, such as, the problem of researcher bias and the generalizability of findings which will be addressed in section 3.4.2 on “Trustworthiness”.
3.4.2 Trustworthiness

There is a multiplicity of divergent views that exist as pertains to issues of validity and reliability and generalizability (Cohen et al 2000) in research. In the positivist tradition these are the criteria of rigorous research. Angen (2000) notes that proponents of positivist quantitative research criticize qualitative research, especially interpretive approaches to human inquiry as being “rife with threats to validity that they are of no scientific value” (Angen, 2000, p. 378). However, Maxwell (1992 as cited in Cohen et al 2000) rejects this and warns that qualitative researchers should not be operating “within the agenda of positivists in arguing for the need for research to demonstrate concurrent, predictive, convergent, criterion-related internal and external validity” (p. 106).

Other qualitative researchers assert that there are alternative approaches to reliability and validity. Since a different worldview and different assumptions about reality undergird qualitative research, the issues of reliability and validity should be pursued from a viewpoint in tandem with the philosophical propositions of the paradigm (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). In this vein Creswell (2013) puts forth the concept of verification, which entails eight verification procedures to be used in qualitative research instead of validity. These procedures include prolonged engagement and persistent observation, triangulation, peer review, negative case analysis, clarifying researcher bias, member checks, rich thick description and external audits (Creswell, 2013). However, Wolcott (1994) proposes the term “understanding” instead of validity. On a further note, Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose “trustworthiness” as a substitute criterion in qualitative research. They warn that terms such as internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity are irrelevant in qualitative research and should be replaced (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Therefore, to ensure the ‘trustworthiness’ of qualitative research Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest four alternative concepts: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability. In order to enhance the
trustworthiness of this proposed study, the four constructs suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) were employed.

Internal validity deals with whether findings are congruent with reality (Merriam, 2009). Credibility, which is employed instead of internal validity, was enhanced through several strategies in this study. The researcher sought the assistance of a peer at the School of Education, University of the West Indies, to scrutinize the process of the research and discuss compatibility of findings that emerged with original data. The peer’s interpretation of the interview data and observation data were compared with my interpretation and generally our interpretation were in tandem with each other. This process provided an opportunity to further refine my interpretations and assumptions.

The researcher also engaged in intensive and critical self-reflection or reflexivity (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) in order to clarify and discuss any biases, and assumptions, which may affect the research investigation. Member-checks were also employed as it is critical for “establishing credibility” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 314). This entailed taking back transcribed data and emerging interpretations and conclusions to participants to confirm that it accurately represented their views. All the participants confirmed the truthfulness of the transcripts and their perspectives. Furthermore, they agreed with my interpretation and did not change anything in the transcripts.

Also, since the researcher wanted to get a close-up picture of participants’ perspectives of curriculum implementation, a lot of time was spent collecting data until emerging findings began to be the same (Merriam, 2009). Additionally, multiple methods of data collection were used to verify findings. Semi-structured interviews were the primary instrument of data collection however; observations and documents were used to corroborate data from interviews. Documents were also used to help in understanding whether teachers’ actual classroom implementation
is aligned to the principles of the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus. Documents therefore are a way of complementing data from observations and interviews. Additionally, the follow-up interviews after each observation were employed to get a clearer picture from teachers’ perspectives of their implementation of CAPE Communication Studies in their classroom instead of just my interpretation. In this way accuracy of my interpretation could be confirmed. For instance, I observed that all the teachers spent time on teaching to the test and practicing examination related activities during classroom observations. They used past CAPE Communication Studies examination papers to train students on tasks for the examination. My interpretation was that the examination had a major influence on classroom activities. The teachers did agree that it was a factor but indicated that there were several other interrelated factors also mentioned in the main semi-structured interviews, such as a lack of resources, ineffective professional development and training, and time-constraints and others that also influenced classroom practice (see section 4.4).

As noted previously, “dependability” is used instead of reliability in qualitative research (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Reliability has to do with whether findings can be reproduced (Merriam, 2009) as well as whether a data collection instrument works consistently to provide similar results on several occasions. However, in qualitative research what is important is whether “findings of a study are consistent with the data presented,” which means that it is dependable (Merriam, 2009, p. 222). In order to address dependability, the researcher employed an audit trail. A detailed account of the entire process of the research was provided which consisted of original transcripts, research questions, data collection methods and analysis procedures, member-checking comments and decisions made along the journey (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016; Yin, 2014). Readers can then “authenticate the findings of the study by following the trail of the researcher” (Merriam, 2009, p. 222). I drew on Merriam and
Tisdell’s (2016, p. 223) advice, as such, I kept a reflective journal (see Appendix 4) where I wrote my thoughts, challenges, encounters, questions and issues in relation to data collection “to construct this trail.”

In contrast with external validity or generalizability, qualitative researchers use transferability. The generalizability of research results to an entire population is significant in quantitative research. In qualitative studies “transferability” is more important where the onus is based on the individual scrutinizing the study to determine if the findings are pertinent to “his or her particular situation” (Merriam, 2009, p. 226). In order to allow readers to determine whether findings relate to their situations, the researcher employed “rich, thick description” (Geertz, 1973) of the findings of the study, participants and the setting, which involves as Merriam (2009) suggests, genuine evidence in the form of detailed verbatim quotes in the research report. Others can read the detailed description and “assess the similarity” that exists (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 125).

Confirmability, as the qualitative parallel to objectivity, emphasizes the significance of findings that are reflective of participants’ experiences and ideas rather than the researcher’s preferences (Shenton, 2004). As such, the researcher’s predispositions were revealed (Miles and Huberman, 2010) and the rationale for preferring one approach against others was explained and limitations in strategies employed admitted (Shenton, 2004).

3.5 Sampling

3.5.1 Education district and schools

The ideal research site, Marshall and Rossman (2016, p. 106-107) contend is where:

Entry is possible…there is a high probability that a rich mix of the processes, people, programs, interactions and structures of interest are present…[and] the researcher is likely to be able to build trusting relations with the participants in the study.
They further argue that while a site maybe “perfect for its representativeness and interest and for providing a range of examples of the phenomena understudy” if entry is refused to the site and “activities within it, the study cannot succeed” (Marshall and Rossman, 2016, p. 107).

Bearing this in mind, I decided to conduct my research in the Caroni Educational District since gaining access would be easier as I had worked there as an English Language teacher and established collegial relationships with several school supervisors, Heads of Departments and teachers. Moreover, one educational district would be easier to manage and would allow for in-depth analysis. In fact, Bogdan and Biklen (2016, p. 65) warn that fieldwork should be done on one site at a time since “doing more than one site at a time can get confusing”. Moreover, the geographic location of Caroni education district is convenient as it was important that the distance that I have to travel from my workplace to the location of the schools be reasonable in an effort to also allow classroom observations.

Notably, another reason that the Caroni educational district was chosen out of the other seven districts in Trinidad and Tobago is that it is strongly representative of the whole education system in Trinidad. It includes the two types of public secondary schools namely government and government assisted as discussed in section 1.2.1. Diversity in terms of school types will illuminate various positions about curriculum implementation (Creswell, 1998). Furthermore, two different types of secondary schools within the educational district are important since teachers’ implementation of CAPE Communication Studies may be influenced by local contextual factors, which maybe facilitators or barriers depending on the schools’ characteristics. For instance, different schools may exhibit differences in relation to leadership style by principals, school culture and availability of resources which can influence teachers’
implementation. Significantly, the various secondary school types will have their own culture, history of change efforts and idiosyncrasies, which could influence implementation. The district also reflects the diversity inherent in our multicultural society, since students that attend the schools in the district are from different socio-economic status, religions and ethnicities. Moreover, there are teachers with varying levels of experience implementing CAPE Communication Studies and schools that were involved in the piloting of CAPE Communication Studies in 2003-2004.

There are sixteen (16) public secondary schools in the Caroni educational district and eleven (11) of those are seven (7) year public secondary schools, which means that there is a sixth form level where the various CAPE subjects, including Communication Studies is implemented. A summary of the school characteristics showing school types, schools by gender and the number of teachers currently implementing CAPE Communication Studies for at least one year is presented in Table 2 below.
Table 2: Summary of sample of schools by school characteristics as of April 2015 – April 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Schools by Gender</th>
<th>Number of Teachers currently implementing CAPE Communication Studies for at least 1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santo High School</td>
<td>Government (G)</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carapi Secondary School</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville High School</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton High School</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coral High School</td>
<td>Government – Assisted GA)</td>
<td>Single Sex (Girls)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Park High School</td>
<td>Government - Assisted</td>
<td>Single Sex (Girls)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarry High School</td>
<td>Government - Assisted</td>
<td>Single Sex (Girls)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s High School</td>
<td>Government - Assisted</td>
<td>Single Sex (Boys)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View High School</td>
<td>Government - Assisted</td>
<td>Single Sex (Boys)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills Bay High School</td>
<td>Government - Assisted</td>
<td>Single Sex (Boys)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews High School</td>
<td>Government - Assisted</td>
<td>Co-educational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.2 Participants

“Probability and non-probability sampling” are the two basic types of sampling (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016, p. 96). Probability sampling means that the researcher can “generalize [findings] of the study from the sample to the population from which it was drawn” (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016, p. 96), which is not the objective of this qualitative research. In fact, purposeful (Patton, 2015) sampling which is the most familiar type of non-probability sampling is “the method of choice for most qualitative research” (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016, p. 96). Glesne (1999, p. 99) provides a reason for this:

Qualitative researchers neither work usually with populations large enough to make random sampling meaningful nor is their purpose that of producing generalizations.

In this study I employed a purposeful or purposive sampling strategy (Patton, 2015) to select participants, since I wanted to “discover, understand and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (Merriam, 2009, p. 77) in relation to the research questions. Patton (2015) provides further justification for the selection of purposeful sampling in this study:

The logic and power of qualitative purposeful sampling derives from the emphasis on in-depth understanding of specific cases: *information-rich cases*. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research, thus the term *purposeful sampling* (Patton, 2015, p. 53 emphasis in original)

In this vein, it is critical to select a sample that provides rich information on teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. This will “build in variety and create opportunities for intensive study” (Stake, 2006, p. 24). Therefore, teachers must be implementing the CAPE Communication Studies so that they will be in a better position to discuss issues involved
in the implementation process of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and the factors that influence their implementation of it.

The study chose participants based on a selection criterion reflecting a “list of attributes essential” to allow me “to find or locate a unit matching the list” (LeCompte, Preissle and Tesch, 1993, p. 70). The following selection criteria was used to select participants besides their willingness to participate in the research study:

- Currently implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in classrooms.
- Implementing the CAPE Communication Studies for at least one year.

I felt that teachers experience of implementing CAPE Communication Studies even for one year would provide a deep story of how it was being implemented and the barriers and factors that facilitate its implementation. Based on the above criteria a total of twenty-three teachers were selected for interviews from eleven secondary schools in one educational district. However, three teachers did not agree due to personal reasons. Moreover, another teacher was concerned and overly preoccupied with the issue of anonymity and whether it can truly be guaranteed. Although she was happy to conduct the interview with me, I believe that she was a bit distressed after cogitating on whether complete anonymity would be given. As such, I decided not to use her interview transcript in the study as I did not want to cause her emotional or other harm (British Educational Research Association (BERA), 2011). Participants profile highlighting gender, years of teaching experience, years of teaching CAPE Communication Studies, school type, teacher status and qualifications can be seen in Table 3 below.
Table 3: Profile of interviewed teachers as of April 2015 – April 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (T)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience in CAPE Communication Studies</th>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Teacher Status</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Government Assisted (GA)</td>
<td>Head of Department (HOD)/ Teacher 111</td>
<td>BA Literatures in English; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111 and Acting Dean</td>
<td>BA English with History; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>BA Language and Literature with Education; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Government (G)</td>
<td>Teacher 111/ AG Head of Department</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English; Postgraduate Diploma in Education; MPhil. in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English with Gender Studies; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English with Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English with History; Postgraduate Diploma in Education; M. A literatures in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A. Language, Literature and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A. Language, Literature and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A. Language, Literature with Social; Sciences; certificate in Mass Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A. French/Spanish; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>B.A. Spanish with Human Resource management; M. A Mass Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English and Communication; MA in Communication Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>BEd in Education, Language and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>BA English and History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Temporary Teacher</td>
<td>BA English and History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111 and Acting Head of Department</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English; Postgraduate Diploma in Education; M. A literatures in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English with Linguistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation is another data collection method used in this study. Given the time demands of the thesis twenty teachers could not be observed. As such, I used maximum variation sampling (Merriam, 2009) which is a type of purposive sampling (Patton, 2002) technique to select
teachers for classroom observations in order to garner deeper insights into how teachers are implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation by looking at it from a wide spectrum. Therefore, maximum variation was used as it results in “important shared patterns that cut across cases and derive their significance from having emerged out of heterogeneity” (Patton, 2002, p. 235). Teachers were thus selected for observations based on a wide range of attributes: gender, years of teaching CAPE Communication Studies, school type, teacher status and qualifications (see Table 4 below). Nine teachers were initially selected but only eight were observed.

Table 4: Profile of observed teachers as of April 2015 – April 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher (T)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience in CAPE Communication Studies</th>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Teacher Status</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Head of Department/ Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English; Postgraduate Diploma in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher 111/ AG Head of Department</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English; Postgraduate Diploma in Education; MPhil. In Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English with Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A Literatures in English with History; Postgraduate Diploma in Education; M.A Literatures in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Teacher 111</td>
<td>B.A. Language, Literature and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>B.A. Language, Literature with Social;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Ethical consideration

Ethics, as a hallmark of research, is a burning issue and continues to be a platform for ongoing deliberations and discussions. Indeed, these discussions have been fuelled by several studies of unethical research, which have led to the formulation of “codes of research ethics” (Silverman, 2010, p. 153).

For Pring (2000) ethics is a “philosophical enquiry into the basis of morals or moral judgements” (p. 141). Similarly, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) perceive ethics as the “principle of right and wrong that a particular group accepts at a particular time” (p. 42). In education research, the issue of ethics must be addressed thoroughly and given due consideration and prominence. This is even more critical since as Cohen et al. (2001) point out ethical challenges can emerge at any stage of a research project. These include the research project, the background of the research, procedures to be employed, data collection methods, participants’ attributes, the type of data collected and how the data should be analysed (Cohen et al., 2001).

Furthermore, the British Educational Research Association (BERA) in its Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2011, p. 4) contends that research in the realm of education needs to be conducted within an ethic of respect for:
Many researchers therefore concur on critical ethical issues that must be addressed in education research. Silverman (2010, p. 153-154) suggests the non-mandatory participation and the right to withdraw, protection of research participants, evaluation of possible benefits and risks to participants, obtaining informed consent and not doing harm. Similarly, Busher (2002) puts forth ethical principles in relation to the pursuit of truth, respect for privacy and dignity of participants, commitment to honesty and avoidance of plagiarism (p. 73). However, Patton (2002, p. 408-409) offers an ethical checklist that researchers must address in qualitative research:

1. Explaining the purpose of the inquiry and methods to be used.
2. Promises and reciprocity.
5. Informed consent.
6. Data access and ownership.
7. Interviewer mental health.
8. Advice (who will be your counsellor on ethic matters).
9. Data collection boundaries.
10. Ethical versus legal conduct

Based on the ethical principles outlined above and taking into cognizance that good ethical practice underscores the need for relevancy of ethical principles in relation to the context of the research (Silverman, 2010, p. 178), several ethical considerations were addressed in this study.
Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee from the University of Leicester. Permission was also sought from the Ministry of Education Ethics Committee of Education in Trinidad and Tobago, given the fact that approval must be obtained from this body prior to any access to schools. Approval also had to be obtained from the principals of the eleven schools in the education district before the research commenced. As such, I sought the assistance of a past colleague and friend to gain access to the schools since she was in the education system and her substantive post was Vice-Principal Secondary, which meant that she had the relevant contact with the principals.

Subsequently, I met with most of the principals face to face at a time convenient to them and gave them a copy of the permission letter that I obtained from the Ministry of Education in Trinidad. Furthermore, I explained the purpose and benefits of the research study and other details of the research to them. I then answered several questions that were asked for clarification purposes. Two of the principals were very comfortable discussing the research issues over the telephone. In one case the principal also asked that I send a letter to the school board delineating the details of the study so that I can gain access to the school since their approval was mandatory. The board approved access and all the principals were very supportive and allowed permission without any hesitation. I believe this occurred without problems because I adhered to the idea and principle put forth by Cohen et al (2007, p. 56) that once clarification of the research issue is done properly prior to meeting gatekeepers, the researcher can then explain their research in an “informed, open and frank manner”, which will allow him or her to be better able to “gain permission, acceptance and support.” The principals were happy to help with the research but stipulated that my fieldwork must be conducted without any form of disruption to the school and based on the teachers’ willingness. I assured the principals that my fieldwork would not interfere with the smooth running of school activities or the teachers’ work-related duties.
I then met with the teachers and they were given a consent form (see Appendix 5) that they signed prior to taking part in the study. This was done to ensure that the research was conducted without deception and free of choice. A letter of information (see Appendix 6) about the research was also given to the teachers that explained the purpose, procedures, and any risks that would be involved in their participation in the research. Moreover, participants were assured of their right to withdraw consent from the study at any time without prejudice since participation is voluntary and not based on coercion. The researcher ensured that throughout the research there wasn’t any harm to the participants. As such, the researcher took heed of the way in which the research was communicated, particularly in the case of sensitive material (Silverman, 2010). Participants were also assured of confidentiality of research data. This was done by making sure that research information was not discussed accidentally, taking extra care in securing records of data to avoid accidental disclosure. Since interviews were audio-taped, participants’ permission was sought.

In terms of anonymity, pseudonyms were used instead of the names of participants, and schools. In spite of this, the issue of anonymity posed perhaps the greatest ethical dilemma or challenge within the realm of this research for me. I had to acknowledge that although I was very careful in protecting participants’ identity, they could still “become visible through the words they use, the way they position themselves, or the way in which they are located” (Bush and James, 2006, p. 7). Therefore, complete anonymity for the teachers seemed improbable as there is still the chance “of unintentionally leaving clues that could be traced back to their identities” (Xu, 2015, p. 59). Contextual details such as the school district and school types were disclosed, as well as my professional affiliation with the educational district and background details of teachers in terms of gender, status, experience and qualifications, which can provide clues into location and the teachers.
I was therefore confronted with conflict of my responsibility towards “maintenance of respect for the individuals whose lives are being lived, focally or peripherally, in the context of one’s research project” (Smith, 1999, p. 192) and uncovering knowledge of a critical issue, the process of curriculum implementation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. I believe as Mitchell (2012, p. 65) does in relation to curriculum policy development in Trinidad and Tobago that “such a scrutiny [is] necessary” as well on teachers’ perspectives of curriculum implementation “in spite of the associated areas of complexity and reduced possibility for anonymity” There is also the argument as Xu (2015, p. 59) puts forth which is also relevant to this study, that I have an “obligation towards my readers and examiners to provide a sufficiently detailed and contextualized account of the research…which unavoidably put aside the ideal of watertight anonymity for my participants.” Therefore, I chose as The British Sociological Association (BSA) (2004, p. 4) recommends not to obscure the details of participants when data are presented since it can influence the integrity of the data:

Potential informants and research participants, especially those possessing a combination of attributes that make them readily identifiable; may need to be reminded that it can be difficult to disguise their identity without introducing an unacceptably large measure of distortion into the data.

In this study, except for one teacher (see previous section 3.5.2), the other teachers were not preoccupied or worried about the issue of anonymity. In fact, based on discussions with the teachers, the impression I got was that they wanted their voices to be heard about the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, which they believe can lead to policy change in relation to the implementation process in Trinidad and Tobago.
3.7 Pilot study

Generally, the pilot study confirmed the feasibility of the study and the findings revealed that the data collection instruments generated the intended data. Moreover, the participants and the gatekeepers felt that the study is invaluable, worthwhile and taking it further will be beneficial. It also proved useful for me in understanding how significant access to participants really is, so much so that I had to “develop a repertoire of strategies to gain access to sites” and draw on all my “interpersonal resources and skills as well as…theoretical understanding of social relationships and organizations” as Rossman and Rallis (2003, p. 148) predicted. Notwithstanding this, the pilot study also illuminated that minor modifications and revisions needed to be made to the interview schedule and observation schedule for the main study.

During the interviews with the three participants the use of probes proved very beneficial in that it allowed them “to expand on a response” when intuited there was more to say (Robson, 2002, p. 276). It deepened the participants “response to a question, increase[d] the richness and depth of responses and [gave] cues to the interviewee about the level of response that is desired” (Patton, 2002, p. 373). This is exemplified in the following interview with one of the participants (Ava-pseudonym):

Interviewee: Yes, we have many challenges, and problems with the implementation of CAPE. These challenges are not being addressed. It is as though we have to shrug them off and implement.

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about the challenges that you refer to?

Interviewee: Well for one thing the time factor is serious. We never have enough time so we pick and choose what to teach as we could never finish everything.

Interviewer: Would you please explain what you mean by “pick and choose” in more detail?

In other words, I tried to use some of the probes suggested by Merriam (2009). These included, “What do you mean? Tell me more about that?
Give me an example of that? Walk me through the experience. Would you explain that?” (Merriam, 2009, p. 101).

However, probing was not always possible with each of the participants and with all the issues that were elicited. A case in point is with the first interviewee (Sandra- pseudonym) where I missed a few chances for deeper probing, which is illuminated in the following interview extract:

Interviewee: You cannot get away from our examination system. It is there throughout, from primary to secondary to university. Exams right through. Importance is placed here so it cannot help but impact on my teaching. There are so many examples where I had to just teach to the test. (Sandra)

Interviewer: Finally, are there any other factors that you would like to suggest?

Due to time limitations, I did not probe further as the stipulated time for the interview was forty-five minutes. In the example, it was basically the end of the interview, and I could not continue as the participant had a class and the principal had expressed deprecation of going beyond the time because students would be left unattended. However, this was the first interview and my skills in terms of timing and probing were enhanced with the other two interviews that followed. Based on challenges with time in the pilot study therefore, I had to be more cognizant of the importance of time in my main study while conducting interviews since as Patton (2002, p. 375) asserts, “[t]ime is precious in an interview” and “digressions reduce the amount of time available to focus on critical questions.”

Furthermore, what was most conspicuous from the pilot study is that there is dire need to use a plethora of probes as different interviews and situations demand different probes. Furthermore, “it is virtually impossible to specify” what probes to use “ahead of time because they are dependent on how participants answer the ... questions” (Merriam, 2009,
p. 100). For instance, at times the interviews required more non-verbal probes and at other times clarification probes. As a corollary of this, several types of probes were employed in the main study following Patton’s (2002, p. 372-374) suggestions:

- Non-verbal probes such as gentle head nodding as positive reinforcement. This is aimed at communicating that you are listening and want to go on listening. It also indicates silence at the end of a response which means that the researcher wants the participant to continue.

- Elaboration probes with direct verbal forms such as “could you say more about that?”, “would you elaborate on that?”, “that’s helpful”, I’d appreciate a bit more detail”, “I’m beginning to get the picture.”

- Clarification probes are useful in the event that something has been said that is ambiguous or an apparent non sequitur. It indicates to the interviewee that you need more information, a restatement of the answer, or more context.

The pilot interviews also revealed that a minor modification needed to be made to one item in the interview schedule for the main study. For example, the question “Do you include all the skills recommended in the syllabus in your teaching and learning activities?” was revised to, “To what extent do you include all the skills of the syllabus in your teaching and learning activities?” creating a more open question instead of a closed question. In the pilot study this question elicited a very limited answer from one of the participants, which was a “yes” or “no” response. However, by using a follow up probe the participant was able to provide more relevant details. Generally, the main interview questions were effective in generating responses appropriate for answering the main research questions of the study.

Another modification that was made to the main study based on my experience of conducting the pilot study is the inclusion of a reflective journal. Although this was not included in my data collection
techniques for the pilot study, I realized how significant it was at times to “jot” my thoughts on paper, which I endeavoured to do while conducting the pilot. As such, I believe a reflective journal will be germane to establishing my voice and engaging in deeper examination of “what I know and how I know it” (Patton, 2002, p. 64). It will provide the impetus for me to pursue further lines of inquiry and question myself on how I am progressing and functioning in terms of data collection and data analysis. It can also unleash fresh insights and epiphany moments or “ah ha” moments for me. Keeping a reflective journal can allow you to question the insights and responses during the research journey (Guba and Lincoln, 1989).

The pilot observation also revealed that it was pivotal to include a follow-up interview after the pilot observations of each of the three teachers, in order to clarify issues that emerge during classroom observations. Due to time constraints of the school and teachers, as well as the fact that I had to transcribe and analyse, re-examine and reflect on the data, a follow-up interview after each observation was not be feasible in the main study. Some of the questions and issues that the observational data generated in the pilot study that needed further clarification were related to their teaching practice that was traditional and teacher-directed. I also needed to ascertain why they were teaching to the test and using the CAPE examination paper for teaching and learning in each of the classroom observation sessions. In other words, what were the factors that contributed to this? For the main study therefore follow-up interviews (see Appendix 7) were included as Orafi (2008, p. 72) elucidates the value of it, “when used after classroom observations” it can help, “in understanding the perspectives of the teachers being observed instead of relying on [ones] own inferences.” Moreover, follow-up interview questions were based on what occurred in the classroom observations or generated from observation data. Additionally, there were standard questions that were asked of the participants:
Can you tell me the reasons that you chose these activities?

What are the factors that influence how you implement the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

From the findings of the pilot study, it is also evident that minor revisions had to be made to the conceptual framework (see section 2.7) of the main study. Two additional external-contextual factors were therefore included as the data generated revealed that they are indispensable factors that influence teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context, namely:

- Approaches to curriculum innovation
- Examination-oriented system

3.8 Data Collection

In order to provide an in-depth analysis of teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, data were collected in concert with qualitative research methods. Indeed, a distinctive feature of qualitative case study research is the use of multiple data sources, which Patton (1990) notes can enhance data credibility (see section 3.4.2). Semi-structured interviews were the primary source of data collection. However, observations, field notes, follow-up interviews and documents were also employed to corroborate information generated from interviews. All the methods used in this study are qualitative so discussion of the processes of data analysis was placed after them.
3.8.1 Interviews

Interviews as the predominant method of “data collection should be [selected] based on the kind of information needed and whether interviewing is indeed the best way to get it” (Merriam, 2009, p. 88). The main purpose of this study is to understand what is “in and on someone else’s mind” (Patton, 1990, p. 278), in this case teachers’ mind about the curriculum implementation process. As such, the interview was chosen since the purpose of interviewing “is to allow…[entry] into the other person’s perspective” (Patton, 1990, p. 196). Interview then is “the main road to multiple realities” (Stake, 1995, p. 64).

Interviews can be structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016). In the highly structured interview, wording and order of questions are predetermined, which may hinder access to participant’s perceptions of the world (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016, p. 109). In contrast, unstructured interviews do not include pre-determined questions. Instead, there are open-ended questions that are exploratory in nature. However, while insights may be gleaned in this approach, the interviewer must be skilled to deal with the flexibility and various viewpoints demanded (Merriam, 2009). On the other hand, semi-structured interviews include “questions [that] are more flexibly worded” (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016, p. 110). It is also guided by issues to be examined and there is no predetermined order of the questions or “exact wording” before time (Merriam and Tisdell, 2016, p. 110). To best examine teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, semi-structured interviews were employed. An interview guide (see Appendix 8) was used, which had “a mix of more or less structured questions” which allowed teachers the leeway to put forth their views freely (Merriam, 2009, p. 90). It also enabled the researcher the privilege to diverge beyond teachers’ answers to the devised questions (Berg, 1989). Moreover, the semi-structured interview facilitated data collection on unexpected
dimensions of the phenomenon of teachers’ perspectives of curriculum implementation (Bogdan and Biklen, 2016). For example, the semi-structured interviews revealed that several barriers influence the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation such as the extra-lessons and societal culture that were not anticipated. Table 5 shows how the interview questions are linked to the main research questions of the study.

**Table 5: Main research questions linked to interview questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What perspectives do teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? | • Can you tell me your views about the new CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?  
• To what extent do you think that Caribbean cultural content and resources should be included in the syllabus?  
• Can you tell me your views about the inclusion of the three modules in the syllabus?  
• What are your views about the teaching approaches and classroom activities proposed by CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? Do you find them helpful?  
• What are your views about traditional and internal forms of assessment?  
• Can you tell me your views about the role of the teacher in the classroom as suggested by the syllabus? |
| 2. How are teachers implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? | • How do you conduct your classroom teaching to achieve the objectives of the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus?  
• How do you organize your classroom activities that allow students to work in group and pairs?  
• To what extent do you use multimedia in the teaching and learning process?  
• Can you tell me to what extent you use the five modes of communication in the teaching activity?  
• Can you tell me to what extent are you engaged in team teaching as suggested in the syllabus? |
Semi-structured interviews are criticized as being time consuming; however, they unearthed rich thick data that questionnaires cannot provide. This is because it is not merely a data collection exercise.
but a social and interpersonal encounter (Merriam, 2009) that built an in-depth picture of teachers’ perspectives of the implementation process of CAPE Communication Studies. Further justification for selecting semi-structured interviews was that I was able to probe responses (Bell, 1999, p.135) and it provided entry “to participants’ ideas, thoughts and memories in their own words rather than in the words of the researcher” (Reinharz, 1992, p.19).

Semi-structured interviews were scheduled based on teachers’ availability. Therefore, teachers had the choice of where they wanted to be interviewed. Most of them preferred to be interviewed at their respective schools during their free periods or luncheon interval or immediately after school dismissed. Furthermore, I gave them the opportunity to choose the venue in school so that they would feel a sense of freedom to “explain potentially sensitive parts of their lives without fear of repercussions their words might have” (Oliver, Serovich and Mason, 2005, p. 1280). Venues selected included school libraries, school conference rooms, teacher lounge rooms and the offices of Vice-Principals. Prior to the interviews, participants were reassured of anonymity and confidentiality and the main aim and procedures of the study were reiterated. Moreover, they were reminded that the session would be audio-taped. Interviews were approximately forty-five- to sixty minutes and audio-taped with the consent of the participants.

As a researcher conducting qualitative research, I used the strategies suggested by Stake (2005), Merriam (2009), as a guide during the interview process which allowed rich insights to be unfurled in relation to the views teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, how they were implementing it in their classrooms and their perspectives about the barriers and facilitators to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies. I concur with Stake (2005, p. 459) that “[q]ualitative researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world”. As such, I was “respectful, non-judgmental and non-
threatening” (Merriam, 2009, p. 107) while conducting interviews with teachers. Moreover, listening carefully to participants allowed me to be alert to the nuances and valuable cues that surfaced in the interviews. I realized that it is by actively listening to different points of view that value resonant social context can be fully, equitably and honourably represented (Guba, 1990) and the merit of Guba’s claim (1990) that the good qualitative researcher looks and listens everywhere. I also did not see myself as “a cold slab granite-unresponsive to the human issues” (Patton, 2002 p. 405). I believe these skills allowed me to establish positive rapport; trust and cooperation with the teachers which made them feel at ease and eager to share their perspectives about the implementation process in the Trinidad and Tobago context.

Verbatim data was transcribed immediately after interviews in order to clarify data early and hence facilitate analysis. I transcribed the first few transcripts to get acquainted with it (Merriam, 2009) but it was a time-consuming process. As such, I asked a colleague to transcribe the rest of the interviews for me so that I could have more time to analyse my data (Merriam, 2009). Even though this was done, I still went through each transcript while listening to the audiotape recording to ensure that there were no mistakes (Merriam, 2009).

3.8.2 Observation

Observation is criticized as being subject to observer bias (Cohen and Manion, 1994), since the observer comes with his or her own beliefs and predispositions. However, to address this issue the researcher examined contradictory results for explanation and gave participants the opportunity to comment on accuracy of notes and interpretation after observations. Hence, as stated in an earlier section (see section 3.7) follow-up interviews were used after each observation in order to elucidate ambiguous issues that emerged and hence verify the precision of the researcher’s interpretation. Despite this criticism, observation gives the researcher with the avenue to collect data ‘in situ’ rather than
vicariously (Patton, 1990). It also allows the researcher to unearth those aspects that could be unconsciously missed and find issues that participants may intimidated to talk about in interviews (Cohen et al., 2000). Moreover, classroom observation is pertinent “to see whether what teachers say they do is reflected in their behavior” (Alderson and Wall, 1993, p. 127).

In this study observations were used to corroborate and verify data garnered from interviews in relation to the second research question:

How are teachers implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

In other words, teachers self-reports about how they implement the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum in the classroom were compared with actual classroom observations of their implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum, to see if there are any discrepancies since people do not always do what they say (Foster, 1996). Therefore, observation data were used as a form of triangulation with interview data to unearth teachers’ classroom practices and provide deeper insights into how teachers were implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies innovation in their classrooms. Moreover, observation data of teachers’ classroom practices and activities were compared with the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus to ascertain if teachers’ classroom practices and activities in terms of their implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum are congruent with the intended principles of the syllabus.

Structured observation was not suitable to this study since “it is inflexible and does not allow the observer to change the focus or record aspects of classroom practice that do not correspond to the pre-determined categories” (O’Leary, 2014, p. 50). Moreover, it is “too oblique a tool to understand the intentions and motivations of the participant” (Yancy, 2013, p. .96) especially in relation to the dynamic process of curriculum implementation. Therefore, observations in this study were mainly open-
ended or unstructured since there is flexibility in how information can be recorded and collected (Robson, 2002) and it allow for in-depth description of the issue that is being investigated (Cohen et al., 2000). An observation guide (see Appendix 9) was used as a guide to understand teachers’ implementation of the intended CAPE Communication Studies syllabus. Therefore, teachers’ classroom activities, selection of teaching materials and curriculum content and how they were implementing them were the focus of the observations. Although an observation guide was used for classroom observations, it was open to other areas of teachers’ practices and activities that naturally unfolded or emerged, which were also recorded. Classroom observations were audio-recorded instead of video-recorded as it is less intrusive (Corrie, 2002). Teachers also indicated from the outset that it was their preferred choice since it would make them feel more comfortable. The researcher’s role was that of an observer-as participant where “[t]he researcher’s observer activities are known to the group; participation in the group is …secondary to the role of information gatherer” (Merriam, 2009, p. 124). Teachers’ classroom lessons were observed from the back of the class to prevent disturbances. The researcher also took field notes as an aid to audio-taped data. Field notes are “the written account of what the researcher hears sees, experiences, and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in qualitative study” (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p. 108). As such the field notes included:

- Verbal description of the setting, the people, the activities
- Direct quotations in at least the substance of what people said
- Observer’s comments (Merriam, 2009, p. 131)

It also entailed the length of the classroom observation session, class size, date of the observation and drawings of the physical classroom layout.

Prior to classroom observations, I reminded the teachers that observations would be audio-taped along with my written field-notes and
explained again to them the purpose of the research. I emphasized clearly to the teachers that the aim of the observation was not to evaluate or assess them in any way. This was done to put the teachers at ease with my presence in the classroom.

Classroom observations were conducted with eight teachers based on a date and time that they suggested to make them comfortable. As such, observations were held at different periods during the school term: April to May 2015 and February to April 2016. Observations were not held during the September to December 2015 school term as teachers stated that during this period most schools accept their new cohort of form six students. As such, they have to cover a lot of work from all three modules in order to prepare students for the internal assessment (IA) which is twenty (20) percent of their final marks. The IA involves continuous marking and remarking of several drafts of students’ work. In some schools the IA is also assessed in the September to December school term.

Each observation session was approximately eighty to ninety minutes long. Moreover, each of the eight teachers was supposed to be observed twice, however only two teachers were observed twice and six teachers were observed once. The teachers explained to me that the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation is very demanding, expansive, time-consuming and involves a high-stake examination. They indicated that they had a heavy timetable and workload. The teachers were also very busy with several other duties and responsibilities at the school while still implementing Communication Studies. Some of the teachers were even implementing more than one curriculum innovation simultaneously at different levels, and were involved in extra-curricular activities, which took up a lot of their time.

As stated previously, initially nine teachers (see section 3.5.2) were selected and consented to participate in classroom observations but
eight teachers were observed. One of the teachers agreed and gave his consent to be observed. However, he seemed preoccupied with whether the observation was an assessment or evaluation of him. I then explained again in detail the purpose of my study and reassured him that it was not to assess him. Despite this, I felt that the teacher still seemed nervous and worried as he continued to inquire if his lessons would be marked against a rubric. Considering this I decided not to observe this teacher although he had consented because I felt it would put him under duress and I did not want to violate his rights. I drew on the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2011, p. 5) ethical guidelines, which provided valuable insight during this phase of my study and allowed me to make a knowledgeable and ethical decision:

The Association takes voluntary informed consent to be the condition in which participants understand and agree to their participation without any duress, prior to the research getting underway (BERA, 2011, p. 5).

Based on my experience of teachers’ classroom observations, I felt that they did not behave differently with my presence in the classroom or that the observations caused the teachers any apprehension or discomfort. This could be attributed to the fact that the teachers choose when, and where the observations would be held and because the purpose of the study and ethical considerations were explained to them thoroughly. The teachers’ feelings are espoused by T1 (follow-up interview) that “during classroom observations I taught as I would normally do, natural without an uncomfortable and uneasy feeling” (T1/I/9/03/2016). I therefore concur with Mulhall (2003, p. 308) that, “[o]nce the initial stages of entering the field are past most professionals are too busy to maintain behavior that is radically different from normal.”

I felt that the classroom observation with the teachers especially since they were 80-90- minutes, provided an in-depth picture of how teachers were implementing the CAPE Communication Studies
innovation. In fact, observation data confirmed what teachers revealed in the interviews.

3.8.3 Documents

Documents are “an unobtrusive method…rich in portraying the values and beliefs of participants” (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 85) and “the presence of the investigator does not alter what is being studied” (Merriam, 2009, p. 155). Moreover, documents are “concerned with the explanation of the status of some phenomenon at a particular time of its development over a period of time” and “serves a useful purpose in adding knowledge to fields of inquiring and in explaining certain social event” (Best and Kahn, 1993, p. 90). The CAPE Communication Studies syllabus document was used as a form of data collection in this study since it contains insights that are pertinent to the second research question (Merriam, 2009):

How are teachers implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

It is significant in understanding whether teachers’ classroom practices and activities are congruent with the principles suggested in the syllabus. I also took Ozga’s (2000, p. 95) advice and included other pertinent documents since they also “can be read as significant within the discursive parameters of an investigation” These documents included, CAPE Communication Studies past examination papers, teachers’ model answers and teachers’ selection of materials from textbooks used in implementing Communication Studies during classroom observations. They also provided important information about teachers’ implementation practices in relation to CAPE Communication Studies in the classroom. All the documents above therefore served to corroborate evidence gathered from observations and interviews. Table 6 presents the examples of document sources that were collected for this study.
Table 6: Examples of Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Nature of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>CAPE Communication Studies syllabus (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model answers</td>
<td>Teacher’s model answers used in implementing the CAPE Communication Studies Innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination papers</td>
<td>CAPE Communication Studies Past Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials from textbooks</td>
<td>Reading material from textbooks that teachers used in their implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.9 Data Analysis

Qualitative “data analysis is a process of making sense out of data” collected to get the solutions to the research questions, by “consolidating, reducing and interpreting” the data (Merriam, 2009, p. 175-176). It is an ongoing and iterative process (Miles and Huberman, 2014) which involves taking the data apart and then reconstructing it to ascertain what is to be learned and what patterns might reside within the data (Creswell, 2013). I drew on Miles and Huberman’s (1994) interactive model (see Figure 6 below) with the “three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification” (p. 10) in analysing my data.
Data analysis occurred simultaneously with data collection since data analysed in this manner are “parsimonious and illuminating” (Merriam, 2009, p. 171). Audio-tape recordings of semi-structured interviews, observations and follow-up interviews were transcribed verbatim. The transcribed data was again checked against the audio-tape recordings to ensure that it faithfully represent participants’ voices in their exact words. Tentative and initial understandings about the data were checked with participants to determine whether they are plausible. Participants also verified whether transcripts were a truthful reflection of their perspectives and provided confirmation of statements that they may not want to be included.

3.9.1 Coding of Interview Data

Data reduction is the process of “selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming the data that appears in written-up field notes or transcriptions” (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 10). This
is significant since it sorts data so that “conclusions can be drawn” (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 11). Data analysis therefore began with the manual coding of data directly on the interview transcripts.

As an initial step in the analysis, interview transcripts were repeatedly read through to get a sense of the whole (Creswell, 2013), and to “force the researcher to become familiar with those data in intimate ways” (Marshall and Rossman, 1994, p. 113). The interview transcripts (Appendix 10) were then examined line by line. This facilitated deeper meanings about teachers’ perspectives about the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. I searched for responses that were linked to the view teachers hold about the new curriculum, how they were implementing it and factors that impeded and facilitated their implementation of it. I then engaged in assigning codes to segments of transcripts, considering the research questions and ensuring that the codes fit. Codes then are:

Labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study. Codes usually are attached to chunks of varying size words, phrases, sentences or whole paragraphs, connected or unconnected to a specific setting (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 56).

As many codes as possible were put on the right margin to segments of data deemed useful (see Table 7 below). Two types of codes were created for the teacher’s interview transcripts. In vivo codes, which entailed key phrases or words in the actual language of the participants (Creswell, 2013), were mainly used. In vivo coding was used since this study gave credence to teachers’ voices. In other words, it allowed me to “ground the analysis from their perspectives” (Saldaña, 2013, p. 7). Implicit codes (Mullen and Reynolds, 1978) which were composed by the researcher were also used since they represented the essence of meaning and concepts derived from the interview data.
Table 7: Sample- Creation of Codes from an extract of T9
(16/04/2015) interview transcript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155 I: You mentioned some barriers in relation to the innovation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156 Can you elaborate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 T: Yes. But before that I want to say that we have a centralized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system, a bureaucratic way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158 the MOE operate that has posed challenges to the implementation</td>
<td>Centralized,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process. Communication</td>
<td>bureaucratic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159 Studies was introduced to us in a top-down manner. Dissemination</td>
<td>Top-down approach-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was top-down. Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 selected few teachers were involved in its development. And while it</td>
<td>Few teachers in development-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has good aspects, I feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 teachers needed a bigger say that would have made us own it. Take</td>
<td>Lack of teacher-ownership- barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for instance, I and other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162 teachers would have told them the time to do all it requires is too</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short, impossible with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 the time 150 hours, in Trinidad you will not get that. Preparing for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the internal assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164 picks up so much time alone. And other areas like the creole of</td>
<td>Time constraints-curriculum demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other islands are too much.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 Also CXC made several revisions to Communication Studies but we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were not involved. They</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 changed the IA reflective now to one piece from two pieces. And the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis part from doing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 dialect variation, register, attitudes to language, communicative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behaviour to any two. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168 recent change is the Multiple-Choice inclusion. All we know is that</td>
<td>Lack of teacher involvement in CXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we got a correspondence</td>
<td>revisions-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 in the form of a memo informing us. No consultation, nothing, I didn’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like it. I prefer the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170 structured paper than the Multiple Choice. No workshops, nothing. In</td>
<td>No teacher consultations-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact, I really went to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 one workshop or two in the earlies. Am, it was not ongoing and more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one shot and just giving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172 information. Not helpful, more rushed, for these new changes even,</td>
<td>One-shot ineffective workshops- barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none. It doesn’t help me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173 in my teaching. It didn’t address my needs or challenges. Those new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers are really in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174 trouble. I have friends that started two and three years ago and they</td>
<td>Challenges with no teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have real challenges and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 never underwent training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My next step involved going through all the interview transcripts to search for common links. Codes were compared and those that shared common characteristics were grouped to form categories or themes. In other words, I looked for similarities and regularities-patterns— in the coded data to put them in categories. The constant comparative method allowed me to saturate the categories. Categories are thus “buckets or baskets into which segments of text are placed” (Marshall and Rossman, 2006, p. 159). As an illustration of this process, the codes that emerged from Table 7 such as “centralized, bureaucratic system pose challenges”, “top-down approach,” “few teachers in development,” “lack of teacher-ownership” and “no teacher consultations,” were put in the category of “approaches to curriculum innovation” (see Table 8 below). This was a barrier to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies.

Table 8: Sample Category from an extract of T9 (16/04/2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❖ Approaches to curriculum innovation</td>
<td>• Centralized, bureaucratic system pose challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Top-down approach-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Few teachers in development-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of teacher-ownership-barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No teacher consultations-barrier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any inconsistencies, anomalies and contradictions were noted and presented since qualitative research does not seek to remove variabilities but to comprehend their existence (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003). The contents of each category were further refined (Rubin and Rubin, 1995). I then proceeded to compare each category with other categories.

From this process several themes and sub-themes emerged. For example, some sub-themes deduced from the research question,
“What are teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation” were: large class size, school culture and unsupportive principal, time demands and expansive syllabus. All these sub-themes showed teachers’ perspectives of school-related barriers to their implementation. As such, I put these under a common theme “School-Contextual factors.” Another theme based on the same research question is “External-Contextual factor” with sub-themes: examination-oriented system, approaches to curriculum innovation, insufficient resources and funding, ineffective professional development and training, extra lessons and societal culture. Another emergent theme also in relation to the research question is “Innovation-Related factor” with the sub-category, clarity.

Themes and sub-themes of each of the four research questions were then linked to chunks of texts and organized in the form of a table and displayed (see Appendix 1). This allowed justified conclusion drawing (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Interpretation of themes and logical conclusions were drawn and verified (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Verification involved, “a fleeting second thought crossing the analyst’s mind during writing with a short excursion back to field notes” (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 11). I then considered how the themes related to the conceptual framework and literature review.

Significantly, based on this process, I had to extend my literature review, as well as, add other areas to my conceptual framework. For example, the interview data revealed that I had to modify the initial three main dimensions: Teacher-related factors, Innovation-related factors and Contextual factors that influence implementation. Contextual factors were broken into school-related and external-related factors. Moreover, approaches to curriculum innovation and extra-lessons emerged solely based on the data from the transcripts and put under the new dimension, “External-contextual factors.” Another unexpected factor that emerged strongly with some teachers was “societal culture” and this was included
under “External-contextual factors” in the conceptual framework. I concur with Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006), that the themes of the study are concealed waiting to be uncovered. Therefore “[e]ach theme represents a kernel of knowledge waiting to be revealed (Mitchell, 2012, p. 77).

Additionally, the researcher elicited the help of a colleague to review the findings and conclusion. Interpretations and findings were also discussed in relation to the existing literature and conceptual framework for the study, illuminating comparisons and contrasts. Findings were written in a rich, thick narrative format with direct quotations so that the participants’ voices are indeed presented.

3.9.2 Coding of Observation data

Data generated from the audio-taped classroom observations (see Appendix 12) and observation field notes (see Appendix 13) were analysed in a similar manner as the interview data. Observation data were used for answering research question two, which triangulated with data from the main interviews and the follow-up interviews. The audio-taped observations for each teacher were transcribed verbatim. Both field notes and observation transcripts were read closely several times to get a general impression about the data.

Bearing in mind research question two, which focuses on how teachers are implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, I then engaged in open coding (Corbin and Strauss, 2007) where I constructed codes in the participants’ own language (Stern, 1980) on the right margin to segments of data deemed useful. I also created my own codes based on the data. As I coded the data, I took heed of Averbauch and Silverstein’s (2003 cited in Saldaña, 2009, p. 18) advice, to keep a copy of my research concern, goals of the study, and research questions on one page in front of me, so as to keep me focused since the page focuses my coding decisions. After coding the data, I proceeded to
form categories and themes which involved comparing the data and searching for similarities and differences. In order to elicit deeper meaning from the observation data, I had to engage in an iterative process of constantly moving back and forth from transcripts and field notes to codes and then categories and themes. Categories were then compared with other categories again. Hence, the main themes that emerged from the observation data are: Teaching approaches and techniques; Selection of content and modes of communication and Teaching materials and resources. Themes were then linked to the existing literature and used to draw insights in relation to the research question.

3.10 Summary

In conclusion, this chapter has provided the research design, and methods adopted for this study in an effort to address the research inquiry. The researcher chose the interpretive paradigm using the qualitative approach. Based on this approach I selected semi-structured interviews as the main source of data collection. Classroom observations, follow-up interviews, field notes and documents were also used. This chapter also reported the data analysis process as well as how ethical issues and trustworthiness were addressed.

The next chapter provides a detailed report on the findings that emerged from the data.
Chapter 4: Presentation of findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents findings of the study based on data collected from semi-structured interviews, documents, classroom observations, which included audio-taped observation transcripts and field notes, and follow-up interviews. The findings of this study are based on teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. In this study, I sought to validate their voices as being critical to understanding the implementation of Communication Studies in the Trinidad and Tobago context. Significantly, since as Richards (2003, p. 283) argues that “our claims will be judged on the extent to which we are able to support them with adequate evidence that is fairly representative of our data set,” the findings that emerged from the data will be presented in a rich, thick narrative format using participants’ verbatim responses. In this way, readers can assess whether my interpretation and conclusions are accurate, fair and represent the participants’ true voices.

The major themes and sub-themes (see figure 7) that emanated from the data are presented under the following four sections in this chapter:

- Views teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

- Implementation Gaps: Teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in their classrooms.

- Perceived barriers to the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.
• Perceived factors that facilitate the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

Figure 7: An overview of the themes and subthemes of the study under the four sections

4.2: Views teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation
   4.2.1: Caribbean identity and cultural content and resources
   4.2.2: Internal and traditional assessment
   4.2.3: Teaching strategies and classroom activities

4.3: Implementation gaps: CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation
   4.3.1: Teaching approaches and techniques
   4.3.2: Selection of content and modes of communication
   4.3.3: Teaching materials and resources

4.4: Perceived barriers to teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation
   4.4.1: External-contextual factors
      4.4.1.1: Examination-oriented system
      4.4.1.2: Approaches to curriculum innovation
      4.4.1.3: Insufficient government funding and resources
      4.4.1.4: Ineffective professional development and training
      4.4.1.5: Extra-lessons
      4.4.1.6: Societal culture
   4.4.2: School-contextual factors
      4.4.2.1: School culture and lack of principal support
      4.4.2.2: Class size and time and syllabus demand
   4.4.3: Innovation-related factor
      4.4.3.1: Lack of clarity

4.5: Perceived factors that facilitate the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.
   4.5.1: Teacher-related factor
      4.5.1.1: Teacher willingness and commitment
   4.5.2: School-contextual factor
      4.5.2.1: School culture and principal support
The participants (see section 3.5.2) of this study included nineteen teachers from one educational district, Caroni. Thirteen teachers came from Government assisted schools and six came from Government schools (see section 3.5.1).

In this chapter a system of codes was used for the participants from T1 – T19 to protect their identity. Moreover, interview extracts from the nineteen participants were coded “I”, audio-taped observation transcripts from the eight participants were coded “O”, field notes from the ten observed classroom lessons were coded “FN” and follow-up interviews from the eight participants were coded “FUI”. Additionally, the dates of semi-structured and follow-up interviews, classroom observations and field notes were stated together with their participants’ codes.

4.2 Views teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation

Research Question One:

What perspectives do teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

In this section I explore the views that teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. In relation to this research question, four themes (see figure 8 below) were identified which are: Caribbean identity and cultural content and resources; Internal and traditional assessment and Teaching strategies and classroom activities.
Figure 8: Views teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation
4.2.1 Caribbean identity and cultural content and resources

Generally, all the teachers expressed positive views about several aspects of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the Trinidadian context. They felt that it was appropriate, a unique and novel idea and certainly an effectual endeavour as encapsulated in T17 statements:

I believe it is one that is very relevant to our form six students and it is very interactive and interesting (T17/I/26/2/2016).

This belief also resonated with T1:

Am, well I think that the idea of Communication Studies was a novel one and was a worthwhile one (T1/I/9/03/2016).

Teachers agreed that CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation represented a movement away from dependency on the curriculum from England. T11 illuminates this:

GCE was [for] the entire world and it was not Caribbean specific…[It] did not target our particular reality and our problems faced by our students. I think [CAPE Communication Studies] was a way to sort of streamline the approach and deal with our issues in the Caribbean from language issues to cultural issues. It was a way to become more I guess autonomous, independent from England (T11/I/2/03/2016).

Significantly, two teachers (T10, T16) professed that acceptance and positive endorsement of CAPE Communication Studies was not automatic. Instead, its initial introduction to Trinidad and Tobago was met with resistance especially as they were comfortable with the General Certificate Examination (G.C.E) General Paper. T10 explains:

Initially, to be frank I had resisted it because I had been teaching …General Paper for a long time and I had enjoyed that…so when they decided to do away with that…I was a little unhappy. [B]ut I am working with the subject over the last few years [and] I’ve grown to like it more and more (T10/I/17/4/2015).

Similarly, T16 posited:

At first having taught General Paper I did not really see the value in changing over into something Caribbean because [there] was still
this perception that everything foreign is better because it is organized, it has been around for a longer time. So, I was initially one of the teachers who really didn’t embrace this whole idea about CAPE. And as a matter of fact, I was actually at another school, then we heard about the changes being made…[W]e were actually one of the last schools moving to embrace CAPE. We did the G.C.E ‘A’ Levels until we had no other choice, so I think that may have been the responses of many board schools (T16/I/26/2/2016).

This implies that although these teachers had negative feelings toward the CAPE Communication Studies innovation initially, they eventually endorsed it.

Teachers were also proud that CXC was able to establish a Caribbean regional curriculum that is more nationalistic in nature and better suited to the needs and cultural realities of the Caribbean people. Additionally, they proffered that the inclusion of the Caribbean cultural content is relevant and significant since it allows students to understand who they are and develop a sense of identity and consciousness in their own context. This is reinforced in T15 statement:

I also like the content particularly because there is so much more inclusion of our content- our Caribbean content, our local content, there is so much more of that. I suppose I am saying that because I can compare it to G.C.E which was a foreign exam and you really didn’t get much of the Caribbean content in it, so I really appreciate that. I find that in teaching it you are able to really connect with the students (T15/I/26/02/2016).

T17 also concurs with this view:

The Caribbean content I think is actually appropriate because the students, they get a better sense of self and identity with the Caribbean content being included into the syllabus. It is not like the G.C.E syllabus where you would actually be learning about another culture, you are learning about yourself. So therefore, you are prepared to go into your own Caribbean setting, and you can function effectively (T17/I/26/02/2016).

Some teachers further expounded that the Caribbean cultural content is important since it provides grounding for students in terms of
history especially with the influence of the American culture on the Trinidadian society. Many students are drawn to this culture and tend to eschew their own culture, sometimes because they are not exposed to it. T4 explains:

Actually I like that part of the syllabus [the Caribbean cultural content] because surprisingly when you start teaching it you realize that some students; maybe it’s the influence of the American culture, as they are not very familiar with their own, with the Caribbean culture. So, its eye opening you know for both the students and the teacher. You realize that some of the young people are coming to you and they are not educated about their own culture, their own way of life, things that are Caribbean…so they leave with knowledge of Caribbean culture. I think…with…media and with the influence of…American culture, children really now are not familiar with their own (T4/I/5/06/2015).

This view is also espoused by T18:

Well I think that it is critical because we have to keep in mind our identity, we can’t lose it. We are becoming more Americanized and you know the first world influence is great, so we are losing the old traditions that we have. But teaching that aspect of it brings it back. [A] lot of students probably you know hardly speak that amount of dialect anymore…[They] speaking more American (T18/I/18/05/2016).

This view is further endorsed by T13:

It must be included because children must know where they have come from despite the Americanization of society in Trinidad… [O]ur children must be aware of our culture, our Caribbean, our people, history (T13/I/18/04/2016).

Additionally, all the teachers had positive beliefs about the Communication Studies innovation, particularly as the content includes a focus on ‘Caribbean languages’ and the part that language plays in Caribbean identity. They envision the innovation as in sync with the needs of Caribbean people in that it promulgates a sense of pride in their culture. These are perceived as indispensable dimensions of their context. Therefore, teachers underscored the significance of including the ‘Language and Community’ Module 2 as it benefits not only students but parents and Caribbean people generally. T11 articulates the benefits of it:
Well I think it is long overdue…I think that the Module Two makes students aware of the languages that we have in the Caribbean and each language, the value that it has compared to the Standard [English]. So, I think that [this] particular module is good for us as parents, people to learn about ourselves and our situation (T11/I/02/03/2016).

T15 provided further details on the significance of the language aspect:

Well as I said, I am very appreciative of it because it [can] help the students to grow in love with their Language…As we were saying in class Language is so intimately connected to who we are as a people. We can finally examine what is our own [and]…Look at how it’s structured and [the students] can see it as something that is valuable. So, I really appreciate that aspect of it. We examine our own language as part of language on the whole. It is viewed as something that is real and valuable (T15/I/26/02/2016).

Teachers reasoned further that the “language aspect of Communication Studies is very important”, (T13/I/18/04/2016) specifically, exposure to the Trinidadian Creole, linguistic diversity of the Caribbean and language awareness, since many of the students are “not aware of where their language came from [and] where it originated” (T2/I/9/03/2016). As such, it is necessary “to teach students about how [their] culture and language had been developed and formed over the years” (T14/I/2/5/2016). T19 provides details of the necessity of unearthing the Caribbean language heritage:

I think it’s a good idea to introduce the students to their own language because many of them come and they shun the Trinidadian Creole that is spoken, and they have lots of reservations about the language and so they learn a lot (T19/I/1705/2016).

Moreover, teachers felt convinced that it can broaden students’ myopic perception of their own language which they perceived in most cases with uncertainty, disdain and as inferior. They firmly believe that interrogation of Caribbean languages will help with students’ marginalization, and negative attitude of the language while enabling them to appreciate, respect and value it, as T16 points out:
I think it is a good thing, it’s the way to go, many of our current students have not appreciated Caribbean issues, Caribbean Language, Caribbean values and they need to be exposed to it. We [are] talking about things like nationalism and being part of the Caribbean Community and one of the ways in which we can foster this is by learning about…our language. So, I see [CAPE] as being viable not only in the present, but also for the future … [I] see its importance in the classroom (T16/I/26/02/2016).

T3 agrees but her focus is on the male students as her school is an all-boys school:

I appreciate the fact that it gives the students the idea about Language and the basis about Language…[B]ut teaching boys and having the boys…respect [the] language, it’s a fight on a daily basis, it’s a fight. Even from form one all the way up that’s what I see it as. It’s like pulling teeth [very difficult] with them sometimes just to even respect…the language. They will say “well I talk it and that’s all I need to do” …I appreciate what the syllabus is trying to do but I think we have some difficulties along the way (T3/I/15/03/2016).

There was a general sense that the Language content was pertinent to students developing a sense of their own language experience. Students need to experience various uses of register and dialect so that they can apply it effectively based on the context. For instance, T5 hinted that “once students are able to appreciate the language, they will be able to code switch and use the language in different situations” (T5/I/05/06/2015). Another teacher echoed a similar sentiment, but in relation to the functions of language:

Because they have to look at different elements and perspectives, they are able to be exposed to different functions of language and the actual linguistic inclusion is important for when they move on (T17/I/26/02/2016).

There was also acknowledgement that the Trinidad Creole has finally been given its rightful place, validated as a language and “recognized within the classroom” (T5/I/5/06/2015). For many years it was shunned but now it is perceived as “one of the high points of the subject itself because for too long the Caribbean [had] no identity in the area of language” (T5/I/5/06/2015). However, amidst these merits,
teachers bemoan the fact that there are difficulties during implementation. Moreover, some teachers (T1, T11, T9) also believe that there are a few limitations of the language component itself in terms of the wide expanse of understanding in detail, the structures of the various Creoles from the other Caribbean islands such as Jamaica, Guyana and Barbados, as exemplified in T1 words:

They are asking students to...become familiar with each type of Creole. So for children who are already...confronted with limited Creole in today['s] society it becomes more and more challenging for them to appreciate Jamaican Creole or Guyanese or Bajan simply because it is so unfamiliar...[I]t is not uncommon to hear children saying that “Miss, I do not understand this (T1/I/09/03/2016).

T11 concurs that there is “too much depth as far as Linguistics [is concerned] that is not needed or applicable for a student just doing it for a year” (T11/I/02/03/2016). Additionally, T11 goes further and believes that more understanding about the art forms of each Caribbean country could have been included in the language component:

They focus too much on describing Creole grammar, too many Linguistic terms that I myself barely know and understand... [Instead]...speak about the art forms in each country, each territory, what they famous for, calypso, chutney or reggae...so focus a little more on the art of the country, which are actually done in the language but it is a different side of it (T11/I/02/03/2016).

Most teachers also believed that the inclusion of a multiplicity of cultural resources and artefacts from the Caribbean were significant since it is commensurate with their Caribbean cultural identity and experiences. They did not have to solely depend on “foreign” or Eurocentric texts or materials that denied their cultural realities. They professed that for too long they were schooled using only “foreign” resources:
I think [cultural resources] are excellent resources and ideas to include in the syllabus because many of our students are not exposed to persons of West Indian nature who have helped the art-forms and the literature and the language (T7/I/17/04/2015).

T14 extends this further by pointing out that these cultural resources promote the “idea of what it means to have a Caribbean identity” (T14/I/02/05/2016). Moreover, some of the teachers mentioned specific materials and resource persons that are critical to include such as bringing Paul Keens Douglas himself, and videos by Debra Jean Baptiste, Miguel Browne and Louis Bennett because they represent the Caribbean culture. This will allow students to understand that “it is really part of our culture; it is part of us you know, and we should learn to appreciate and treasure what is ours” (T9/I/16/04/2015). This idea is further captured by T18:

I think we should, we have to [include cultural resources]. Paul Keens Douglas was one of the persons who got us on the map…so we use [his work]. We use Miguel Browne, we use V.S. Naipaul, and you know these are the people that influenced us… I also use clips from Oliver and Beular and Desmond [and] Samuel Selvon’s [novel] ‘Moses Ascending’. So, I use all that and I think it’s important to keep that because the overall tradition is dying and now, we have to resurrect it (T18/I/18/05/2016).

Significantly, most of these teachers alluded to the fact that although they believe that resources from their culture are entwined with their identity, and hence necessary, there are obstacles accessing some of these material resources and even resource personnel:

Now again, the [cultural] resources are not available to all of us in the same equal way… [T]here is not much for us in our school that is dedicated to…Communication Studies…, we have nothing that is actually you know given to us for Communication…, it is a general thing. So, I think we need more resources that gear more towards…Module 2 in particular (T11/I/02/03/2016).

Another teacher adds that she even wanted to bring in Paul Keens Douglas to present a session on the oral tradition at her school at one point, but couldn’t because “the cost [was] substantial…four
thousand dollars just for him to visit, so even that is not affordable” (T5/I/05/06/2015).

Hence, a major concern pinpointed by teachers is that despite their positive beliefs about several aspects of the innovation, in reality the actual implementation of it in the classroom was not well thought through and planned as revealed by T7:

Communication Studies is actually a very, very, good idea to implement in schools. It is just that a lot of perspective must be placed on it in terms of the implementation, what really goes on in the classroom instead of looking at what it is in theory (T7/I/17/04/2015).

Moreover, teachers felt that the “black box”, the actual implementation process was complex, fraught with challenges, and posed several barriers to effective curriculum implementation (this will be discussed further in Section 4.4). T8 exemplified this:

[I]n teaching [CAPE Communication Studies] I have encountered quite a lot of problems, the workload, the content and time allocated to me to teach it (T8/I/16/04/2015).

The statement above indicates that teachers embraced the innovation and have positive views about it. However, this does not mean that their beliefs will be transferred to practice in the classroom since what occurs in the classroom is influenced by contextual and other factors.

4.2.2: Internal and traditional assessment

Another pivotal theme that emanated from the interviews based on research question one is in relation to forms of assessment namely, internal assessment (IA) and the traditional assessment.

All the teachers inextricably connected in their views that the IA is beneficial. However, teachers differed in their beliefs about the various ways in which the IA benefitted students. Some teachers posited that the IA is “a good avenue for expression” (T18/I/18/05/2016) and allows students to develop their creative and critical thinking skills. There
is less focus on absorption of facts where you have to “force everything down last minute for exam preparation” (T14/I/02/05/2016). T16 illustrates this:

> It is important because [the IA] look[s] at students not just simply regurgitating information…they have to apply it and the best way to do so is by having these IA’s whereby we are encouraging them to be creative. So actually [it is] not just about learning about the differences between the Creole and Standard [English] but they have to [produce]…creative pieces [for the IA]. So, I think that the IA is necessary (T16/I/26/02/2016).

This view is congruent with the perspective of another teacher who also emphasized the importance of including the IA component in the syllabus:

> It is a good form of assessment for the students [since] they tend to perform better with the IA because they [are] more hands on…[I]nstead of just learning off something, preparing for an exam, learning definitions [and] concepts. For me the IA gives them a little chance to be a little more free in terms of expression. The IA does give them a chance to create a piece of their own and critique it, so for me the IA is an excellent part of assessment (T7/I/17/04/2015).

Teacher 18 provided an example:

> You know students get to express themselves… [O]ne student, her reflective was on journals. She chose to do that. In those journals now she expressed how she came from an alcoholic home and having spoken to her I realized well…is true…[S]he said ‘…I am writing about it because this is the only avenue, I have to express it’ (T18/I/18/05/2016).

These views show that the motive behind the IA assessment is laudable in that it promulgates skills crucial to the total development of students. This also resonates with CXC’s perspective that the IA “provides an opportunity to individualize a part of the curriculum to meet the needs of students” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 28).

Other teachers (T19, T15) recognized the importance of research skills, writing skills and oral skills affiliated with the IA assessment. The following comments by teachers illuminate this assertion:
The IA in itself is good [as] our children lack research skills. [A]lot of them don’t have research skills, so I think the IA in itself is a really good step for them, because it is made up of…research (T19/I/17/05/2016).

This was reinforced by T15:

Well I am impressed with the internal assessment because for our subject area they have to present a speech. It is definitely different this time in an English based subject they get to speak, to give their opinions in an oral fashion… [T]hey get an opportunity to do it on their own, to learn and do research. It prepares them, I think…pretty good (T15/I/26/02/2016).

Another pertinent view is that the IA “brings a good balance” (T6/I/21/04/2016) as the focus of assessment is not just the traditional form of assessment. Students are therefore allowed to “work on something throughout the year…instead of just preparing for a single exam” (T6/I/21/04/2016). Therefore combining “the two types of assessment” allow students “an opportunity to practice their writing skills and research skills” (T6/I/21/04/2016).

On a slightly different note, a few teachers (T4, T9) embraced the IA because they perceived it as advantageous in that students can go into the final examination with some marks from the IA:

I like the advantage of students going in with marks and the IA mimics the final exam, so it helps them with the skills, it helps them to develop the skills and I think that’s great you know… Again [though] the time is always a factor, it’s a lot of time to develop the portfolio…So in that sense it is difficult, but it works for the benefit of the students because at the end of the day if you get a student who can work…they go in of course with [marks] and it increases their chance of being successful in the exam (T4/I/5/06/2015).

The statement above indicates that although teachers expressed appreciation for the merits of IA, such as reinforcing some of the examination skills, inevitable difficulties ensued in practice with the IA. This was affiliated with time constraints as alluded to by T4. Similar views were espoused by other teachers. For example, T18 articulated that in addition to the fact that “Communication [Studies] is not a year, it is
nine months,” there are other challenges since the students have to do an IA for each of their other CAPE subjects, which make it over demanding for them:

Every CAPE subject has an [IA]…and this is where the problem comes in. Now I start mine probably the very first term. You now give [students] an idea of what we [are] doing in order to finish and yet still [they] have challenges finishing it (T18/I/18/05/2016).

Some teachers (T13, T10, T1) further commented on the problems that emerged with the IA in the reality of their specific context. Implementation of the IA in the classroom had challenges not only in concert with students but also with the teachers. T10 commenting on this proffered that the “IA takes up [too] much time [and]…it interferes with [their] teaching of the subject because it is so demanding” (T10/I/17/04/2015). Therefore, there is the view that it is a lot of work as it involves the teacher correcting several IA drafts: “the first draft, second, third and sometimes…up to six drafts.” (T13/I/18/04/2016). T1 agrees that, “as a teacher it is a very tiring process [and] the quantity of IAs is a very difficult task” (T1/I/09/03/2016). Additionally, since the IA is only 20% of the final examination marks, teachers would still focus more on the external examinations that are worth 80%. For them the oral skills required for the IA are crucial but is overshadowed by the traditional external examination.

Furthermore, a few teachers (T6, T12, T13) felt that the inclusion of the various forms of traditional assessment are practical and better than only having a final traditional examination. They reverberated the view that the integration of both types of assessment (IA and traditional) “brings a good balance” (T6/I/21/04/2016) although the eighty percent allocated for the traditional examination is too much. Moreover, the essay type exam and the multiple choice seem to work well together as they harness “students’ analytical and written skills” (T12/I/09/03/2016). Teacher 13 summed it up:
This is an exam-society and parents, teachers, and students all grew up learning that we have to write this exam and we must perform the best at it no matter what. So therefore…right now we can’t get another way in which we can test them but the [traditional] exams are a more meaningful way together with the IA. [This] gives them a proper mark…[I]t produces a good mark and a good reflection of what they have done in the year with Communication Studies (T13/I/18/04/2016).

Conversely, most teachers had a different perspective particularly with the inclusion of the multiple-choice examination. The only benefit of the replacement of the short-structured exam with the multiple-choice paper is the convenience of easy marking. However, the opportunity to explore students’ higher order thinking skills would be lost with this movement. T10 explains:

I like the short answer, it offers students the opportunity to think through things, to work it out…[Y]ou could challenge them to figure it out…to articulate it. [B]ut this multiple choice you never know. I think it is convenient in terms of marking… but…students have lost something. (T10/I/17/04/2015).

This is indicative of these teachers’ consensus that the multiple-choice paper stifles students’ creativity.

Generally, teachers agreed that the inclusion of the IA is needed and beneficial. However, it is challenging to implement as teachers’ classroom realities (O’Sullivan, 2002) such as time demands, and a heavy workload were overlooked.

4.2.3: Teaching strategies and classroom activities

Most of the teachers had a positive view about the merits of the teaching approaches and classroom activities suggested in the curriculum. They embraced the idea of student-centred pedagogy and classroom activities that included group work, pair work and the inclusion of technology. However, given the classroom and school context, these
activities were generally done on a limited basis though some teachers employed more strategies than others. T4 explains:

The teaching approaches and activities are all wonderful ideas and…if it was so in reality, I think we would have, I mean, a wonderful learning, teaching experience. [B]ut the reality is at my school is that we don’t have access to technology and it is very difficult to get a multimedia projector…[W]e have no WI-FI…we can’t explore that part of the syllabus very much with our teaching, but the technology ideas are great. [Also]…group dynamic, it does not work as you would hope, or you intend (T4/I/5/06/2015).

In fact, the teacher as a facilitator is seen by most teachers as important but not always practical. Teachers admitted that didactic instruction takes centre stage due to various factors. T5 summed it up:

It works better when we give them notes…it is a subject that you cannot go without notes. So as a teacher…I have to go to chalk and talk. I have to give notes, so they actually have something to read (T5/I/05/06/2015).

T1 goes further to highlight the positive view of the teacher as a facilitator but delineates the difficulties encountered in always practicing it in the classroom:

Tell me if I am going wrong… [A]s a teacher we recognize our role is to be a facilitator. However, I am also preparing students for examinations so that am, I do not have the luxury of time to do activities that I would like to do that…would be more student-centred. Am, it is very difficult when you look at a school calendar and you know that you are going to have time lost…[and] you have to… finish the module[s] so that students are examination ready and therefore…you also have to am get the job done (T1/I/09/03/2016).

In terms specifically of classroom activities suggested after each of the three modules in the syllabus, teachers viewed these as interesting, “very helpful” (T12/I/09/03/2016) and “really good ideas” (T12/I/09/03/2016) but not feasible given the examination system and other factors.

This dilemma is highlighted by T1:
Am, we do have to use multimedia and we do have group work, however, we also have to do a lot of lectures simply because of the quantity of work…Am in terms of group work…students have their presentation to make, am, we do incorporate the drama and the skit and the role play…You need a variety of approaches… [D]oes it necessarily mean that the variety of approaches get done as suggested? [No] we can’t because of time constraints because of the timetable and because of the students (T1/I/09/03/2016).

This implies that even though most teachers recognized certain benefits of some of the teaching approaches and activities suggested in the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, in reality it was difficult to implement since the school and classroom context and other factors had a great influence on teachers’ practice. These factors will be discussed in the section 4.4. It seems evident therefore, that implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation “is not a uniform process” since “it looks different in different places” (Wedell, 2009, p. 31).

Furthermore, the findings suggest that all the teachers fully embraced the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. They held positive views about it in terms of the Caribbean content and resources, the internal assessment and the teaching strategies and classroom activities. Despite this overwhelming support for the innovation teachers indicated that it was not practical given the realities of the local context. In other words, a beneficial curriculum innovation alone is not enough to attain its ideal without consideration of the whole context in which it has to be implemented. Curriculum innovations such as Communication Studies are not always implemented successfully as contextual and other constraints are not considered such as, the examination-oriented system, lack of resources, large class size, time constraints, school culture, lack of principal’s support and a top-down approach to policy development (see Section 4.4). As such, the data in this section clearly indicates “where teachers lack support of various kinds, distant ideals are often outweighed by immediate realities” (Song, 2015, p. 43).
4.3 Implementation Gaps: CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation

In the previous section, I reported on the views that teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation (see Section 4.2). This section reveals the findings of research question two:

How are teachers implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in their classroom?

The purpose of this question is to examine teachers’ implementation of the innovation in their classrooms and to ascertain if there are any gaps between the intended curriculum and what actually occurs in teachers’ classroom practice. This was done using documents, the interview data of nineteen teachers and audio-taped classroom observation data of eight teachers coupled with field notes, and follow-up interviews for the eight teachers. The findings revealed that several themes emanated from the data, these are: Teaching approaches and techniques, Selection of content and modes of communication and Selection of teaching materials and resources.

It was clear that there was consonance from the interview and observation data. In other words, classroom observations revealed that teacher implemented the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation as they stated in their semi-structured interviews. This was also illuminated in the follow-up interviews after the classroom observations.

4.3.1 Teaching approaches and techniques

Findings revealed implementation gaps which resulted due to the incompatibility between the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and how teachers were actually implementing the innovation in their classrooms. The positive conceptions they expressed about student-centred activities (see section 4.2.3) did not totally transfer to their classroom practice. In fact, the traditional teacher-centred
approach to teaching and learning took precedence, which involved whole class discussions. Most teachers adhered to this practice. It was evident that generally the teacher was the authority figure or expert in the classroom and students were most of the times, relegated to a passive status. The teacher adhered more to the concept of the jug pouring information where students were required to absorb the information. This is illuminated in T4 comments:

“The teacher as facilitator does not work especially in my context...so many times the teacher has to be teacher-oriented rather than student-oriented and you actually have to go and explicitly teach certain skills [and] certain content (T4/I/5/06/2015).”

T7 also provides further details:

“How I deliver a lesson is mostly teacher-centred. I encourage some sort of whole-class discussion…and then the answering of questions will follow that (T7/I/17/04/2015).”

The observations of the eight teachers also corroborated the semi-structured interview findings that instruction was mostly characterized by teacher-led whole-class discussions. This is effectively exemplified in T4 classroom practice. The teacher was in full control, which is effectively portrayed in the physical arrangements of the class. The classroom setting was traditional “where the teacher was mostly positioned in front of the class and students mostly seated in rows” (T4/FN/17/4/2015). The session was ninety minutes long and based on Module 2, ‘Language and Community.’ Specifically, the focus was on dialectal variation, register, communicative behaviour and attitude to language. The following excerpt sheds light on this:
T: Going back to the comment that I made as a teacher to Bena, would you consider that the register [that] I used with Bena to be appropriate at that time?

S: No

T: Why not?

S: Because it is a classroom and, in a classroom, you have to use formal register.

T: Right, what else?

S: Use of register for the situation.

T: Right, very good. When we talk about register, we are talking about the appropriateness of the use of that register for the situation. When we are determining whether the register is appropriate or not, we need to take two or three things into consideration. When we are assessing and analysing, like we are required to do for our [Internal Assessment] IA. What are the three things we need to keep in mind or to assess whether the register is appropriate or not?

S: Your audience

T: Very good, the audience.

S: Your context

T: Your context or situation and your purpose. In terms of communicative behaviour, you said ‘I pointed’. What did my pointing do in that comment that I made?

S: It add[s] emphasis. It indicated who you were speaking to.

T: Right. So, it gave some sort of direction and it emphasized who I was speaking to. Do you remember what the functions are? Maybe before I jump to that, can you tell me the different types of communicative behaviours we need to look for? Let’s do that first. What are the types of communicative behaviours we need to pay attention to, to look for, in our pieces of writing in any extract? What do we consider as communicative behaviour?
S: We have hand gestures; we have body language

T: Right

S: The pitch and tone

T: First of all, we talk about all that and it falls under the broad heading non-verbal right? Good. Non-verbal and we’re looking at hand gestures. You said body movements, what else? Are these the only two communicative behaviours? Casey, what other communicative behaviour do you know (T4/O/17/04/2015)?

This method of whole class discussion is also reinforced by T1’s classroom lesson (ninety minutes) on the ‘Writer’s Purpose, Organizational Strategies and Language Techniques.’ This is an objective in Module 1, ‘Gathering and Processing Information’:

T: So, in this [passage] if we are asked to write what is the main idea then, the main idea is that [The University of the West Indies] UWI has decided to make themselves more accessible and more affordable by expanding now through Distance Learning. Yeah? No?

S: Maybe you can add to that ‘due to increased competition’.

T: Due to increased competition or in response to increased competition?

S: Miss is it necessary to put in the distance learning part?

T: It is not necessary to put in the distance learning part. [Do] you agree with that?

S: I agree with that.

T: So, we agree that the topic is about UWI, the topic is about the limitations of three campuses and the fact that they are now reacting to competition by expanding?

S: Yeah?

T: Good. So, are you writing that down? Please, thank you. The topic is
Both excerpts based on classroom lessons are generally representative of how most teachers conducted their classroom sessions. It followed a pattern of the teacher questioning the students and the students providing a response to the teacher’s questions. “If the teacher was not satisfied with the response from the students, then the correct answer was provided by the teacher” (T4/FN/17/4/2015). The focus was on eliciting the correct answers from the students using whole class discussions. Additionally, in these excerpts the students’ participation in the class were relegated to “answering the teacher’s questions and note-taking” (T1/FN/11/03/2016). Teachers seemed to give students some of the answers to make sure the lesson moved at a good pace. The rationale for this was because of time constraint, a “massive curriculum, high-stakes examination, students’ resistance, lack of resources and other challenges,” (T1/FUI/11/03/2016), which hindered their implementation of the innovation.

Findings also revealed that group work and pair work activities were done on a limited basis by all the teachers even though they had expressed positive views (see section 4:2.3) about the benefits of using these strategies. In fact, the syllabus stipulates a more student-centred approach to learning where group and pair activities and students’ active participation in the teaching and learning process take precedence. This is exemplified in the suggested teaching and learning activities in the three modules. For instance, in Module 2: ‘Language and Community’, suggested teaching and learning activities include the following (italics in original, Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 17-18):
Identify a passage which represents informal, conversational Creole (you may wish to transcribe a section of an audio tape from the suggested resources for Module 2). Have students (in groups so as to stimulate discussion) translate the passage to a formal standard, written version of Caribbean Standard English (italics in original).

Divide students into groups. Have each group identify and focus on new technological advancements in the home, school and workplace, for example, computer, MP3 player, digital recorder, smartphone, blog, and social networking Internet sites. Each group should explain the varied [use] of these “new” tools and their impact on the communication process.

The teachers lamented that unfortunately they could not be as creative as they wanted to and include all the student-centred activities that are required given all the problems that they encountered in their working context. This is effectively captured by T15:

Some of the content I would tell them work this out in groups and present it to me in a dramatic skit. I have done some of that, but we could do a lot more. I find...we still so traditional in terms of the teacher up there teaching the content and they [students] taking notes...Things like group work and pair work, I really feel we could do a lot more of that and a lot of it wasn't done (T15/I/26/2/2016).

T13 shared a similar sentiment:

Even though the syllabus has suggested pair and group work we do not get time to do it often...because of the intensity of the work in the syllabus and other challenges (T13/I/18/04/2016).

T10 explains further:

I have found [when] we are doing revision; we are looking at past papers. I found that the third module, ‘Speaking and Writing’ lends [itself] to group work. In most cases, the questions in that module asks for you to make proposals to be presented in a committee setting...I try to cover that module exam questions with group work. Some of the other things am, you know, we do not do it...because there is a lot to cover, am, in a short space of time (T10/I/17/4/2015).

Data from classroom observations also corroborated teachers’ interview data that they seldom used group and pair activities in the classroom. It was not unusual therefore that two of the lessons that (T16 and T8)
observed did not include these activities since the teachers established that it “is not every time I teach, I use it, rarely I do” (T16/FUI/26/2/2016). However, the others included it albeit at different intervals but just for a short time. The following observation excerpts illuminate this:

T: While we spoke about the questionnaires, we identified some of the advantages and disadvantages. Now working in small groups using one of the data collection methods, you are going to inform the class of three advantages and three disadvantages. You have to explain and discuss the data collection. One person will present. You will take five to seven minutes to organize what you have to say since you have your notes (T6/O/18/2/2016).

T: So, this question is asking you to analyse these four elements that we just discussed. That is in terms of register, dialectal variations, attitudes to language and communicative behaviours. That is what I would like us to do very quickly maybe in pairs…I am giving you about fifteen minutes. I think that should be sufficient time to just identify what was used in the passage and of course to try and offer some justification, explanation for your answer. Of course, let me just interrupt a minute, you have to present right to the class your findings. So be prepared to speak (T4/O/17/4/2015).

The excerpts illustrate that group and pair activities gain minimal attention and are representative of how most of the teachers conducted these activities. In the first excerpt T6 is doing a “revision session on Module 1, ‘Gathering and Processing Information’, where the emphasis is on the advantages and disadvantages of secondary data” (T6/FN/18/2/2016). In the second excerpt, T4 focuses, as stated previously, on dialectal variation, register, communicative behaviour and attitude to language. Students were allowed to work in groups for fifteen minutes and then present briefly for ten minutes. After the teacher read the passage from the CAPE Communication Studies examination past paper based on Paper Two, Section B students were put in groups, specifically to answer the examination questions related to the passage.

The findings imply that most of the teachers only gave minimal time to activities where students were active participants in the
classroom. Notably, however, there were variations among the teachers in terms of which lessons they would use group and pair activities for, and the time given to those activities. For instance, specific group and pair work ranged from five minutes to fifteen minutes. Teachers also admitted that if they were running out of time they would even “skip the presentation part of the group activity or discuss it as a whole class session” (T7/FUI/17/4/2015). However, with all the teachers, group work and pair work were used basically to answer questions based on the examination past papers or teacher created questions similar to the exam questions. In spite of understanding the importance of student-centred activities and embracing it, these activities were really used to advance the objective of rehearsing for the final examinations by using the examination questions. This suggests that there are obvious challenges facing teachers in their implementation of CAPE Communication Studies. It seemed that “constraints of the curriculum reform in a context which stresses results on discipline-based examinations were very real to those teachers” (Lam et al, 2013, p. 32).

These findings also point to another grave problem, whether the teachers understand properly how to use group and pair work effectively in the classroom as “the training and workshops didn’t really deal with ‘how’ to teach using the new methods” (T10/FUI/8/3/2016). This supports and gives credence to James’ (2008, p. 8) contention that in Trinidad and Tobago, professional development and [T]raining of teachers to deliver the new curriculum is ineffective and often conducted after the policy changes have already been implemented. The necessary support to manage and sustain the change process is lack.

4.3.2 Selection of content and modes of communication

Findings suggest that generally all the teachers were preoccupied with covering subject matter content commensurate with the
CAPE Communication Studies examination. What this means is that teachers mostly selected content applicable to the external examination. They skimmed other content areas if they felt it would have less importance in the examination or not tested at all. T8 exemplifies this:

I looked at questions that come in [the] exam and I make sure and I cover the content in all those areas (T8/FUI/16/4/2015).

T5 further explains:

I look specifically at the syllabus…the objectives and I try to cover what’s being examined because we would run out of time (T5/I/5/06/2015).

This suggests that teachers emphasized specific content areas in an effort to develop students’ content knowledge so that they would be prepared for the examinations. They wanted to “give them the best possible chance to excel at examinations as it was so important to them, although [they] wanted to incorporate so much more. It just wasn’t possible” (T6/FUI/18/2/2016). The problems and challenges teachers experienced including “time constraints and a massive syllabus” (T15/FUI/26/2/2016) forced them to give priority to coverage of certain areas of subject content and “skip and skim other areas” (T8/FUI/26/2/2015). For instance, all the teachers focused on several key content areas in the three modules. Some of the areas pinpointed included: register, dialectical variations, attitudes to language, communicative behaviours, evaluation of data sources and context and effective use of verbal and non-verbal communication” (T6/FUI/18/2/2016).

The classroom observations also showed that most teachers delivered lessons that were heavy in content knowledge in some of those areas. For example, five out of the ten lessons observed (T7, T10, T4, T15, T16) focused on various aspects of language awareness in Module 2. The following excerpt highlights this by T16:

T. Today, our objective is to revise the elements of [the] ‘Language and Community’ [module] that is presented in the essay. At the end of the two periods, we would have revised all the elements
you are tested on in [the] ‘Language and Community’ module that is the exam essay in Paper Two (T16/O/26/2/2016).

T16 started the lesson by explaining that the main aim is to transmit content knowledge based on Module 2 to the students. The areas that were capitalized on were dialectal variations, registers, attitude to language and communicative behaviours (T16/FN/26/2/2016). These were major content areas that all the teachers indicated that they teach. As T16 continues the lesson, this becomes evident:

T: The elements to be considered in Module 2 are: dialectal variation, attitudes to language, communicative behaviours and use of the register. Please volunteer this time to tell me what you understand by the register in Module 2.

S. Registers are the level of formality, it can be either formal, informal, intimate, consultative or casual.

T. What’s another one?

S: Frozen

T. What was the other one that was mentioned in the text?

S: Private

T. Give us an example of a frozen register.

S. Different laws in the nation

T. That is going to come from what? The different laws of the nation enshrined in what?

S: The Constitution

T. Give me other examples of frozen register. What are the first two lines of the Pledge?

S. ‘To the service of my God and my country’
T. In legal documents, it is frozen and sometimes in holy textbooks: the Gita, the Bible, the Quran is considered frozen. Give examples of casual register (T16/O/11/03/2016).

The lesson went on to deal with the other areas that were indicated. The deep emphasis in the same content area as T16 was also the main aim of T4’s lesson as revealed in the following excerpt:

T: So, I want you to look at these four elements on the board and these four elements are what you are required to use to do your analysis for section three of your portfolio. It is going to be tested as you know for your exam. This morning because the analytical part of your IA is approaching, quickly approaching, I want to focus very much on these four elements this morning. To do so I just need you to remind me if you were able to identify them in the comments that I made. But let’s just quickly go back a little bit and make sure we have in our minds what each term means. When we talk about dialect, your exam requires you to analyse what we call dialectal variations. When you hear the term dialectal variations what do you understand by the term dialectal variation (T4/O/17/04/2015)?

This implies that the particular section on register, dialectal variation, communicative behaviours and attitudes to language is very important as it not only comes for the final external examinations, but it is also an integral part of the ‘Analysis’ section of the internal assessment. It is evident that teachers selected content to suit the format of both types of the CAPE Communication Studies assessment. Most of the content they chose was influenced by the examination. There were minimal differences in the topics chosen by teachers based on the syllabus that were skimmed by them. However, they all agreed that “it was necessary to do this given all the challenges that they faced,” (T15/FUI/26/02/2016). The “content areas tested in the external examination paper especially took centre-stage in classroom teaching” (T7/FUI/17/04/2015).

In terms of the modes of communication, writing skills were given prominence. However, listening and speaking were done but more on a limited basis, although the syllabus advocated that this should be
done continuously. Writing skills took precedence since paper two of the external examination accounted for fifty percent of the final marks (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010) where the students have to write three essays from each of the three Modules. Therefore, essay writing skills are assessed in the examination. This is reinforced by T3 and T10:

I guess to me is not the listening as much as the writing skills I stress. The writing will be there because the exam is going to be written at the end of the day. The writing skills are there, and students have to be able to complete essays in the allotted time and so forth (T3/I/15/03/2016).

They have to learn to write the essay. You know they have to learn the am, organizational strategies and be able to identify it and so on (T10/I/17/4/2015).

Classroom observations also reflected the interview findings above. For example, T10 focused on reviewing essay writing skills and techniques based on Module 3 ‘Speaking and Writing’ (T10/FN/4/3/2016). T10 begins the lesson by directing the students to the task at hand, which is revision of a CAPE Communication Studies examination past paper that focuses on the writing of an essay of no more than five hundred words (T10/FN/04/03/2016). T10 contends:

Let us look at the question, what we are going to do at the end of the double period is to have one written response to this question. This question is asking you to write in an essay format, a proposal for a Caribbean youth sports tournament, suggesting strategies to encourage volunteers to come forward to help. Remember you are the volunteer coordinator who needs to write this (T10/O/04/03/2016).

T10 further reminds the class about the importance of the accurate format and structure of the essay. The following excerpt elaborates this:

Okay, we [are] going to put it on the board so that everybody will have a structure. Now am, you get twenty-five marks alright. Module 3 essays carry twenty-five marks. You have ten marks for content, you get seven marks for organization and you get eight marks for expression…the organization we [are] working out on the board. For organization you have a good introduction, and a good conclusion. Development of each paragraph must be sound and well
developed. There must be links between paragraphs...For expressions, the language must be error free, so you can get the whole eight points. So, in essay format, write a proposal for the organizing committee...You have to have an introduction, you have to have a conclusion, and there must be the body or development of the essay part (T10/O/04/03/2016).

T10’s lesson on writing skills is also representative of a major area of focus by most teachers. In this case, T10 produced on the blackboard a work plan (see Appendix 14) of the essay question for the class, given its prominence in the syllabus. This suggests that teachers emphasized writing skills as this was a major area affiliated with the external examination.

Most of the teachers admitted that listening skills were also marginalized as it was given less importance in the external examination. For instance, the focus is on the listening comprehension, which is now incorporated in the multiple-choice paper one as it is only five percent of the total marks as T8 explains:

When it came to other areas for instance, the listening and speaking section in the module suffered. We focused in the beginning part the heavy content and then when it was coming closer to the exam, I realized the importance of doing a listening comprehension with them...[I]t was just one class and I realize it was just five percent of the total grade, but they still needed that (T8/I/16/04/2015).

The lessons that were observed also supported this finding. However, only one lesson that I observed dealt with the listening comprehension. It “focused on the various levels of comprehension such as the literal level, interpretive level and the applied level” (T8/FN/16/04/2015). The teacher basically conducted a drill practice session based on the listening comprehension examination. The teacher read a poem entitled “THE PAWPAW” (Brathwaite, 1989, p. 10) (see Appendix 15) twice, while the students listened. After this “the students got fifteen minutes to answer the questions on their own” (T8/FN/16/04/2015). This was followed by a whole class discussion of the answers to the listening comprehension:
T: What is the main idea of the poem?

S. The main idea of the poem is the admiration of four boys for the poet by presenting her with a hard-earned pawpaw.

T. Right that’s closest I might get to three marks, but it will get half of a mark, you know why? Just one little thing inside there. How did he feel when it comes? …Like a bomb, remember that, so is that a good thing or a bad thing?

S. A bad thing

T. The main idea is exactly what Yashoda said there but just to add a little bit. The poet or the speaker in the poem was unsure of how to receive that present because the pawpaw was stolen.

S. Stolen?

T. Exactly. The pawpaw was stolen. That makes it like a bomb. Now how [are] you going to fit all of that into two lines, one sentence? The poet was unsure [of] how to deal with it, the present he got, because the pawpaw was stolen. And that would have been a three marks response. You’ve stated the poet was given a present. You didn’t have to mention the boys were filthy or anything like that, that wasn’t called for in here…So how are you going to mark yourself now (T8/O/16/04/2015)?

This suggests that most of the teachers paid attention to the listening comprehension component but even that was done sparsely, just once or twice. Moreover, the listening comprehension activity focused on eliciting the proper responses to the questions, to guide students to obtain full marks in the examination. This is reinforced again towards the end of the lesson by T8:

T. Right, you recognize the importance of reading and analysing the question, consolidating information you didn’t get yet. So that when [you] read you would have been open to certain types of information you would have been looking for… How much was that worth?

S. Fifteen marks
T. Fifteen, so just on average by a show of hands who got ten or more?
All of you? That’s a big improvement. (T8/O/16/04/2015)

The other teachers that were observed further indicated that they have to fit the listening section in wherever they can and explained how the marks are distributed. The follow-up interviews supported the findings from the observations and semi-structured interviews. T10 contends:

Well, writing is key. I more teach writing skills. Listening skills, well we rarely do a listening comprehension to be exact. One practice, sometimes two. We, am, just get to the point, how marks are distributed and that’s it. It’s only five percent of the marks in any case. If, am, we had more time, better resources, more training, yes, we could enjoy it all and develop students totally (T10/FUI/04/03/2016).

This indicates that the “listening activity is more like a listening test” (Yan, 2012, p. 438) Moreover, besides the exam there are many other factors such as time, resources, class size and training that interact and negatively affect teachers’ implementation of the intended curriculum in the classroom.

The oral skills were also given minimal attention except when it had to be assessed. The internal assessment (IA) is twenty percent of the final marks. The ‘Exposition’ or oral presentation is one of the sections of the internal assessment (IA) (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010). Many teachers therefore attune a few oral sessions to cater for this. However, they admitted that after it is finished, they resort again to coverage of content as “time is of the essence” (T1/FUI/11/03/2016). This is effectively evinced by T7, T13 and T4:

To be honest with you the orals are also a big limitation because of time constraints and the heavy subject matter content. Orals are given very little attention and maybe twice we had a practice in terms of only preparing for the IA. As I said it is very exam oriented. Orals were just done basically because they had to prepare for this IA where [students] had to give a ten-minute speech (T7/I/17/04/2015).
Well the only oral, am, skills that were performed were at the speech that they had at, am, the IA oral presentation. That is the only thing really and when they answer their questions in class (T13/I/18/04/2016).

It is very difficult to develop oral skills in our classroom…as I said earlier the orals really sometimes begins with a question and answer and then with students trying you know to do…presentations. But to actually harness those skills it is very difficult because of the size of the classroom and because of the lack of infrastructure. We have other issues too (T4/I/5/06/2015).

This suggests that apart from student answering teachers’ questions during whole class discussions and presenting in groups on a limited basis, oral skills were only given attention specifically when the oral assessment was approaching.

Significantly, none of the classroom lessons that were observed focused on the oral skills component. In the follow-up interviews (FUI) after observations, the eight teachers explained that this is rarely done in class as it is too time-consuming, and other challenges ensue such as, examination preparation and large class size. They admitted it is a wonderful skill to include but not realistic. The following remark by T15 explains this:

Well we do it closer to the internal assessment oral exam. Just one or two sessions. Too much time to look at each individual student. We love the idea, but the idea is not realistic. Does anybody take note of all the issues we face (T15/FUI/22/02/2016)?

Hence, teachers’ responses to the follow-up interviews supported teachers’ views of the semi-structured interviews. Teachers selected content and skills that matched the examination. It was impossible to include all that the syllabus demanded given the various barriers within the confines of the external, school and classroom context.
4.3.3 Selection of teaching materials and resources

Findings from interviews and observation data revealed that several teaching materials and resources such as the syllabus and a variety of textbooks were used often by most teachers. However, the CAPE Communication Studies past examination papers were the most prevalent teaching material used by all the teachers. T19 reflects:

As I teach, I [do] past paper questions one time going down the road. So, my children are learning and doing past paper questions both at the same time in order to get them prepared for the May/June exams (T19/I/17/05/2016).

T6 and T18 also articulate this:

What I did is create a scheme of work for term one and term two. I would use the syllabus and guidance from textbooks, [but] mostly past papers (T6/I/21/04/2016).

I use several textbooks for Communication Studies. I give them handouts from the books and some notes… and past papers (T18/I/18/05/2016).

The emphasis on these materials and resources were also reinforced during classroom observations. Findings from the observations revealed that in most of the class lessons teachers used the past examination paper as a form of revision on topics. This is discernible in the following excerpt:

T. Let’s move on to a question now that I have here for you. In fact, it is a past paper question, and it deals with exactly what we are speaking about (T4/O/17/4/2015).

The continuous use of examination past papers is also elaborated in another lesson by T10. T10 commenced the class by informing the students that the objective of the lesson is revision of Module 2, ‘Language and Community’ specifically, ‘Attitudes to Language’ (T10/FN/08/03/2016). A CAPE Communication Studies examination past paper was used to review the content of Module 2 and provide enough drill and practice so students would ace the essay writing sections of the
examination (T10/FN/8/3/2016). T10 asked one of the students to read the passage from the examination past paper:

T. Alright so we are going to look at the passage from the exam paper and then we are going to go through it. We are revising so we want to look at the exam questions that follow…Ari [pseudonym] read as loudly as you can (T10/O/08/03/2016).

After the reading session, students were asked to respond to the questions based on the passage (T10/FN/08/07/2016). The teacher then proceeded to provide a model answer (see Appendix 16) of the exam essay systematically on the blackboard. The following excerpt illustrates this:

You need to analyse the questions in an essay of no more than five hundred words…Now listen, we revising, and I want you if you come across a question like this is to immediately structure a plan. So, we are going to work on this very briefly…What are the standard things we need to have in an essay? We are going to put the plan on the board (T10/O/08/03/2016).

Evidently, not only are past papers used in the teaching and learning process, but also teachers’ creation of model answers to help students excel at the examination. However, only two teachers (T10 and T19) indicated that they formulate their own model templates as an instructional resource to help in their implementation of the innovation. T19 reinforces this view:

I’m being honest with you, to be able to write some of the essays, I create a format for them. So, all they [are] doing is plugging in what is needed. I have a model and format for questions (T19/I/17/05/2016).

This suggests, as with the use of the other materials, the model answers were basically used to teach content and skills commensurate with the examination.

Furthermore, extracts from textbooks were also used by all the teachers but mostly to teach the content areas of the syllabus. T9 explains:

We don’t have a set textbook, but we look at particular sections from various textbooks to give the students notes on language awareness, writing skills and other content areas (T9/I/16/04/2015).
This pattern of selection of passages and other extracts were also reflected in classroom observations. For example, T16 used sample notes from the textbook by Rochford (2011, p. 82-83) “Communication Studies: Preparing students for CAPE” (see Appendix 17) in order to provide students with the knowledge about the characteristics of Creole languages, the Creole continuum, types of registers and attitudes to language (T16/FN/26/02/2016). T16 read these notes and then discussed them with the class:

T. How many of you agree, that many people think the Creole is inferior? Do you have pride in the Creole? … When you go to write the exam, you must write it in Standard English. Why do they say it is good in Standard English? What are the components in the Creole like the Standard English? We just reviewed the notes from the textbook. Refer to those.

S. It has a lexicon

T. What is a lexicon in language?

S. Vocabulary

T. What else does it have?

S. It has a syntax

T. What is a syntax?

S. Structure of language

T. Give me another one

S. Phonology

(T16/O/26/02/2016)

The selection of notes from textbooks by T16 was representative of how the other teachers used these as well. For example, after T16 discussed the notes on Module 2 with the students, she pointed them to how they can apply it to answer the examination question in paper two:

T. They are always going to ask you about the Creole language and the Standard English in the exam. So, every extract will contain it somewhere. You would have to say why it is Creole and why
it is Standard English. All the elements you pointed out like morphology, syntax and so on are important (T16/O/26/02/2016).

This suggests that teachers’ selection of notes were heavily influenced by the examination.

The findings insinuate that although there were some features of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation that were being implemented as planned, generally teachers were not implementing most aspects of the innovation, which resulted in an implementation gap. The CAPE Communication Studies examination and other factors seemed to influence teachers’ selection of teaching methods, content, skills and teaching materials. Specific coverage of content areas and writing skills were given preference as they were congruent with the examination. Teaching was didactic in order to get good results as teachers were judged on their performance at the examination (Wedell, 2003). Moreover, the teaching materials that dominated in teachers’ classroom practice were the use of examination past papers. Teachers also used various textbooks and provided model essay plans in their implementation of the innovation.

Several interrelated factors, a major one being the high-stakes examination influenced teachers’ behaviour in the classroom. Although teachers wanted to develop students’ higher order thinking skills and total development, they bowed to the various constraints in the wider system and sub-systems, which resulted in them teaching to the test.
4.4 Perceived barriers to teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation

Research Question Three:

What are teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?

In the previous sections, I reported on the views that teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation (see section 4.2) and how they were implementing it in their classrooms (see section 4.3). I now discuss the factors that hindered the teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

In relation to this research question three themes with relevant sub-themes were identified. These are: the examination oriented system, approaches to curriculum innovation, insufficient government funding and resources, ineffective professional development and training, extra-lessons and societal culture (external-contextual factors); school culture and lack of principal’s support, large class size and time and syllabus demand (school-contextual factors); and lack of clarity (innovation-related factor).

Table 9 presents the themes and sub-themes that emanated when the semi-structured interview data were analysed in relation to research question 3, which are the factors that impede the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies.
Table 9: Barriers influencing teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External-contextual factors</td>
<td>• The examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approaches to curriculum innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient government funding and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ineffective professional development and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extra-lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Societal culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-contextual factors</td>
<td>• School culture and lack of principal’s support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large class size and time and syllabus demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation-related factors</td>
<td>• Lack of clarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.1 External-contextual factors

Findings indicated that several interrelated external-contextual factors also inhibited implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. These included the examination-oriented system, approaches to curriculum innovation, insufficient government funding and resources, ineffective professional development and training, extra-lessons and societal culture.

4.4.1.1 The examination-oriented system

All the teachers across all the sites alluded to the fact that the pervasive examination-oriented system is one of the major barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies. T13 exemplifies this:

As you know this is an exam society. Parents, teachers [and] students, we all grow up learning that we have to write…examination and we must perform the best at it no matter what (T13/I/18/04/2016).
An exegesis of the statement above implies that the education-system is highly exam-oriented and result-oriented. Furthermore, the teachers contended that the examination had a profound influence on their teaching as T5 explains:

Well I teach to facilitate the exam right. If I have to teach the entire syllabus, we would not be able to meet the needs of the exam. So that happens with a lot of subjects as well, you teach for the exam

(T5/I/09/03/2016).

In a similar vein T14 pointed out:

As much as you would like to do...an in-depth analysis of Caribbean culture, identity, and communication, you can’t. End result is to get a one in the [examination] and a scholarship...You have to focus on what is coming for the exam and gear yourself towards that rather [than] go in depth (T14/I/2/05/2016).

This perspective suggests that priority was on obtaining great test scores, so teachers felt that they had to prepare students for the examination. Examination therefore meant that teachers were teaching to the test and this resulted the curriculum being truncated. Certain content areas were omitted that were not included in the exam (see section 4.3.2). However, they included content that reflected what was on the examination. Teachers used examination past papers (see also section 4.3.3) to ensure that they did not overlook any of these key areas.

T18 provided details:

We use a lot of past exam papers from all over...[W]e start the [exam] module 1 essay writing very early because that’s the five-hundred-word essay and that’s where you get the problem (T18/I/18/05/2016).

High-stakes examination guided teaching and learning activities in the classroom as teachers had to “pick and choose” (T19/I/17/05/2016) those areas that were in concert with the examination. Other activities and skills were not given priority.
It also seemed that teachers were judged based on their examination results. It is used as a measure to evaluate their performance which puts a lot of pressure on the teachers. This was a reason given by teachers for matching their chosen content areas, activities and skills based on the examination requirement. Discussing this tension and dilemma T15 commented:

We teach towards passing the exam and we miss out on a lot, you know, that discussion in class. I would have loved to do some outings [school excursions] and bring in resource persons to talk about language. But because of time constraints and working toward this exam and passing the exam, we cannot. And in a school like this especially…a Prestige school they are working towards scholarships. You have to produce a one in Communication Studies and you have to get scholarships. There is that extra pressure to do well…and sometimes I feel I miss out on class time for that (T15/I/26/02/2016).

Commenting on this further, T1, stated:

Students are unfortunately…more qualification-oriented and certification-oriented because we all know this is a high-stake exam for them…we are answerable to the principal, parents, teachers, alumni [and] everyone else. And it is not that we don’t want to spend the time to get into the depth of the [work], we have to do it in a limited way. Students want what is necessary for the examination. You have to let them know, well you need to have a holistic view of things, but at the end of the day I may be looking at that in my classroom, but they are seeing it from the perspective of what is the requirement of the exam (T1/I/09/03/2016).

There is a general sense that a critical priority for parents, administration, students and society at large is success at the examination. The main purpose of education then seemed teaching for examinations, as a high-test score and a scholarship are evidence of students’ successful learning. Even though teachers believe that just teaching for the test is not what education is about, they gave in due to the pressure and stakeholders’ expectations. T19 expounded further the inescapable nature of this, referring particularly in her case to additional accountability by the ‘board’ that govern the school:
This school, I can’t understand the ‘board’ sometimes. They display your results and they would put your name up with a graph from last term to this term, and they would look at the results. They may not give you the resources and all of that to help you, but all they looking at are the graphs. How [many] ones, how [many] twos and how [many] threes. So, you could understand sometimes how demotivating it could be for some teachers (T19/I/17/05/2016).

This implies that in addition to being judged by parents, students, and principals, the school board also expects successful results or else the teachers would be humiliated and embarrassed by displaying their results. The high stakes-examination therefore, obstructed these teachers’ motivation and willingness to embrace all the innovative features of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. There is also the fact that CAPE Communication Studies is a key subject needed for students to obtain scholarships to enter university. This compounded the accountability issues and pressured teachers further to concede to the demands of the examinations as they did not want to jeopardize students’ chances to obtain scholarships.

Furthermore, all the teachers indicated that they do see the importance of including so much more of the other skills and competencies suggested in the syllabus but again the examination system deters them from fully implementing these areas. This sentiment is reflected by T4:

My philosophy is that education should be about learning and not just about preparing to pass an exam. I find often times we end up trying to train the children to pass the exam and, so learning is really hampered. So, you know they leave, they pass the exam. Sometimes I question myself as a teacher, did I do an injustice to the students, did I actually help them? Yes, they got the certificate...fantastic, [but] how much did they learn at the end of the day (T4/I/5/06/2015)?

Teachers recognized the importance of teaching beyond the examination but the reality, however, was that the education system remained the same with high-stakes examination. This was the dominant force in the secondary school system. However, as the teachers implied, a
wrong precedent is set when the emphasis is for “students [to] become good at performing in examination but less effective in the kinds of communication, interpersonal and future learning skills demanded by society” (Deng and Carless, 2010, p. 301). What was evident is that a chasm was created between choosing content and skills that were congruent with the exam and facilitating the holistic development of students. However, the teachers bowed to the pressure and focused on the examination. They alluded to the fact that given the entrenched examination-oriented system that exists in Trinidad and Tobago, “the learning aspect of an education reform is overshadowed by the assessment aspect” (Kwok, 2014, p. 52).

4.4.1.2 Approaches to curriculum innovation

All the teachers contended that they do not feel a sense of ownership to the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. They did not have any input in the development nor were they consulted on policy issues. T7 gives details:

I think that something as drastic as making changes to a curriculum, the implementers of the curriculum who are the teachers on the field, they should have a lot of input into what goes into the curriculum and what changes are made. At the end of the day we have to teach it, we have to implement, we have to do everything possible to make it work. We can’t just have an idea in our head, sit down and put it in writing and not consult those who have to be out there and have to implement it (T7/I/17/4/2015).

Teacher 1 explains this further:

Everything that CXC presents to us we are the last to know and this was again something that we had to deal with… We are not involved at the policy level and the strategic level. We are only told afterwards that you must implement this. So, in terms of that decision-making process and understanding the reasons, the background for what is the necessity, what is the void we are trying to fill, teachers are left out of that process. Unfortunately, it is not communicated to us effectively. We are simply at the level of here is the syllabus teach it…As a teacher you need to understand and
appreciate the value of what you are presenting to the children because then you can be passionate about it. So as teachers we are not involved in the process and decision-making, then how can you expect us to be passionate with regard to the area that we have to present and to be able to transfer that to the students? So, you can always feel as if you are forced to do something (T1/I/09/03/2016).

These perspectives imply that CAPE Communication Studies was top-down and managed from outside the school by CXC. Teachers were just informed about the innovation and this made them feel left out of the entire process. Moreover, it made them feel unprepared to implement the changes in the classroom. Teachers were therefore relegated an inferior status, which negatively affected their implementation. They did not feel a sense of commitment or passion toward the innovation. It was a mandate that was forced on them instead.

It also seemed that teachers continued to be overlooked in the decision-making process in relation to new changes that are made. This was particularly true as the short response structured type examination paper was replaced with the multiple-choice examination paper. T16 also recalled what ensued:

In terms of the development of CAPE [Communication Studies] of course we felt that policy makers made that decision and there was no consultation. But now that it is here and teachers are compelled to do it, we would like very much to be included in the decision-making even if we are reviewing or revising the curriculum. We…want CXC to get feedback from us before making a decision about something like that. For example, CXC moved away from the structured paper to the multiple choice. This is the second year we are going into the multiple choice…[B]ut many teachers preferred the structured because with the multiple choice it is so 'cut and dry'. Students can guess whereas with the structured paper they have to work a little harder to put their answers on paper…And we got like a memo in September and then the following May-June, it was multiple choice. No consultation (T16/I/26/02/2016).

In fact, there was consensus among the teachers that the multiple-choice paper was not a good idea at all as CXC didn’t provide proper structural resources to accompany the change. Moreover, they
were just informed about it through a memorandum from the Ministry of Education and had to begin implementation of it. T2 noted:

I think that it is unfair. I think that teachers should have a part to play. After all we are the ones who have to bring this to the classroom and when they just throw things at us, like they just threw the multiple choice paper, we have no resources, we have no past papers…We have to find time now to come up with item banks and so on. It is very difficult for us to deal with this multiple choice (T2/I/9/03/2016).

Teachers’ voices and opinions continue to be negated with new changes to the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. Moreover, it is presumed that the teachers will just be compliant recipients of the innovation and implement it as intended by CXC. However, this is not always the case as policy developers like CXC do not take into consideration the contextual realities of the classroom and the school. In fact, “nice lofty ideas must be in sync with the reality of the working situation” (T15/I/26/02/2016). Teachers felt that their views are important. T4 sums this up:

As a teacher you would hope that they would value your opinion. You have experience, you are in the field, and you are dealing with it. [Yet], it always feels as though people come in higher positions and [are] not au-courtant with the reality of the situation and they are just imposing all these changes without having a fair perspective of what is happening. So, you feel a little bit rejected and unappreciated…You need to own it right…there is no ownership here! So, you are given something new to teach and …it can really kill the teachers’ passion because your voice, you feel like you [are] not being heard. If you are not, then you don’t have that passion to communicate with the children (T4/I/5/06/2015).

This suggests that teachers felt demoralized and disheartened as they had no agency on matters that concerned them.

A few teachers (T15, T10) also felt that there were other areas of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation that needed to be changed as there were contradictions and inconsistencies inherent
that surfaced during their implementation of it in the classroom. However, again they lamented that they were not given an opportunity to have a say on policy issues. For instance, T10 argued that the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus promulgates the importance of the Trinidad Creole and that it is a legitimate language, yet, it is not given any priority in the syllabus in terms of assessment. T10 believes that students should be allowed to orally present their internal assessment using Trinidad Creole. In this vein, it will really match the objectives of the syllabus, instead of students just using solely Standard English:

The curriculum says that we should never refer to Trinidad Creole as improper or wrong…[B]ut I am sensing contradictions because the instruction is pretty clear, if you are doing the oral presentation it must be done in Standard English…I think sometimes we are fooling the students. If the Trinidad Creole is a legitimate language and must be valued, then I feel the students should get the opportunity to use it, at least to do the oral presentation (T10/I/17/4/2015).

Another dimension in terms of the internal assessment (IA) is proposed by T15:

They need to be a bit more creative and fearless with the IA (internal assessment). For example, with the internal assessment you have the oral part. There is a part where they have to give a reflection. This reflection could be in any genre, but it’s written. Why is it written? Why can’t they act it out? …There is room for a lot more creativity (T15/I/6/02/2016).

In other words, T10 and T15 believed that the internal assessment should be more creative and allow the students to use the Trinidad Creole. The IA is made up of a portfolio that includes several sections. One of the sections is an exposition where students present orally on the topic using a theme of their choice. Another section is a written reflection on the theme using one literary genre. T10 believes that the exposition could be presented using the Trinidad Creole and T15 contends that consideration should also be given to allow students to dramatize the written part as this
section deals with reflections using the genres from poetry, drama and short story.

Evidently, the top-down approach that continues to be affiliated with the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation is a barrier to teachers’ implementation of it in the classroom. Policy changes are outside of the schools. Although teachers have recommendations for improvement, they are not given that power to influence any of the changes as there is no forum to accommodate this. What obtains is generally a one-way type of communication on syllabus changes via written correspondence.

4.4.1.3 Insufficient government funding and resources

Findings also indicated that all the teachers concurred that insufficient provision of resources and funding were a barrier to the successful implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. T2 notes:

I think the government can outfit at least the form six classrooms with the technology. We have a little IT lab so certain classes would go and use it. They are going out there into the world with technology. They should have everything they require in a classroom (T2/I/9/03/2016).

T14 reinforces this:

We are talking about Communication Studies. We are also talking about the use of technology in communication as a major part of the syllabus. but yet we don’t have access to it. So it’s like you talking to them about how technology impacts their communication process yet you doing it from a text book or a handout… [W]e are supposed to educate these students on these things and yet we don’t have the resources and its demotivating to say the least (T14/I/2/5/2016).

This implies that technology and multimedia resources are indispensable in teaching Communication Studies, yet these resources are insufficient in schools.
Furthermore, most of the teachers posit that even when they have the physical equipment, the physical infrastructure such as the audio-visual room poses even more challenges in using technology. T5 explains:

Infrastructure does not allow the use of multimedia…I would use a photocopying machine to photocopy things and take to the classroom as resources…Our audio-visual (AV) room does not facilitate our class at all. The air-condition does not work there. The room is too small, it’s hot, it’s very uncomfortable so we cannot use the multimedia in the classroom at all and we don’t have outlets that work in the classroom (T5/I/5/06/2015).

T4 adds:

But the reality at my school for instance, is that it is very difficult to get a multimedia projector. The AV room for years now I think the air-condition isn’t working…we have no WIFI, so the use of technology in the school is limited, so we can’t explore that part of the syllabus very much with our teaching (T4/I/05/06/2015).

The reality is that in most cases teachers were unable to use multimedia resources on a regular basis due to various challenges, for instance, outlets that were not working, no internet service and poor infrastructure.

Eight teachers also recommended that all schools need to have a language lab to effectively facilitate the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. T1 contends:

We need the language labs. It is critical in this subject area. I don’t think the curriculum personnel would have really taken into account the fact that more than seventy-five percent of our schools are not equipped to teach a subject as Communication Studies with the limited facilities that we have. That is a major drawback to the success of this subject. We [are] successful in getting our very good grades, but at the same time the goal of the curriculum, I would say, is not really achieved because the students will go out to university and will still lack language appreciation awareness (T1/I/9/03/2016).

This suggests that without proper multimedia resources to aid in the delivery of the syllabus, students are not able to explore their full potential
and crucial skills. A dilemma among the teachers therefore is that good grades do not necessarily mean quality learning.

All the teachers also relayed that the library facilities do not meet the demands of the Communications Studies innovation. T11 posits:

We have stuff in the library but…it is more general stuff we have in terms of resources. We do not have anything relevant to Communication Studies (T11/I/2/3/2016).

T2 also articulates:

We do not really get anything from the Ministry. At one point we used to get textbooks, but we have not gotten in a while (T2/I/9/03/2016).

Government failure to provide proper library resources and textbooks to students are other areas of contention for most of the teachers. Evidently, the insufficient resources hampered teachers’ implementation efforts.

4.4.1.4 Ineffective professional development and training

There was consonance among all the teachers that professional development and training is critical to successful implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. However, this was not forthcoming as the teachers that attended workshops and training concurred that generally they were ineffective, insufficient, untimely, short, rushed and ad hoc. T4 exemplifies this:

Workshops are few and far between. I can’t say that they had many or I have attended many. And I am always asking, looking, liaising as I said with colleagues from other schools. When they do happen so much time has passed and so many changes have taken place. Does that make sense? Workshops are short, either one day [or] two days. It is not sufficient to communicate to teachers about the expectations of the syllabus. I find sometimes they gloss over issues and items that they really need to take time you know to inform teachers about (T4/I/5/06/2015).

Furthermore, teachers indicated that the workshops did not address their pertinent needs and various concerns. They were disappointed that their
voices were negated totally as the workshop took the form of knowledge transmission passed on from experts to submissive implementers. There was no feedback session or sharing of ideas at the workshops. T11 reflects:

We were lost...we didn’t know what was required of us. The workshops didn’t help. CXC could have had people come to schools before the workshops and ask us about what we needed out of the workshop. What we want to hear about, what are our particular issues, our questions. [This] didn’t happen. They had this big workshop that just spoke in a general way and [it] didn’t really target our needs and what we wanted (T11/I/2/3/2016).

T4 gives further details:

One area we all wanted them to give more information on was the mark scheme for the internal assessment component of the syllabus. It was vague. As a teacher you [had] to work out the specifics when you are marking so that you mark properly for the students...For instance, they say students must provide “excellent” or “good” or “unsatisfactory” evaluation. In the workshops you ask [them] a question to clarify this. But they do not address the issues. They do not give feedback. So, teachers do not have a say (T4/I/5/06/2015).

This implies that professional development and training was basically top down without specifically targeting teachers’ needs. It was one uniform workshop regardless of where they were in the change process. Additionally, the internal assessment rubric (see Appendix 18) that was given to teachers to score the students posed some difficulty especially the use of certain words under the ‘Exposition’ part of the internal assessment. However, this was ignored.

Another area that all the teachers who attended the workshop agreed on was that it failed to convey relevant information and clarify issues associated with the language and linguistics component and the internal assessment. T1 uses a metaphor of being stuck in the mud to explain the ineffectiveness of workshops:
After workshops you are still in the mud…trying to get to the shore…The workshop on Module 2, Language and Community was very boring, and the presenter did not seem well prepared or knowledgeable about this area. This is an area that we need more clarification on. We have our Literature degrees to teach Communication Studies but some of us did not do Linguistics courses at the University of the West Indies (U.W.I) that would help with the Linguistics part. So obviously we need more training in this area. If they could have a few training sessions on this, that would have been good (T1/I/9/03/2016).

All the teachers also raised concerns that CXC mandated the multiple-choice examination paper to replace the short-answer structured examination paper but there were no workshops to effectively communicate this change. T4 illuminates this:

Again, the change with the structured exam paper to the multiple-choice exam paper, I heard about it from a colleague. No workshop. Nobody said well you know we are only going to focus on certain issues. More than a year passed and you [are] now finding out about the multiple choice but still no workshop on it (T4/I/5/06/2015).

A few teachers (T11, T6, T8) were also unhappy as workshops did not address suitable training to implement skills and teaching practices applicable with the inclusion of student-centred activities that the syllabus demanded. T11 articulates:

Every year they should have a workshop for Communication Studies to show us, the teachers, approaches we need to know. Also, to give training on ‘how to teach’ using the new student-centred approaches. We could share ideas and…help each other. But I have not gone to a Communication Studies workshop in years, the last three years (T11/I/2/3/2016).

There was also the issue that the workshops failed to understand the implementation change process as the officials and experts charged with the power to manage and present at the workshops perceived change as an event (Hall and Hord, 2011) and expected that teachers would go back to class and “implement immediately” (T9/I/ 16/04/2015).
Additionally, two teachers (T1, T18) espoused that although the workshops were generally unhelpful, there was one that was held in 2008 on the internal assessment component that helped them. It provided some important insights and guidelines that assisted them with the IA. T1 recalled:

I do remember one workshop...that was on the IA. The [presenter] gave us an [IA] sample. He went through the sample. It was an excellent sample...Before that you had no idea what to do for the IA. The guidelines given in the syllabus were very limited. It is only after you had that sample, that you had something concrete to work with as a teacher...so that workshop was enlightening. But not the others. Now we don’t even have (T1/I/9/03/2016).

Furthermore, eight teachers (T2, T3, T5, T7, T12, T14, T15, T19) indicated that they never attended any of the CAPE Communication Studies workshops although most of them taught Communication Studies for basically about five years or less. T12 contends:

Unfortunately, I have never been to a workshop. It is a saddening situation. Communication Studies is one of the main requirements to get into the University of the West Indies [but] teachers are not getting feedback on how to implement better or improve their teaching skills. Workshops are so important, and I have never been to one (T12/I/9/03/2016).

T19 also laments:

No Communication Studies workshop...I think they need to have workshops alright. I think workshops would help even if it’s every year. You have a workshop to empower teachers alright because the syllabus is very heavy. If you focus on different areas of the syllabus, helping teachers to understand...different areas and concepts of the syllabus, it will help. We need help in all areas. It is new to us (T19/I/17/5/2016).

This implies that CAPE Communication Studies workshops were not ongoing. It seems that CXC and the Ministry of Education (MOE) provided a few workshops very early, right after the innovation was launched in Trinidad and Tobago. Evidently, the newer teachers did not have that privilege of attending a workshop, but they believe that “it
would be beneficial” (T17/I/26/2/2016) as it would help them become “better teachers” (T14/I/2/5/2016).

These views are indicative of teachers’ convergence that the professional development workshops were a barrier to their implementation. The unavailability of workshops also equally impacted negatively on the classroom practice of the eight teachers that never had the opportunity for any training from the Ministry of Education and CXC. Furthermore, it was evident that the hierarchical workshops did not provide the subject content knowledge that teachers needed to implement the innovation effectively. This was because teachers were not given the opportunity to select the areas that were significant to them. Moreover, the workshops did not provide training for teachers based on the new suggested teaching and learning strategies. It was obvious as well that the workshops were not streamlined to address the challenges that affected the teachers during their implementation or give them any voice in determining the planning and organization of it. Long-term training, follow-up visits and feedback after workshops were clearly absent. In fact, the workshops:

Made no attempt to find out ‘where the teachers are now’ – to identify their existing practices and beliefs, and contexts that they worked in, and to use these as a starting point to discuss the new practices (Wedell, 2009, p. 36).

4.4.1.5 Extra-lessons

Another barrier that influenced the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation is the influence of extra-lessons. Eight teachers (T 2, T1, T13, T17, T18, T19, T3, T15) were adamant that students’ pursuit of extra-lessons affected how the innovation was implemented in their classrooms. This sentiment was echoed by T1:

4.4.1.5 Extra-lessons
You are forced to teach [students] for an examination…As I mentioned earlier the extra-lessons culture means that the [students] come into class, who attend lessons with more content covered, with at least one of the modules covered. They want us to just cover what comes for exam like their lesson teachers. They want drills and practices in class just as in lessons. They want to specialize in certain subject areas, so they take lessons (T1/I/9/03/2016).

This suggests that the main goal of students pursuing extra-lessons is to excel at the examination. Significantly, this meant that the teachers felt forced to accommodate the students’ demand and employ a more teacher-centred approach with drills and practice. Students expected their class teachers to continue teaching and learning activities in the same mode as their extra-lesson teachers. T18 explains:

In lessons they do past papers and drills in huge classes. The whole class would go through past papers. If they do not understand, there is no time to give individual attention. So, I wonder why they are doing it. The students say their parents insist and they need the scholarship (T18/I/18/5/2016).

In other words, the approach used in extra-lessons is whole-class discussions using past papers. There is no avenue to focus on individual learners. Moreover, two major reasons are attributed for pursuing extra-lessons, parents’ motivation for it and the pressure students feel to be successful at the examination.

Moreover, students appear to place more focus on extra-lessons and prefer the methods used by these teachers. This is reflected in T2 comments:

Another challenge that we face is extra-lessons, that’s a real issue. The lessons teachers teach one thing, and you teach another. Then students will come and say ‘Miss, [our] lessons teacher did not say what you are saying.’ A lot of times they would go and not take our classes too seriously. They would take the lessons class teacher’s word. So sometimes they are absent for my class. They say they would make up in lessons class. For them, they believe we have to pass this [exam], we have to get our distinction because we have to get our open [scholarship]. They see lessons as making sure this happens. They are not interested in all [the] other classroom activities really (T2/I/9/03/2016).
T13 explains further:

Well, many of our students go to lessons. It is a culture of this school where they prefer to go to lessons as opposed to listening to the teacher. So, we have a problem where the information they are getting sometimes in lessons is clashing with our information. Also, we teach one way and our style might be different. Their lessons teacher would have a different style. But they are paying for lessons and believe in it. [The students] would come and tell us that we are doing the wrong thing. So, lessons I think impact in a negative way (T13/I/18/04/2016).

These perspectives confirm that extra-lessons are perceived by students as ensuring that they are successful at examinations. In fact, the students have more faith in the extra-lessons’ teachers than their classroom teachers as the approach and content delivered in lessons trained them specifically to pass the CAPE Communication Studies examination. The result is that they put pressure on their class teachers to adopt the style of the extra-lessons teacher.

Notably, of the eight teachers who indicated that extra-lessons were a barrier to their implementation, only one belonged to a Government school. The other teachers came from Government-assisted schools, where the teachers claim, “we are noted for scholarships every year and where the extra-lessons culture prevails” (T15/I/26/2/2016). The extra-lessons culture is a normal part of schooling as T18 posits:

It is a culture…you learn a little in school and you go for lessons in the evening, the more lessons you go to the more successful they are. It’s a culture and it’s hard to break off (T18/I/18/05/2016).

T1 further shared this view:

We also have a problem with lessons. By the time we get children in September, they would have already covered modules in lessons. So, the lessons culture is such that children are preparing for an examination. When I am trying to give the content for Communication Studies, what is being presented is not necessarily what the child wants to prepare for…Like I said the child who is
going to lessons is somebody who is gearing up for a scholarship. Therefore, what you are doing in class is like, ‘Miss show me the necessity, my lessons teacher does not do that. When are we going to start the questions? When are we going to start writing essays…the past papers for the examination?’ So that it is hard, it is really challenging for a Communication Studies teacher to get students to appreciate all the aspects that CXC would like us to appreciate (T1/I/9/03/2016).

It seems that even the students that attend government-assisted schools pursue extra-lessons to give them a better advantage of academic success. The teacher in the government school also admitted that the school “ranked high as they get a few scholarships even though it is a government school” (T13/I/18/09/2016). Extra-lessons therefore transcend both school types in Trinidad and Tobago. However, these were schools that had “a record of excelling at the examinations” (T17/I/26/2/2016).

4.4.1.6 Societal culture

Most of the teachers indicated that students’ resistance to the student-centred activities obstructed their implementation of the innovation. T1 explains:

We have a lot of students who are geared towards certification and you know getting scholarships…They are not prepared to engage in group activities…So while we would like the group activities…it is more of a burden for the children because they would prefer to get their work done quickly. So that is a challenge…[Y]ou want them to do the group activities so that everyone will learn. Sometimes it is hard…they prefer to be given the opportunity to work independently (T1/I/9/03/2016).

This is reiterated by T18:

Our students prefer spoon-feeding, they don’t like group work. They have all kinds of issues. They prefer you spoon feed them. It’s our culture you know, they don’t see themselves as actively involved in class. They are crammers, and they just want to sit and get the information (T18/I/18/5/2016).

T16 explains further:

Students prefer individual work…There is the idea of individuality and they don’t see the value in group work. They see that it is too much effort and they have to compromise, and they have to have a
leader. They have to mediate sometimes, and they do not want to do that. They just want to know that the syllabus is there. Miss is giving notes, handouts [and] they [are] studying for the exam…So they don’t really appreciate or want to do group work. They oppose it. They criticize and complain (T16/I/26/2/2016).

This shows that the students resisted group work as they didn’t see their role as active participants in the classroom. In Trinidad and Tobago students are accustomed to the traditional approach to learning (Sharma, 2007) where they just want to take notes. The students’ beliefs about how they should behave in the classroom were inconsistent with the demands of the innovation. This in turn is influenced by socio-cultural norms and values about appropriate classroom roles and conduct (Shamim, 1996).

Data revealed that a multiplicity of barriers negatively affected the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. As such, the CAPE Communication Studies innovation is still beset with many problems at the implementation stage. In other words, the external-related barriers have hindered teachers’ implementation of all the features that the innovation recommends.

4.4.2. School-contextual factors

Findings revealed that school-contextual factors also hindered teachers’ implementation efforts. These are: school culture and lack of principal’s support, and class size and time and syllabus demand.

4.4.2.1 School culture and lack of principal’s support

In terms of school culture seven teachers (T1, T2, T3, T4, T12, T18, T19) suggested that the lack of collaboration among staff members at their schools impeded the implementation of the CAPE Communications Studies curriculum innovation. T1 exemplifies this:
If I had collaboration it would have [have] definitely helped because then I would have had somebody to work with together and share ideas instead of just fending on my own (T1/I/9/03/2016).

T9 further adds:

The subject itself means that we need to talk, to share ideas. But the nature of the physical space, physical structure does not allow for that. We are isolated most of the time (T9/I/16/4/2015).

This suggests that teachers yearned for collaboration as the nature of CAPE Communication Studies necessitates ongoing collaboration to confront novel problems that arise during the implementation stage. However, this seemed elusive. Moreover, the physical structure of secondary schools with disparate classrooms that are compartmentalized reinforces individualism.

Furthermore, principals did not adjust the timetable to allow teachers to meet and share ideas. T18 explains:

The timetable is so packed that we have to be free. No time is put aside by the principal for us. You have to organize that on your own (T18/I/18/05/2016).

T19 also concurs with this view:

You know like some schools it would be time-tabled for a department to get together and discuss things, [but] that does not happen here...so when I was the Head of Department for me to talk to my teachers sometimes I pull them one by one...If we have to collaborate on something it might be recess and lunch time. I mean recess time is their recess time, their lunch time is their lunch time (T19/I/17/5/2016).

This indicates that timetabling could have alleviated teacher isolation to some extent in that teachers could get stipulated times every week to meet and discuss the innovation. However, this was ignored by administration. As such, teachers tried to meet on their own personal time.

Another issue that emerged was that these teachers felt that collaboration with colleagues would have better facilitated the implementation process, especially for the new teachers. T3 explains:
We do have the most superficial collaboration…A teacher came to do a lecture…and she was explaining that they put all the new teachers to teach Communication Studies at her school. They have on a weekly basis all the new teachers and the senior teachers sit together and basically discuss and find out anybody’s problem areas…The first thought in my head was ‘wow’ how come we don’t have that here (T3/I/15/03/2016)?

Teacher collaboration is critical for effective implementation as it allows the sharing of ideas and confronting challenges at the implementation stage.

The findings further revealed that there was consensus among five teachers (T3, T4, T10, T14, T15) that the lack of their principals’ support was a barrier in their implementation of the innovation. T4 explains:

The principal really never took interest or give us any kind of real support. The teachers were the ones who were involved in am, teaching the Communication [Studies] curriculum…we are the ones who really would have to go do the research, liaise with colleagues from other schools. Perhaps at one time I was liaising with the Curriculum Officer for myself…The principal might …pass on a circular to the teachers. [But] the teachers were the ones responsible you know about finding out about changes (T4/I/5/06/2015).

T3 also points out:

I don’t know if they had a role per say. I think the principal would just be happy that the classes are covered…To teach Communication Studies you are supposed to be able to just simply know. Again, it is the first time I am doing this so is not like I knew the syllabus at the back of my hand. It was just well, this is your class, the names for your class and that was kind of it (T3/I/15/03/2016).

This reveals that the principal was not supportive of the teachers in the change process as they felt that they were “pretty much on [their] own” (T10/I/17/4/2015). The principals did not really envision themselves as playing a critical role in the implementation of the curriculum innovation as they left the teachers to fend for themselves. Support was important for the teachers in their change effort and could have alleviated some of their challenges.
4.4.2.2 Large class size and time and syllabus demand

Large classes also made it difficult for five teachers (T4, T7, T13, T14 and T18) to implement CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. The teachers explained that it is difficult to manage a large class and give the students individual attention as they have different ‘learning styles’ (T18/I/18/5/2016). Furthermore, it was even more challenging to help individual students enhance their oral skills, especially for the internal assessment (IA) component. Even a practice session prior to the oral assessment, which is one area tested for the internal assessment proved difficult. Moreover, students’ oral skills are supposed to be developed throughout the year, but these teachers admitted that it was rarely done given the large class size. Additionally, large classes militated against class discussions where students’ participation is required. T14 exemplifies this:

Right now, class discussions and participation and conversations are very difficult with a large class. Thirty-five from my opinion is smaller than we had. It’s normally forty...And it is challenging because when you engage students in discussions, and thirty-five students talking, it becomes chaos...Furthermore, to go through the oral interview with them and give them oral skills, it becomes difficult...due to the [number] of students. All communication should be unique to an individual. Everybody has different traits that you need to work with...It’s very tough because of the time to manage a large class (T14/I/2/5/2016).

The average class size for these teachers was between thirty-five to forty students, which they considered very large given the rigors of the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus. They explained that since Communication Studies is a compulsory subject all the form six students are mandated to do it so that they can attain proper certification at the form six level. This is why they have large classes. However, the teachers recommended that the class size for this specific subject should “not have more than twenty students” (T18/I/18/5/2016). T13 further explained that smaller classes would certainly help:
Large classes would be a problem because we cannot attend to the individual needs of the students... I would like smaller groups of students where we can have more interactions with them. In this way I think I would be able to get more group work and have presentations done with a smaller group of students (T13/I/18/04/2016).

Similar views were expressed by T4, but more in relation to the challenges experienced with the marking of the IA:

Marking is an issue with large classes. Marking scripts is an issue... when it comes to preparing for the IA again it is extremely time consuming because you have to ensure that each child meets the requirement. It takes a long time because you have to go through at some point every child’s script... So it takes very long to mark the scripts and return scripts... It’s very difficult to manage in terms of numbers, especially when you are preparing for the IA (T4/I/5/06/2015).

The findings show that it is important for school principals and Ministry of Education (MOE) and CXC to put mechanisms in place to reduce the CAPE Communication Studies class size as it negatively affected teachers’ implementation. It is difficult to manage in terms of marking the IA and catering to the individual students’ needs. It also deterred teachers sometimes when they wanted to include more oral skills and student-centred activities.

All the teachers also concurred that time and syllabus demand are other barriers to successful implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. They expressed their displeasure with the expansive CAPE Communication Studies syllabus and the limited time that they have to implement it. The time to teach all that the syllabus demanded is unrealistic and inadequate. This is exemplified by T7:

I found that in terms of actually delivering the curriculum it was very, very limited in terms of time... As well as in trying to keep up with the curriculum and all what they have outlined for teachers to follow in terms of student activities and teachers’ activities. I think basically we just have approximately about nine months to work with. In addition, to that we have to factor in the Internal Assessment (T7/I/17/4/2015).
This is reiterated by T15:

The time is too short to do the subject area unless I think maybe the objectives are reduced… The list of objectives from the syllabus is way too much to cover in about one year (T15/I/26/2/2016).

Time constraints hindered teachers from employing more activities in the classroom and accomplishing all the objectives indicated. It was also difficult to complete the IA. Most of the teachers had an average of six sessions, forty-five minutes long each week or in some cases eight sessions, thirty-five minutes long. This compelled the teachers to rush and skip some areas that they believe are irrelevant to the examination. Teachers indicated that they had no choice but to use their time to ensure at least examination areas were covered. T1 provided details:

We have eight periods for Communication Studies… [O]ur period is thirty-five minutes so that eight periods for a week does not cover the requirements of the syllabus…It’s hard for us to get the required time [on] the timetable. So first of all, your time allocation is a hindrance. So when you planning you have to think about how much work the[student] has to do on his own to get the subject and to get the syllabus covered…[T]he syllabus does suggest that you have a lot of classroom activities but because of the time constraints you cannot have as much activities. Exams have to be given enough time (T1/I/9/03/2016).

T11 also adds:

My problem [is] not having enough time. Many times when the exam comes around, I have to rush stuff down…just so I would cover the exam…This means I don’t have time to do any sort of pair work, or group work, or research projects because of the time issue…[I] make sure and cover everything before the exams but I do not explore all of the topics properly you know (T11/I/2/3/2016).

Furthermore, T10 explained in more detail how difficult it was for him to complete correcting all the IA drafts in the given time frame:

The IA takes up so much time and to be frank…it interferes with the teaching of the subject because it is so demanding…Within the first month when students come in, you have to start to work on the IA if you intend to finish it (T10/I/17/07/2015).
All the teachers were equally concerned that the official time of the examination in May every year is not practical given the expansive syllabus. Teachers indicated that CXC and the Ministry of Education did not take into consideration that public holidays, several school activities and Easter, and summer school breaks meant that more time was lost. T7 contends:

“We have a lot of school vacation. We have Easter, we have summer. The way the Ministry and CXC…structure their exams to me, it was not really in keeping with our school activities… For example, when school is closed for [Easter] and students get their [exam] timetable slips, they stay away from school. We are checking a time frame of September to March to complete an entire curriculum. The people in charge…need to be aware and work with what the schools have to work with (T7/I/17/04/2015).

What is suggested is that teachers needed more planning and instructional time to effectively implement all areas of the Communication Studies curriculum. There were too many content areas to cover. Areas such as “language experience in all the Caribbean territories were perceived as unnecessary” (T12/I/9/03/2016).

Also, to realistically implement all the group work and pair work activities and the communicative skills would require a lot of time, which was not forthcoming. Moreover, teachers could barely manage to spend proper time on the IA assessment component. As time constraints were not addressed, teachers preferred to tailor their time to ensure that all the relevant examination content and skills were covered. Therefore, these findings show that it is important that CXC and the Ministry of Education understand the whole context in which the innovation has to be implemented. They also need to provide time to suit the innovation demands or else all the goals envisioned will never materialize.
4.4.3 Innovation-related factor

Findings revealed that the only innovation-related factor that hindered teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation is a lack of clarity.

4.4.3.1 Lack of clarity

The interview data showed that a lack of clarity about the CAPE Communication Studies innovation was found to be a barrier by most of the teachers. There was convergence among all the teachers that the recent multiple-choice component that was literally imposed on them was not clear. They did not understand specifically the areas in the syllabus it could cover. This fear of not understanding was compounded by the fact that they had no prior workshops to explain the rationale for the change and proper guidelines on how it would fit into the syllabus. This is effectively captured by T4:

I actually do not enjoy the multiple-choice section simply because again I feel lost in terms of what they are testing… I heard it will maintain the structure of the items in the structured paper just in a multiple-choice form. I cannot say based on the [C.X.C] sample provided that it is necessarily true and as no workshops to clarify. The [students] already have a lot to cope with. The multiple-choice item I think is only going to add more stress to both teacher and student because they can test anything and everything. It is going to be difficult because time again is a factor. I cannot possibly teach every single thing that is required (T4/I/5/06/2015).

What is suggested is that the lack of ineffective workshops to explain the change and give proper guidelines about the multiple-choice component contributed to teachers’ lack of understanding as it pertains to this area.

Additionally, there were variations among the teachers in terms of other specific areas that they needed further clarification on. This was not uniform as teachers were at different stages in the implementation process. For instance, T4 recalled that for years many aspects of the syllabus were confusing to her and while she has now understood some of
the ‘grey’ areas, other areas remain nebulous. An analogy was offered by T4 to explain this:

I cannot say that everything was clear… I did have confusion when I… was handed [the] syllabus the first time. When I was asked to teach it, there were a lot of things that confused me, and I really had to try and trash out on my own. And I felt like you were being thrown into the ocean there with no help. It was difficult. Only when I had the workshop two years after…it gave me some sense of comfort and clarity. Still, today there are things in the [syllabus] that are not clear like the multiple choice. And if you are a new teacher…it will pose a challenge to [those] you know trying to attempt to teach the syllabus for the first time (T4/I/5/06/2015).

Other teachers (T19, T8, T15) indicated that the analysis section of the internal assessment (IA) was difficult to understand as they were uncertain how to analyse communicative behaviours and attitudes to language. They felt that the guidelines in the syllabus for the IA were very limited and lacked thorough detail and explanation. T8 summed this up:

So, in order to prepare the students for the internal assessment there were certain things that we needed to know. A new teacher like myself had a big problem doing this because some of the areas as in the analysis section, such as communicative behaviours and attitudes to language were not clear or detailed (T8/I/16/4/2015).

Some teachers (T19, T5, T11, T15, T8, T16) also indicated that they needed to garner a clearer understanding of some areas in the ‘Language and Community’ module. T11 articulated:

The syllabus does not really explain everything and particularly it goes into too much depth as far as linguistics is concerned but without proper explanation. So much depth about the range of languages and how the history influenced the language situation in many regions. The module 2 is so vague in this. There is also another issue where we have to…compare the English Creole to that of the Standard English. But we are not sure of all the features ourselves and the syllabus just gives a few examples. This is where we need a workshop to address this. But that did not happen (T11/I/2/3/2016).

This means that these teachers needed to get a better understanding of specific areas of Module 2 that the syllabus should have provided. Moreover, they did not do Linguistic courses at The University of the
West Indies (UWI). As such, they needed to understand how many features to include when comparing the Standard English to the English Creole. They were uncertain also about the depth they needed to go in terms of the range of languages and its history and in how many territories. The teachers however, underscored the importance of having workshops to address this need but unfortunately the workshops were insufficient.

Furthermore, two teachers (T2, T11) needed clarification about nebulous concepts and terms that were used in the syllabus. These included the difference between the ‘purpose’ of language and the ‘function’ of language as well as the difference between ‘techniques’ and ‘strategies’. T2 gives details:

The difference between purpose and function of language…is not very clear. [The students] also ask what the difference is between ‘techniques’ and ‘strategies’. Nowhere in any textbook you would get that information. Unless of course CXC would send a report for us and then we would have to figure it out. There are no clear-cut guidelines for us on how to interpret certain things. We have to figure it out on our own. I feel CAPE is a work in progress; I have to say in terms of Communication Studies. They are still trying to find themselves as well. Sometimes, it takes a little while to figure out what it is they really asking for so I can go to my class and explain to them.

Teachers’ lack of understanding in several areas, specifically, with the IA, and Module 2, was a barrier to the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. Notably, the workshops were untimely and did not cater to their needs.

4.5 Perceived factors that facilitate the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation

Research question four:
What are teachers’ perspectives of the factors that facilitate the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?
In the previous section, I reported on teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation (see section 4.4). I now discuss the factors that facilitated teachers’ implementation of the Communication Studies curriculum innovation. The themes with relevant sub-themes that emerged from the semi-structured interview data are teacher willingness and commitment (teacher-related factor) and school culture and principal support (school-contextual factor).

4.5.1 Teacher-related factor

Only one teacher-related factor emerged that facilitated the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, teacher willingness and commitment.

4.5.1.1 Teacher willingness and commitment

Although there were numerous barriers that hindered teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, this study also highlighted that there were a few facilitators that aided in the implementation of the innovation. However, this was not the experience of all the teachers. Three teachers (T19, T16, T14) contended that teachers’ willingness and commitment facilitated their implementation of the innovation. Teachers’ willingness and drive to understand the syllabus, as T14 noted, “came down to your personality and enthusiasm and your energy levels and all these things” (T14/I/2/05/2016). Enthusiasm and commitment about the syllabus can be demonstrated by the approach applied by the teachers to deliver the syllabus. Teacher 19 confirmed this by indicating:

If a teacher is not enthusiastic about the syllabus, she is going to transfer that spirit to the children. They are not going to be too interested either. But if the teacher is really enthusiastic about it and
you know you really like communication and you could show how valuable it is and you pass it on to your students, they take a different approach to the subject (T19/I/17/5/2016).

Significantly, T19 emphasized through this narrative the importance of being knowledgeable in the field and transferring that in a positive way that further raised students’ interests about the subject. T4 further underscored that “willingness to go and do research helped” (T4/I/05/06/2015). Sometimes a teacher’s willingness and enthusiasm to implement the curriculum entailed attaining additional resources that facilitated better delivery of the course in the classroom. T16 elucidated:

I remember having to ask my principal for time to go up to UWI to do research because you know it was something that was new, and you really have to do research before going to the classroom. It’s not something like General Paper where you can just pull from a TIMES magazine and discuss an issue (T16/I/26/02/2016).

T16 was willing and committed to drawing a better understanding of the innovation by seeking resources available at the university. This implies that although teacher willingness and commitment were factors revealed by just a few teachers, it was still important as it assisted in their implementation efforts.

4.5.2 School-contextual factor

Only one school-contextual factor emerged which facilitated the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation which was school culture and principal support.

4.5.2.1 School culture and principal support

Teacher collaboration was a facilitator in the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. However, this was evident with only three teachers (T14, T15, T16). The three teachers were able to collaborate with more experienced teachers in the subject area.
collaboration allowed the teachers to brainstorm ideas with each other about aspects of the CAPE curriculum innovation. T14 explains:

I did the subject myself to prepare, but if it was not for the assistance of a fellow teacher who was more experienced in the subject and kind of guided me, I would have been totally lost. So, I am very appreciative to her and think that it is necessary. Going forward it allows teachers to bounce ideas off each other, especially because CAPE is an intense subject and curriculum (T14/I/2/05/2016).

T15 also reinforces this:

I think we will definitely help each other to come up with ideas and come up with solutions. Again, Ms.[X] helps a lot, she would try to help us who are new and now learning. She would even come sometimes and teach a particular class just to help (T15/I/26/02/2016).

Unfortunately, this suggests that collaboration was not the norm among most teachers. However, the findings indicate that there were some instances of team spirit that assisted these teachers to confront some of the challenges that they faced during the implementation process.

Significantly, eight teachers voiced the way that the support of their principals facilitated their implementation. Some principals encouraged the sharing of expertise among staff. In one instance, a principal who taught the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus mentored a new teacher at her school who had to implement the curriculum. T6 recalled aspects of this experience by highlighting:

We had a different principal at that time in our school and she was the person in charge with teaching the Communication Studies at that point in time. When I entered, I received some mentoring from her, I attended a few classes with her, and she would go through the syllabus with me. She was the one who suggested that I work on the mark schemes myself so that I could really go through the syllabus…to see…what is required, and I got a lot of advice from her as a result (T6/I/21/04/2016).

In another instance, a supportive principal encouraged members of staff to switch periods to enable effective teaching and learning of the syllabus.
T18 recounted, “if we ask our principal if we could switch with another teacher for an extra period, he would facilitate us” (T18/I/18/05/2016).

Another supportive principal provided monetary assistance by using petty cash to purchase additional resources for teachers who were implementing the syllabus. T19 explained:

When the principal gets petty cash money, she would say Miss do this, do that. She would do anything to help me implement the syllabus and children benefitted (T19/I/17/05/2016).

Notably, the principal’s ability to attain resources for teachers helped a little with delivery of the curriculum. Some of the resources were in the form of monetary assistance for extra reading material, the invitation of additional personnel to provide lectures to students, and the promotion of encouragement and support from peers. Teacher 7 explained:

In terms of resources I was given as much help as I could possibly have because of the fact that I was new to CAPE. I wanted to really do the correct thing and try my very best so as much help as I could have gotten, I did get it from administration. Resources, books, and a guest lecturer for the children we got. I think we had one area in Module 2 when somebody came in and talked about it (T7/I/17/04/2015).

Along similar lines T11 discussed the integral role the principal played in facilitating teachers’ understanding and readiness of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. T11 elucidated:

He was really supportive to us. We got any help we needed. I think he bought somebody from Convent in the first year to talk to us, and he gave us time off to have this person speak to us and that kind of thing, so that helped in the beginning in understanding the syllabus because this person had done it two years before (T11/I/02/03/2016).

Both narratives from T7 and T11 confirmed the pivotal roles that the principals played in preparing them for the innovation, specifically in the early phase of implementation. In a timely manner the principals in both cases invited personnel to assist staff in their
preparation of the innovation. T7’s emphasis that “we were new” (T7/I/17/04/2015) and T11’s phrase “in the first year” (T11/I/02/03/2016) suggested that the support of their principals in the early phase of implementation facilitated their receptivity to the innovation.

Additionally, the introduction of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum required the use of technology. T13 discussed the principal’s drive to assist teachers in her school with proper technological aid without the assistance of the Ministry of Education. T13 explained:

Well he could do what he would usually do in terms of getting the equipment fixed. The Ministry of Education does not get these things fixed anymore. He, however, makes these things available for us to use in the classroom or the AV [audio-visual] room in the library (T13/I/18/04/2016).

T1 also highlighted that an administrative change at the school resulted in a new principal who was supportive of providing technology to facilitate the teaching and learning process. T1 contended, “at the time we did not have multimedia but with new principal now we have multimedia” (T1/I/09/03/2016).

These examples imply that there were a few principals who tried through various means to prepare and assist their staff in the implementation of the innovation. However, the support varied and was individualized for these teachers. Their experiences in terms of the principal’s support were not consistent.

### 4.6 Summary

The main purpose of this study is to understand how teachers are implementing the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation and the factors that influence their implementation in the classroom. The findings suggest that although all the teachers held positive views (see section 4.2) about the innovation, these beliefs were
not transferred to the classroom. Implicit in the findings therefore is that there are gaps in the implementation of the innovation. There is incongruence between the intended innovation and classroom practice which led to implementation challenges. This was due to several barriers. School-contextual factors, external-contextual factors, and an innovation-related factor simultaneously affected the implementation of the innovation. The difficulties that teachers endured were as a result of interrelated factors in the wider education system, societal level, school level and the innovation-related level. However, the more pervasive influence was at the external-contextual level and school-contextual level. These findings also point to the views held by others in Trinidad and Tobago, that implementation is largely unsuccessful as the norm is to introduce education initiatives without a proper vision to effectively manage it during implementation (Hackett, 2004; James, 2008). Moreover, curriculum planners underestimated the influence of the visible and invisible (Wedell and Malderez, 2013) aspects of the wider societal context on classroom practice.

Findings also indicated that there were a few interrelated factors that facilitated the implementation process. These included teacher enthusiasm and commitment (teacher-related factor), and school culture and principal support (school-contextual factor). There were more factors that hindered the implementation than supported it. This suggests that the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Trinidad and Tobago has minimal success.

The following chapter will discuss the main findings as they relate to the research questions and in relation to the pertinent literature.
Chapter 5: Discussion

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I discuss the findings of the study in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2. The discussion of the findings will be guided by the overall purpose and aims, which are to examine teachers’ perspectives of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, the views that they hold about it and how they are implementing it in the classroom. Moreover, I argued that it was important to specifically investigate the factors that impede and facilitate the implementation of the innovation in order to better understand the reasons for implementation’s failure or success so that change will be more effectively planned and managed. The discussion thus illuminates these issues.

The main research method employed in this study was semi-structured interviews (see section 3.8.1) with nineteen teachers. Classroom observations of eight teachers (see section 3.8.2) and follow-up interviews (see section 3.7), field notes and documents (see section 3.8.3) were also employed to answer research question two. The observation data supported the findings of the interview data.

The findings have brought to light both convergent and divergent perspectives in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 of the study. Generally, the key message that emerged from this study suggests that the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation was not planned and managed effectively, which resulted in limited success. Policy developers and curriculum planners did not understand the complex nature of change (Fullan, 2016) as such; they did not consider the whole context, both visible and invisible (Wedell and Malderez, 2013), with interconnections among various levels. The implementation change process was perceived as simplistic without simultaneously considering concomitant changes in the “multiple complex
factors ranging from their cultural contexts” (Schweisfurth, 2011, p. 427),
the education system and sub-systems, the central actors (Ornstein, and
Hunkins, 2004) and the innovation attributes (Fullan, 2016; Rogan and
Grayson, 2003). In other words:

Policy rhetoric and implementation plans consistently belie the
magnitude of the task at hand, and the Realpolitik of governments’
desire to be making visible, positive, modern changes drives policy
forward at a pace which practice cannot match (emphasis in
original, Jansen, 1989; Dello-Lacovo, 2009 cited in Schweisfurth,
2011, p. 427).

This accounted for the implementation gaps or as Schweisfurth (2011, p.
428) coins “rhetoric-reality gulfs”.

Findings from nineteen teachers in this study indicate that
although the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation
commenced implementation since 2003 in Trinidad and Tobago, several
features of the innovation are still not implemented effectively as
teachers’ contextual realities are neglected. I have argued that contextually
appropriate implementation of an innovation is required as the “uncritical
transfer of best practice from donor countries… [hinders] efforts at
change” (Ibrahim, 2010 cited in De Lisle, 2012a, p. 64).

In this chapter, I will present “the whole picture of teachers’
experiences,” which “reveal a more holistic and relational view” (Grassick
and Wedell, 2018, p. 322) of how they implemented the CAPE
Communication Studies innovation. This is pertinent as “technical aspects
of curriculum change implementation alone” neglect the “phenomenology
of change” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 322). I begin by discussing
where the teachers were at the outset and how despite the positive
orientations, they had towards several principles of the innovation they
were unable to successfully implement most of them as intended. The
teachers did not perceive these aspects as practical given the reality of
their situations (Orafi and Borg, 2009). Instead they maintained their
traditional approach to teaching and learning. Next, I will discuss what made the Communication Studies innovation very challenging, providing a full picture of the interactive factors that resulted in implementation gaps and the conditions that are necessary to facilitate the successful implementation of the innovation.

5.2 Teachers’ orientation of the innovation

Findings from the study suggest that all the teachers had positive orientations (see section 4.2) about several principles of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. They embraced key aspects of the innovation as they felt that they were theoretically sound. This finding echoes results from previous studies reported in the literature (Abdullah et al, 2006; Ajayi, 2016; Lam, Alviar-Martin, Adler and Sim, 2013; Song, 2015; Tyson, 2003; Yin et al, 2014), where teachers enthusiastically endorsed the new curriculum due to the multitude of benefits to students’ development in various contexts. In spite of the nineteen teachers’ positive views in this study, there was ‘limited up-take’ (Orafi, 2008) of the innovation. Similar to the experience of the eleven teachers in Grassick and Wedell’s (2018) research, the teachers’ in this study, “actual experience of the implementation process seem to have acted as a counterbalance, pulling them towards a continuation of existing teaching practices and behaviours” (p. 322). They were only able to “make a paradigm shuffle” (Grassick, 2016 cited in Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 322). This means that:

Teachers are trying to cope with the new ideas and practices which a more communication-oriented curriculum requires, while at the same time making pragmatic decisions to continue with previous ways of working due to the constraints imposed by their largely unchanged working contexts (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 322).

Teachers’ eagerness and endorsement of the innovation were not reflected in their classroom practices. Therefore, a disconnect between the principles of the innovation and their practice ensued, resulting in
implementation gaps due to contextual and other factors, which is not uncommon in other studies (Agrawal, 2004; Canh and Barnard, 2009; Cuban, 2013; Gorsuch, 1999; Humphries and Burns, 2015; Li and Baldauf, 2011).

For instance, the teachers in this study also perceived that the CAPE Communication Studies innovation was needed (Fullan, 2016) and led to numerous benefits. For instance, they felt that it is more reflective of the Caribbean situation (see section 4.2.1) and the inclusion of the Caribbean cultural content is beneficial to students as it promulgates a sense of identity of their culture and heritage. They endorsed it further as the content includes an awareness of Caribbean ‘languages’, which allow Caribbean people to appreciate their unique language heritage. One may deduce that the teachers felt strongly about this issue because historically the Trinidadian Creole, which is first language or mother tongue of the inhabitants, has been relegated to an inferior status (Youssef, 1996). Over the years several Caribbean linguists have lobbied for Trinidadian Creole to not be perceived as a corruption of the English language (James and Youssef, 2004). Instead, students need to be exposed to a teaching and learning environment that facilitates Standard English without denigrating the Trinidadian Creole (Youssef, 1996). This is an aspect that is promoted in the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, hence, teachers’ endorsement of it. Historically, students’ use of Trinidadian Creole was mocked and devalued, which only promulgated negative attitudes towards the language (Youssef, 1996).

Furthermore, the teachers had positive beliefs about student-centred activities such as group work and pair work, as well as the teachers’ role as facilitator in the teaching and learning process (see section 4.2.3), in tandem with the findings of other empirical studies (Song, 2015; Tyson, 2003). Significantly, although teachers endorsed these aspects of the innovation, a myriad of interconnected external-contextual factors and school-contextual factors negatively affected their
implementation of all the principles that they embraced, which support previous studies (Grassick and Wedell, 2018; Lochan and Barrow, 2008; Sikoyo, 2010; Wadesango et al., 2016; Wang, 2006; Yin et al., 2014).

A discrepant finding therefore with previous literature (Pajares, 1992; Cain, 2012) and this study is related to teachers’ beliefs and classroom practice. For example, even though teachers had positive beliefs about the advantages of student-centred activities, those beliefs were not transferred to their classroom practice. Hence, the findings do not buttress the assertion in other studies that teachers’ beliefs about the teaching and learning process are compatible with their classroom practice (Fu and Sibert, 2017; Pajares, 1992). In fact, the variability between teachers’ beliefs and practice in this study emanates due to various contextual and other factors similar to other research studies (Fang, 1996; Song, 2015).

I argue therefore, that successful implementation of a radical and large-scale curriculum changes such as CAPE Communication Studies depends on how policy developers plan for and support implementation, taking into consideration the teaching contexts of the teachers. In other words, teachers’ beliefs cannot overturn the school context (Lim and Pyvis, 2012). Curriculum planners also need to understand that “government curriculum policy and school-system implementation levels inhibit such different ‘universes’ that ‘intercultural’ understanding between the two is often difficult” (Waters and Vilches, 2008, p. 19). As such, they did not plan for the implementation barriers that would inevitably arise “[w]here teacher meets change” (Schweisfurth, 2011, p. 427). Policy developers also had high expectations that the introduction of the CAPE initiative would address many issues that existed at the sixth form level without considering the demands that it required.

This study therefore supports Song’s (2015) argument that it is naïve for policy makers to believe that all they have to do is “announce
policies, publish guidelines, send them to schools and expect teachers to implement them” (p. 43). They assume that “teachers are on the receiving end of drives for change, and that their roles are to implement the dictates of government” (Schweisfurth, 2011, p. 429). However, successful change does not happen by fiat (Fullan, 2016) or by just the development of a worthy curriculum. It seems that the policy developers’ gaze was focused on the gains of the innovation ignoring the challenges that arise at the implementation stage. Apparently, they erroneously perceived that “the change documents are the change” (Wedell, 2009, p. 44).

5.3 Complexity of change and strategies for effective implementation

The findings in this study reveal that the implementation process is complex and successful implementation is a worldwide challenge, similar to the views reported in the literature (Altinyelken, 2010; Cheung and Wong, 2012; Darsih, 2014; Deng and Carless, 2010; Fullan, 2016; Li, 1998; Rogan and Grayson, 2003; Shamim, 1996; Wedell, 2009). What was discernible from the teachers’ experiences in this study is that there was a multiplicity of interrelated barriers that hindered their implementation efforts. For example, policy developers and planners overlooked the pervasive influence of ‘historical time’ (Wedell and Malderez, 2013) or the existing values, attitudes and beliefs of the education system and society on teachers’ classroom practice. The demands imposed by the CAPE Communication Studies innovation clashed with what were the accepted norms in the Trinidad and Tobago context, in relation to the roles of the teacher and learner in the classroom (Shamim, 1996), teaching approaches and the nature of knowledge. The Communication Studies innovation required teachers to “facilitate communicative teaching” (Caribbean Examinations Council, 2010, p. 3) and include more communicative activities in the teaching and learning process, which entailed a shift from the traditional teacher-centred approach to a student-centred approach. Teachers are supposed to
encourage a more interactive classroom climate, where learners take ownership of their learning and become critical and creative thinkers, actively participating in the learning process. This represented a movement away from the transmission view of knowledge, where memorization of facts takes centre-stage. This therefore means “a profound change to existing cultural conceptions of education” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 326) and knowledge. Maharaj-Sharma (2007, p. 31) explains that this is the norm and expectation in Trinidad and Tobago, that teachers ensure that the relevant content is covered, which means that sound and “correct” teaching principles equal teaching for examinations. However, the findings suggest that policy developers and planners have “insufficient acknowledgement of this ‘gap’ between existing educational norms within the change context, and those implicit in the…change documents” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 326). As such, they overlooked the challenges that inevitably ensued. Tabulawa (1997, p. 192) discussing the situation in Botswana, illuminates the problems that arise when this “gap” is underestimated which also explains why the change was so challenging for the teachers in this study:

To propose that [teachers] shift from a banking education pedagogical paradigm to a learner-centered one is necessarily a proposal that they fundamentally change their views of the nature of knowledge of the learner and his/her role, and of classroom organization in general. But this also necessarily calls for the disintegration of the reigning paradigm, thus of the practitioner’s taken-for-granted classroom world. For the practitioners (i.e. teachers and students) such an experience might be anomic since it might lead to the disruption of the existing cognitive order, leading to a deskillling effect. The result of this might be practitioner’s rejection or subversion of the proposed pedagogical innovation Tabulawa, 1997, p. 192).

It seems that from the outset they maintained the traditional teacher-centered approach, where teachers were the authoritarian figures in the classroom, consistent with several studies in English as a second language (ESL) contexts (Agrawal, 2004; Orafi and Borg, 2009). It was nearly impossible for teachers to implement many aspects of the
innovation due to the examination-oriented culture that existed, which is “a dominant driving force in the school system and the society at large” (Mitchell, 2012, p. 96) in Trinidad and Tobago. The examination system therefore (see section 4.4.1.1) was a major barrier in teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation commensurate with the findings of other research studies (Alderson and Wall, 1993; Agrawal, 2004; Deng and Carless, 2010; Gorsuch, 1999; Xianhan and John, 2013; Yin et al., 2014). All the teachers felt pressured to teach to the test as students’ high examination scores were valued by principals, students and parents. As such, they chose areas and teaching materials (see section 4.3.2 and 4.3.3) that were compatible with the examination. This finding is consistent with other research where examinations dominated subject matter content, which involved ‘skimming and sifting’ content areas (Cheng, 2005; Madaus, 1988; Li and Baldauf, 2011). In other words, there was a narrowing of the curriculum to mirror the examination (Cuban, 2013). This study thus gives credence to the assumption that tests “influence what teachers teach” (Alderson and Wall, 1993, p. 120) but contravene others that argue that tests may be the spring board for teachers to be very innovative and create their own original materials, which can result in positive washback” (Lam, 1995, p. 95).

Additionally, the examination-oriented system had a profound effect on the teachers’ instructional approach, thus confirming the assumption of Gorsuch (1999) that tests can promote traditional teacher-led approaches such as whole class discussions and memorization of facts. It is not surprising that the teachers stifled their creativity in terms of teaching strategies in the classroom given the preoccupation of Ministry officials, principals, supervisors and parents with high performance at examinations. The education culture steeped in examinations made teachers’ implementation efforts very problematic and challenging. In fact, test-driven accountability (Cuban, 2013; Li and Baldauf, 2011)
pushed teachers further to use examination past papers, textbooks (see section 4.3.3), and provide practice and drills (see section 4.3.1) to students so that they would be successful at the examination, consistent with other studies (Choi, 2008; Cheng, 2008; Madaus, 1988; Wall, 2012). Teachers were judged and assessed based on the examination results. In one case a teacher’s result was displayed using a graph by the School Board; which was their way of holding the teacher accountable to ensure good examination results. This finding is commensurate with the results of Cuban’s (2013) research, where teachers were judged based on the grades of students. They therefore they emphasized examination topics to avoid embarrassment of public results. This resulted in teachers feeling what Grassick and Wedell (2018, p. 346) term a “sense of risk” characterized by “feelings of vulnerability arising from a fear of public failure,” consistent with the experiences of the eleven teachers in their seminal volume of work. As a result, they resorted to their traditional practice to ensure success at examinations instead of risking their “professional self-image” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p.339) by being judged as ineffective teachers. Grassick and Wedell (2018, p. 343) explain these teachers’ dilemma further:

Professional and emotional struggles and risks involved in adjusting classroom behaviours to curriculum goals are considerable. It is therefore unsurprising that teachers continue to teach according to pre-existing norms.

An example that illuminates this tension and anxiety by teachers in this study is conveyed by T4, “sometimes I question myself as a teacher, did I do injustice to the students, did I actually help them? Yes, they got the certificate… how much did they learn at the end of the day?” Teachers underwent internal conflict in choosing to teach to the test, which means “learning for examinations” (Li and Baldauf, 2011, p. 748), which can jeopardize students creative and critical-thinking skills. The holistic development of students and quality education as promised with the development of new curriculum initiatives like CAPE Communication
Studies and expressed in the Trinidad and Tobago Education Policy Paper (1993-2003) are overlooked:

The education system of Trinidad and Tobago must endeavour to develop a spiritually, morally, physically, intellectually, and emotionally sound individual. That students vary in natural ability and that schools therefore should provide for all students programmes which are adapted to varying abilities and which provide opportunities to develop personal and socially useful talents (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. XX110).

Unfortunately, teachers did not feel that they had the support nor were they given the capacity to foster these skills. Policy makers and planners ignored the contextual realities where the innovation had to be implemented (Montero-Sieburth, 1992).

Fundamental to all this, therefore, is the admission as Wedell (2013), and Fullan (2016) indicate, that a major cultural change is necessary to confront the deep-seated norms and beliefs about the teaching and learning process at the institutional level and wider society. The examples of Shanghai and Hong Kong further make a case for the importance of cultural change in order to address embedded cultural attitudes and assumptions:

In both Shanghai and Hong Kong, deep cultural influences in values surrounding education (such as the emphasis on exams) have been perceived as problems and have provoked a reaction in order to modernize the system: moving from elite to massive popular education, from emphasis on teaching to emphasis on learning, from fact memorization to development of learning capacities, and from economic needs to individual needs. In both cases, the change in the nature and orientation of the entire education system involves struggles against the culture (OECD-Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2011, p. 106).

Looking at my findings it seems that curriculum planners underestimated the influence of the invisible aspects of the school and the wider societal context on classroom practice. In this vein, my study supports Wedell and Malderez’s (2013) framework (see section 2.6.1 ), as well as, Lim and Pyvis’ (2012) and Yin et al’s (2014) research, indicating that the visible layers influence change but unless the invisible layers are considered, the
complexity of change cannot truly be comprehended and supported. Although, some of the data in my study support Fullan’s (2016) model (see section 2.5) and Rogan and Grayson’s (2003) model (see section 2.5) in terms of the innovation attributes and factors in the school and the external context that influence classroom practice, their focus was more on the visible dimensions, and failed to capture the invisible component, as also evident in my study.

The findings of my study also revealed that extra-lessons (see section 4.4.1.5) emerged as a barrier to implementation, which further endorse the influence of the invisible culture both at the school and national level on the teachers’ classroom practice. It seems that extra-lessons are directly related to the pervasive examination-oriented system in Trinidad and Tobago (Lochan and Barrow, 2008). Students at the advanced level in all school types pursued extra-lessons to ensure that they attained scholarships. Extra-lessons were used as a mean to an end, to train students for an examination (Bray, 1999). CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation is a high-stake examination, which means as Brunton (2002) and Stewart (2015) argue, that the higher the demands of the examination the more students pursue extra-lessons. Findings of this study indicated that students placed more value on the extra-lessons’ classes than their mainstream classes as they believed that it provided a formula for them to do well at the examinations, similar to the findings of Yung and Bray’s (2017) study. The teachers were forced to concede to students’ requests to teach to the test in order to cover the necessary areas for the examination. A serious risk exists that in an “assessment dominated” era “teachers may become more acculturated to the realities of examinations as key performance indicators, so that achievement in examinations…becomes a de facto aim of schooling” (Deng and Carless, 2010, p. 301). This is exacerbated as change planners failed to consider that students’ unrelenting pursuit of extra-lessons is deeply entrenched in
the education culture and societal belief that extra-lessons will ensure better opportunities for students’ success at examinations.

Students’ resistance to group activities and other communicative activities also made the implementation process complex for teachers, which echo the findings of other studies (Li, 1998, Shamim, 1996). The CAPE Communication Studies innovation required a reversal of students’ role from passive recipients to that of active learners in the classroom. However, this practice was met with resistance as students’ expectations about their role came in tension with the assumptions of the innovation (Allsop, 1991; Holliday, 1994; Tudor, 2001). I argued in Chapter 2 (see section 2.6.1.1.6) that given the education tradition in Trinidad and Tobago, where students are accustomed to rote learning, note-taking and didactic instruction, it will not be easy to just transplant student-centred practices. This study, therefore, supports Locastro’s (2001) position that classrooms are rooted in the culture of the society. Hence, students’ views about what is acceptable practice in the classroom are influenced by the wider societal culture (Li, 1998; Shamim, 1996). It is critical that developers and planners of policy understand as Shamim (1996, p. 119) asserts, the contention between the expectations of the innovation and the students’ views about proper behaviour influenced by societal culture. What made the change so complex is that planners did not truly understand what the change involved in terms of “new curriculum content, approach, roles and outcomes,” as they “expect[ed] teachers’ behaviour to meet existing norms and did little to support [their] implementation attempts (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 336).

Considering the findings, Fullan (2016) suggests a salient strategy for successful change, which curriculum planners in Trinidad and Tobago need to include in their implementation plan strategies. This strategy requires a form of re-culturing, since demanding change involves concomitant changes in the behaviour of people (teachers, principals, students) at various levels of the system (Fullan, 2016). This takes a long
time as it involves changing deep-seated attitudes, norms and behaviours, but necessary (Fullan, 2016).

Moreover, the top-down approach (see section 4.4.1.2) that was used in relation to the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation was another major challenge to teachers’ implementation. Teachers were left out of the development process and did not have a say on matters that affected them (Markee, 1997). This in turn did not make them feel a sense of ownership to the innovation, supporting the findings of previous studies (Clark, 1987; Kennedy, 1987; Stenhouse, 1975). The teachers were treated as objects of change, which supports the contention of other researchers (House, 1979; White, 1987). Their perspectives did not matter and there was no real forum for them to present their ideas. Communication was basically in the form of directives given from CXC. It is critical that teachers’ involvement and ownership in curriculum development are validated (Stenhouse, 1975), since the top-down approach has been largely unsuccessful in Trinidad and Tobago (James, 2008). Curriculum planners need to build effective communication systems that involve teachers and other stakeholders in the change process (Wedell, 2013). Change fails when stakeholders are not a part of the dialogue and decision-making before its implementation (Fullan, 2016). Although, “consultation and consensus-building are steep and rocky roads demanding much time and effort…the single-track road…has proven to lead nowhere” (Torres, 2000, p. 269).

Implementation challenges were further compounded in relation to teachers’ implementation efforts as professional development and training workshops were ad hoc, rushed, hierarchical and based on knowledge transmission, like the findings of previous studies (Altinyelken, 2010; Brindley and Hood, 1990; Taole, 2015). Again, teachers had no agency in the planning of workshops which were not well thought out (Adey et al. 2004; Orafi, 2008), and did not clarify nebulous content areas (Ajayi, 2016; Kouwenberg, 2007) for teachers. Furthermore,
the workshops did not provide training in the new teaching approaches. Some teachers never got the opportunity to attend any workshops, similar to the Tyson’s (2003) research on the CAPE Literatures in English innovation. It seems that there is a lack of connection and communication at all levels of the system. The Caribbean Examination Council (CXC) workshops seemed to just be for the introduction of curriculum innovations but do not provide ongoing support for teachers that are new to the subject. There is also a lack of communication between the Ministry of Education (MOE), curriculum planners, schools, and CXC in terms of planning these workshops with the needs of the teachers in mind. It is not surprising therefore, that most teachers had challenges with grasping certain content concepts, as well as, theoretical and practical aspects of the innovation. This finding is consistent with other empirical studies where support was lacking to help teachers clarify misunderstanding of the innovation (Brown and McIntyre, 1978; Humphries and Burns, 2015; Jennings, 2012; Karavas-Doukas, 1995; Kirkgoz, 2008).

What is needed for successful implementation is for trainers to address teachers’ needs and expose them to the “principles and practices” of the innovation that Wedell (2009, p. 36) suggests, further substantiating the assumptions of Goh et al’s (2017) study. This necessitates a “relationship of support between trainers and teachers” with careful consideration of the role of others in providing formal support for teachers alongside what content and delivery styles would be appropriate” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 337). Two teachers (T1 and T 18) provide a positive example of this, where they felt that one of the workshops was effective as the trainer addressed their direct issues affiliated with the Internal Assessment (IA). Unfortunately, most teachers did not share their experience.

A worrying picture emerges as curriculum planners plan for change in a segregated, fragmented manner without inter-relation between parts of the system. I argue that, “professional trust” (Priestley, 2011, p.
should be extended to teachers in policy development. Policy developers in the “outer layer” need to understand change from teachers about:

what is happening in classrooms where attempts are being made to implement change, and about how teachers and learners involved are feeling and thinking (Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 222).

This means developing communication systems that involve teachers at the beginning phase in the development of curriculum (Wedell, 2009).

Equally, teachers needed to have a voice at the school system level and garner the support needed to confront the challenges that they faced. However, the culture of individualism (Lortie, 1975) at the school deterred most teachers from collaborating with their colleagues to discuss challenges that arose during implementation, which was unlike the experiences of the teachers in Cheung and Wong’s, (2012) study. This study also supports and fits in with Wedell and Malderez’s (2013) framework that the visible and invisible aspects of the micro-context (school and classroom) influence teachers’ classroom practice. In the few cases where the teachers worked in collaboration with others by lending support and sharing expertise, implementation of the innovation was better facilitated. Teacher collaboration is therefore an integral factor for successful implementation (Wang and Cheng, 2005; Jones and Harris, 2014), which curriculum planners need to consider in relation to the CAPE Communication Studies context. Curriculum planners also need to take heed of Tinker Sachs’ (2002) advice, that it is important to develop creative and collaborative environments:

Within schools and between schools, and between schools and tertiary education, for the development of teaching and learning. However, collaboration needs to take place in a setting where teachers are seen as professionals who are capable of decision making and whose ideas are welcomed and incorporated by those in authority (p. 46).

However, this was not the norm in most schools. Moreover, the findings were mainly in concert with Sarason’s (1982) research, which underscores
that teacher isolation is a universal phenomenon and presents a challenge to the implementation of an innovation (Hargreaves, 1992). In Trinidad and Tobago, the education culture is more transmission based (Wedell, 2009). However, the CAPE Communication Studies innovation requires a change to a more interpretation-based culture (Wedell, 2009), where teachers can have an input in decisions at their institutions. Significantly, this movement demands considerable cultural change, of which policy makers and planners seem to ignore.

This issue is further highlighted as some of the principals did not support teachers in their implementation efforts. Unfortunately, for most teachers, “relationships are based on “compliance”, which is cultivated in top-down education systems” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 341). The principals did not see themselves as having any critical role to play in implementation, as T4 asserts, “I think the principal would just be happy that the classes are covered.” Moreover, the support that was provided by a few principals was mainly in terms of mentoring, providing resources and technology. However, principals have to lead the change and “understand the extent to which their local educational culture ‘fits’ the classroom behaviours that change implementation implies, in order to be able to decide whether and how national policy needs to be locally adjusted” (Wedell, 2009, p. 38). This may be difficult to achieve in an institutional culture, where the structure is hierarchical and made up of disparate parts, where people operate in silos as illuminated in Table 10 (Wedell, 2009).
Table 10: Some features of organisational cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The management structure of the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A steep hierarchy, with a clearly defined leader and a vertical, top down, chain of command.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff at lower levels are not expected to show initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization is seen as a number of separate departments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The organization values staff for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Their ability to contribute their specialist knowledge of a particular field to the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The organization’s attitude to change is to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View stability as the norm. Respond slowly to the need for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel uncomfortable with the notion of continuous innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Wedell, 2009, p. 38
In the Trinidad and Tobago context, Taylor (1982) notes that principals maintain the status quo and their traditional role as authoritarian leader, as they feel powerless by the “ultra-centralized bureaucracy” (p. 11) that exists in the education system. This is borne out in Yan’s (2012) study where teachers who were trained in the new pedagogical approach had to concede to the examination-oriented culture (teach to the test), which was supported by the principal. In such a situation,

Leaders personal re-culturing may...be seen as needing to precede that of teachers, since without the development of new leadership practices it may not ever be practical to start to provide a supportive environment within which teachers can begin to implement education change (Wedell, 2009, p. 39).

Taking this further, Reimers (1997, p. 171) demands total organizational learning ‘if an education system is to change its ways”, which is also critical for successful implementation of CAPE Communication Studies. He argues that:

Educational change is fundamentally about changing behaviours, values, and how people make meaning of their role in the largest organisation in the public sector. In order to change, education ministries need to learn to learn (171).

Time constraints, syllabus demands, and large classes were also challenging for teachers during the implementation process, which have parallels with other studies (Altinyelken, 2010; Lim and Pyvis, 2012; Tyson, 2003; Wadesango et al., 2016; Zhang, 2010). Again, policy developers did not consider the working context. The Communication Studies syllabus is expansive, and the time given to cover all aspects of it is unrealistic. This meant that teachers could not implement group-work activities and pair work activities regularly. The examination culture,
coupled with a heavy syllabus and time limitations, hindered teachers’ implementation efforts. It seems that the Caribbean Examinations Council (CXC), the Ministry of Education and curriculum planners did not consider the school realities such as, public holidays, school activities and interruptions in their development and implementation plan.

Generally, the findings illuminate the ineffective, top down and elitist communication system that posed severe pressure on the teachers. Even a few teachers who were willing and committed by trying to obtain resources to deepen their knowledge (Rogan, 2007) also felt burdened. They tried to deal with the challenges of implementing the innovation by emerging with resources that enhanced the teaching and learning process. Therefore, the teachers’ personalities, (Fullan, 2016) facilitated the change process to a degree but this was not enough, as the challenges that they encountered in the school system and the wider education system had a greater influence on their implementation. Policy developers expected that teachers implementing Communication Studies would include new innovative features without considering that nine months was not enough to accomplish such a feat. Additionally, promoting students’ oral skills throughout the year and ongoing class discussions were not feasible given the large Communication Studies classes, which are commensurate with other studies (Koenen et al, 2015; Wadesango et al, 2016). Moreover, it was challenging to attend to students’ individual needs, promote more group activities and student participation with large classes, thus echoing Harmer’s (2000) assertion that large classes undermine more learner-centred approaches. Policy developers need to understand that a demanding change like CAPE Communication Studies must be congruent with the classroom context. Large classes undermined the innovation assumptions, and this should have been taken into consideration by policy planners.

Additionally, the innovation required various forms of material, financial and human resources to accompany the change for
effective implementation. However, similar to other studies (De Lisle, 2012a; Orodho et al, 2013; O’Sullivan, 2002) this was not forthcoming, which resulted in poor implementation. Multimedia resources and technology were critical to support teachers in the implementation of the innovation, but these were inadequate overall. This finding is consistent with studies in developing countries, where policy developers do not consider the reality of the teachers’ context, which leads to unsuccessful implementation (Ajayi, 2016; O’Sullivan, 2002).

It seems that policy makers are preoccupied with policy development. However, the capacity to support the change by considering systemic and cultural factors is overlooked. An effective strategy for policy planners, is to plan for change with an understanding that the internal system is connected to the external context (Fullan, 2016; Wedell and Malderez, 2013) and that successful implementation of CAPE Communication Studies requires deep collaboration and ongoing and open communication (De Lisle, 2012a; Wedell, 2009) between different units of the education system such as, CXC, the Ministry of Education, curriculum officers, principals and teachers. Therefore, Wedell’s (2009) advice for successful implementation is also relevant for CAPE Communication Studies, that those charged with the task of managing change, need to “begin at the beginning with an honest appraisal of the existing realities of the people whom [they] are responsible for” (p. 177).

5.4 Summary

My discussion has illuminated the challenges that teachers encountered while implementing the CAPE Communication Studies, what made the change so complex and some of the strategies that need to be considered when planning and managing change. I have argued that the innovative features that teachers are required to implement are demanding. Moreover, the influence of the micro and macro-context (visible and invisible) must not be underestimated. I would further argue
that for the innovation to have a firm grounding in the classroom and make more than an appearance, curriculum developers and planners must understand the ‘how’ of change (Fullan, 2016). This means that teachers must not be perceived as the only actors solely responsible for the success or failure of curriculum innovations. What is needed is whole-system reform (De Lisle, 2012a). This includes changes to structures, strongly held norms, traditions and beliefs in the wider society and the education institution. An effective communication system that involves all stakeholders is therefore critical. Additionally, teachers’ voices are valuable, and they must not be excluded but trusted and perceived as partners in the change process.

This chapter discussed the findings in relation to the literature reviewed in Chapter 2 on teachers’ views of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, how they were implementing it in their classrooms and the factors that impede and facilitate the innovation.

The chapter that follows, provides a summary of the findings of this study as well as the study’s contribution, limitations, implications and recommendations.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the study and discusses the study’s contribution to existing knowledge. The limitations of the study are also considered and the implications and recommendations arising out of the findings are discussed. Additionally, avenues for future research studies are proposed. Finally, I reflect on what I have learnt undertaking doctoral research.

6.2 Synthesis of findings

This study explored the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context from teachers’ perspectives. The main focus of this study was to determine how teachers were implementing the innovation in their classrooms and the factors that impeded and facilitated their implementation of it.

The study was conducted in one educational district (Caroni) and involved nineteen teachers. The schools included government (four) and government-assisted (seven), which are representative of the other school types that exist in the other educational districts throughout the country. Furthermore, a case study approach (see section 3.4.1) was adopted to garner in-depth understanding of the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies. Additionally, semi-structured interviews (see section 3.8.1) were the main source of data collection. However, documents (see section 3.8.3) classroom observations (see section 3.8.2) with follow-up interviews and field notes were also employed to corroborate information elicited from the semi-structured interviews for the second research question.
The variety of data sources allowed rich, detailed insights into how teachers were implementing the innovation and the barriers and facilitators that influenced the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies. Significantly, triangulation from all the sources, methodological and data enhanced the trustworthiness of the study.

The findings of this study both supported and contradicted recent literature on implementation and change. Findings showed that in spite of teachers’ positive orientation of the innovation, they were not implementing many principles of the intended curriculum. This was due mainly to various contextual factors.

All the teachers were holding on tenaciously to the didactic approach to teaching and learning. They generally selected subject matter content, communication skills and teaching materials that were more aligned with the CAPE Communication Studies external examination. Teachers were generally teaching to the test. This was due to many barriers that they encountered during the implementation process. This meant that the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation is still plagued with a multiplicity of challenges that are similar in other countries. For instance, various school-contextual factors (time and syllabus demands and large classes, and isolated school culture and unsupportive principal) and external-contextual factors (examination-oriented system, approaches to curriculum innovation, ineffective professional development training, inadequate government funding and resources, extra-lessons and societal culture) and an innovation-related factor (lack of clarity) negatively affected the implementation of the innovation. These barriers hampered successful implementation similar to many studies globally (Lam et al. 2013; Li, 1998; Karavas-Doukas, 1995; Song, 2015; Shamim, 1996; Wang, 2006; Yin et al., 2014). Findings of this study also support Sikoyo’s, (2010) and Wedell’s, (2009) argument
that school and external contextual factors must be taken into consideration or else implementation will be problematic.

The study also unmasked a few factors that facilitated the implementation process, but it was only experienced by a few teachers. These are teacher collaboration and principal support (school contextual factors) and teacher willingness and commitment (teacher-related factors). Although minimal, it still means that there is some small measure of hope for the innovation. The teacher-related and school-contextual factors that facilitated some of the teachers’ implementation must not be taken lightly. This provides valuable insights to policy developers and curriculum planners to understand what is working, so that they can begin devising implementation strategies to alleviate the implementation gap, using these facilitating factors as evidence.

However, if the myriad of factors that obstruct implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation are not given due attention by policy makers and education planners, then implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies will continue to remain largely unsuccessful in achieving its objectives.

6.3 Contributions of the study

This research study makes several contributions to the literature on curriculum implementation and change. Firstly, it makes a methodological contribution. It demonstrates the value of using both interviews and observations to understand how teachers are actually implementing the intended innovation in their classrooms. The merit of conducting interviews in this study is undeniable as it elicited in-depth rich data that was needed to unmask what realistically occurs in the classroom when implementing an innovation. However, it was integral to go a step further with the inclusion of observations as an additional form of data collection to know if teachers’ actions are in concert with their
statements. In fact, “self-reported practice might be vulnerable to self-defensive representation of what really happens in the classroom” (Song, 2015, p. 40). On the other hand, classroom observations alone will not suffice as it is impossible to surmise “the intentions of teacher action or the reasons why teachers work in the ways they do in particular lessons with particular students only from observed practices” (Breen, Hird, Milton, Oliver and Thwaite, 2001, p. 498). Collectively, both interviews and observations contributed significantly by providing insights into the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation.

This study also contributes to the global debate on curriculum implementation and change in several ways. Its focus on curriculum implementation is an international concern especially since this stage in the change process is under-represented and neglected in favour of curriculum development (Century and Cassata, 2016). In this respect, this study enhances our understanding of how teachers implement curriculum innovations in their classrooms and sheds light on the multiple factors that influence curriculum implementation. Furthermore, by confronting and examining implementation head on, this study unearths “some of the most problematic aspects of bringing about change” (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977, p. 337). These problematic issues are most prevalent at the school level and the systematic and societal level, although there are also innovation-related issues. The capacity to support the innovation was ineffectual at these levels. Additionally, this study has contributed to the current understandings that curriculum change is a complex process. It does not “follow the predictable path of formulation- adoption- implementation- reformulation” (Chisholm and Leyendecker, 2008, p. 196) due to these obstacles. Moreover, the findings of this study also suggest that a well-intentioned curriculum innovation cannot achieve its ideal if the curriculum implementation process is not planned effectively. Inadvertently, this will lead to implementation gaps where the intended curriculum is not consistent with classroom realities.
This study also addresses the gap in the local literature by providing empirical evidence in the area of curriculum implementation, which has been scant in the Caribbean region. It therefore heeded the calls from Caribbean researchers (London, 2002; Louisy, 2004; Jones and Schoburgh, 2004) to add to the meagre local knowledge by confronting the reasons for implementation deficits in the Anglophone Caribbean. Moreover, this study is the first of its kind, as it provides a comprehensive picture of the view teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation, how it is being implemented in the classrooms and the factors that impede and facilitate its implementation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. This study suggests that there are more factors working against the implementation of the CAPE Communications Studies than for it and that school-contextual factors and external-contextual factors were more predominant than other factors. The corpus of factors mentioned is an indication that implementation is not very successful although there are aspects of the syllabus that are being implemented.

Additionally, this study generates new understandings of the factors that facilitate, though few in numbers, the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. In fact, in implementation literature, much less is known about the factors that facilitate implementation. As such, this study further contributes to knowledge by delineating the importance that school culture and principal support, and teachers’ willingness and commitment play in supporting implementation.

This study also extends knowledge about curriculum implementation and change theory. A significant barrier that emerged from this study is the phenomenon of extra-lessons (see section 2.6.1.1.6) which was not a factor directly linked to the literature on implementation and change. It therefore, offers the potential for fresh insights into this area but also points to the possible dangers of ignoring the invisible aspect
of the local context in which an innovation is embedded. In other words, several factors emerged that are common in other contexts. However, a unique factor, extra-lessons is also evident given that Trinidad and Tobago have an examination-driven culture.

Furthermore, this study is a valuable contribution as it also provides insights to policy makers and curriculum planners to assist them in generating strategies on how to effectively support and manage the curriculum implementation change process. Additionally, it also adds to the paucity of studies on teachers’ perspectives of curriculum implementation. Teachers’ engagement with the innovation and accounts of how it is being implemented in the classrooms offer guidance to change agents, and school administration to employ better techniques to ameliorate the ineffectiveness of implementation in secondary schools in Trinidad and Tobago. Teachers’ voices provide evidence that can assist the Ministry of Education officials in creating new policy initiatives that can better address the multitude of challenges that the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation presently face in the Trinidad and Tobago context.

6.4 Limitations of the study

This study has some limitations that need to be acknowledged. One of the limitations of this study is from a methodological point of view. Observations were used with semi-structured interviews, to understand how teachers were implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in their classrooms. However, as mentioned in section 3.8.2, I was only allowed to observe two teachers twice and six teachers once. The major reasons were time constraints, a demanding syllabus to implement and preparation for the internal assessment and external examinations. However, it would have been more beneficial to this study if I could have observed the other six
teachers on a more regular basis (at least three times). Additionally, I did not have the opportunity to observe any of the teachers during the September to December 2015 school term. This meant that I was not privy to how they implemented the innovation during that period. Teachers indicated that during that time their attention was focussed on just covering a lot of work relevant for the IA component. Despite this drawback, the in-depth semi-structured interviews and follow-up interviews after the observations compensated for this. Teachers were able to provide details about what they do during the September to December 2015 interval, which was in tandem with how they taught basically for the entire year. Also, as mentioned in section 3.8.2, although the six teachers were observed only once, their eighty to ninety minutes lessons provided a detailed view of their implementation.

Another limitation is that the study was confined to a small number of teachers in one educational district. As a result, the finding cannot be generalized but its significance lies in its transferability. In other words, what needs to be considered is “user generalizability [which] involves leaving the extent to which a study’s findings apply to other situations up to the people in those situations” (Merriam, 2009, p. 226). As such, I made sure that I gave “detailed descriptions of the findings with adequate evidence presented in the form of quotes from participants” (Merriam, 2009, p. 227). In this way users can make sound decisions about the similarities between this study and their own. Maximum variation was also used to select participants for classroom observations (see section 3.5.2) which also means “the possibility of a greater range of application by readers” (Merriam, 2009, p. 227) of this study.

A final limitation of this study is that it focussed only on teachers’ perspectives of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation. While their voices provided great insights into the implementation process, other pertinent voices such as the students and the principals of
the schools were omitted. However, they can also provide relevant information on the factors that influence implementation.

6.5 Implications and recommendations

In direct relation to the findings, this study suggests several implications and recommendations that may help with the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in the Trinidad and Tobago context. The main conclusion that unfurled from the findings is that although teachers fully embraced the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation there were implementation gaps. As such, the study clearly indicates that implementation of the innovation is facing many impediments. In fact, the innovation though sound and beneficial, has not achieved its full outcomes and intentions due to a combination of interactive factors that worked against the ideals of the innovation. My findings point to the fact that it is simplistic to think that teachers are passive implementers of curriculum innovations and that they just implement as robots, whatever is given to them. Instead, external-contextual and school-contextual factors were most predominant, which influenced teachers’ classroom practice. Policy makers and education planners failed to consider these factors. To this end, several implications for policy and practice are considered and recommendations are proposed.

6.5.1 Context—relevant innovation

It is important for policy makers in Trinidad and Tobago to understand that change is a process and complex. In fact, there have been waves of curriculum innovations; yet, policy makers and curriculum planners still have not seriously addressed curriculum implementation challenges. Implementation is a phase that has been neglected. This is
evident in the findings of this study as implementation is not given the attention that it deserves. This might very well be the ‘Achilles heel’ of the implementation of curriculum innovations in Trinidad and Tobago. Therefore, planning and support for successful implementation of curriculum innovations must be a part of the entire curriculum reform movement. This planning must take into account the local contextual realities of the teachers, who have to implement the innovation in the classroom (Wedell, 2009), which will better attune policy planners to challenges that would influence implementation. Unfortunately, in most cases, policy developers and planners are reluctant to start their “initiatives ‘where people are’, [which] makes it impossible for change planning to be situated in the lived reality of those whom the change will affect” (Wedell, 2009, p. 176).

This was the case in my study as policy planners disregarded the existing realities of the school and classroom conditions, as well as the norms and beliefs in the wider society. For instance, in this study students’ resistance to group activities is as a result of their views about what comprises suitable behaviour in the classroom. This is entrenched in the culture of the society. The postcolonial legacy of inherited learning strategies, beliefs and structures (Chisholm and Leyendecker, 2008) inherent in Trinidad and Tobago society obstructed the effective implementation of the innovation. If deep-seated change has to occur there must be an overhaul of the examination-oriented system. Instead of perpetuating placement systems (De Lisle, 2012b) what is needed is a change in the examination system to match the curriculum innovation. Policy makers and other stakeholders need to begin constructing a framework for assessment that is sensitive to the curriculum innovation. Teaching and learning should not be based on getting good grades. Moreover, it is not so easy to erode traditional barriers, but one way to begin is by de-skilling and re-skilling all stakeholders for the new change. This means that the teachers and learners will have to get assistance:
To get to know, and to be able to work with, new ways of thinking about knowledge, the teaching-learning process, and the teacher-learner roles in that process. There will need to be a move away from the idea that education involves all learners being taught the same ‘knowledge’ in the same way” (Wedell, 2009, p. 16)

Additionally, an impediment that undermined the successful implementation of the innovation was inadequate support in the provision of material and human resources by the Government. These included limited access by most teachers to multimedia resources, the absence of a standard textbook for CAPE Communication Studies and library facilities in most schools that did not specifically meet the demands necessary for the subject. Moreover, the infrastructure in some schools is not conducive to the use of multi-media as the audio-visual rooms are very small, without any outlets and internet service and the air condition is non-functional. In fact, there is inequitable dispersion of resources in schools. For example, in some schools the multimedia is not working and in others the audio-visual room is in a deplorable condition. Funding is unavailable for the upkeep of these resources. In one case, T10 had to literally put his television in his car and take it to school to do a lesson on technology as these resources were unavailable. However, when it got too burdensome, the use of multimedia was abandoned altogether by some teachers. It is recommended therefore, that resources, both material and human must be provided on a continuous basis and evenly distributed across all the schools. Furthermore, all Communication Studies classrooms should be outfitted with multimedia. Another crucial recommendation by eight teachers in this study is to have Language Labs in schools so that the communicative activities and student-centred activities would be better facilitated and ultimately help teachers in their implementation efforts. Capacity building will be enhanced through the provision of enough resources (Fullan, 2016).
All the teachers felt that the time to complete the syllabus was insufficient. CXC should examine this closely and extend CAPE Communication Studies for two years, as the syllabus is very demanding. This could provide the opportunity for teachers to be more creative in the classroom and allow students to take a more active role in the teaching and learning process.

Variations also occurred in relation to the availability of resources, opportunities for professional development, teachers’ workload and class size. It is therefore important that curriculum planners understand that the change needs to fit the realities of each teacher situation:

National policy makers need to explicitly encourage local leaders to begin their implementation stage by introducing a version of the change that is true to the ‘spirit’ of what is being attempted while also being appropriate for the majority of their schools…[T]aking such a flexible approach makes it more likely that more change will be visible in more classrooms than will be the case if all contexts are pressured to implement the new practices identically (Wedell, 2009, p. 31).

6.5.2 Systemic support

The findings also suggest that the CAPE Communication Studies innovation require “‘parallel learning’ across stakeholders at all levels of [the] education system, throughout the planning and implementation stages in order to maximise support” (Wedell and Malderez, 2013, p. 345). This means that policy developers and curriculum planners must value the views and opinions about change from the teachers, and administrators at the initiation stage (Wedell and Malderez, 2013). In this way, they would be able to understand the cultural and systemic realities of where the innovation has to be
implemented. This is significant as the demands of the innovation in this study were incongruent with the classroom realities.

For instance, most teachers did not feel a sense of ownership, or commitment to change as they were excluded from the development stage and the planning of workshops. They indicated that professional development and training was one-shot, insufficient, rushed and devoid of collaboration. It did not cater to the different needs of the teachers and was more hierarchal in nature. One of the teachers (T9) in the study indicated that at the workshops “all they want is for you to stay silent, listen and then go and implement” (T9/1/16/4/2015). This suggests that at workshops education planners and officials negated the teachers’ views and perceived implementation as a one-time event. Professional development and training must therefore be more interactive, where teachers can openly voice their concerns and it must be responsive to the needs of teachers. There must be open discussion and dialogue among teachers thereby promulgating a community of learners (Fullan, 2016). A significant and unexpected finding in this study is that eight teachers never had the opportunity to attend any professional development training as it was never available to them. These teachers were new to teaching CAPE Communication Studies. It is important therefore, that teachers are provided with on-going training and support.

Additionally, workshops should not only be for the launch of an innovation, as some teachers, whether new or already many years in the education system, would be implementing it for the first time and would also need the required skills and knowledge to do this effectively. Moreover, workshops must not be a ‘one size fits all’ but address teachers’ needs and problems as they arise. It should help teachers deal with challenges that they encounter during the implementation change process and the realities that occur in the classroom context (O’Sullivan, 2002). Training must also be provided in various areas such as new types of assessment, subject matter content and pedagogical approaches that are
deemed complex or unclear to teachers. This can provide a deeper understanding of the curriculum change to teachers. For instance, one of the areas that teachers in this study indicated that they needed more training in was the ‘Linguistics’ aspects of the syllabus. This was not a strength that most of the teachers had since they did not pursue any of the Linguistic courses at the University of the West Indies. To address this, workshops can be organized by the Ministry of Education in concert with the local universities to focus on promoting the Linguistics knowledge gap that some teachers need, which will entail ongoing communication within these levels.

Notably, just a few teachers had some support in dealing with the challenges of the innovation from their principals. However, this support was basically in the form of providing instructional resources. Conversely, for most of the teachers not even minimal support was forthcoming. There is a danger in this, as “a crucial aspect that impacts on the implementation of curriculum is the school’s management’s capacity to mediate the curriculum” (Taole, 2015, p. 277). It is also critical that principals create a collaborative culture in their schools despite the odds. Many of the teachers yearned for this collaboration within the school. One way this could occur is by allowing teachers time and opportunities to collaborate with each other (Wedell, 2009). In addition, teachers “need chances to meet others trying to carry out the same change in other institutions” (Wedell, 2009, p. 37). It is important then to establish ‘professional learning communities’ (Fullan, 2016) where collaboration is built into the implementation stage in schools by curriculum implementation planners (Wedell, 2009). It is also recommended that principals undergo training sufficiently to understand their role as change leaders in the implementation process (Wedell, 2009). This can ensure that more support is given to teachers.
Another recommendation is that teachers must be allowed to feel a sense of ownership of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation. Teachers in the study felt that the CAPE innovation was top-down and that it totally left them out of the decision-making process. Teachers are critical to curriculum implementation and their voices matter (Stenhouse, 1975). They must be included in policy development not ‘just as technicians but as critical players in the entire policy making process’ (Mitchell, 2012, p. 162). Moreover, CXC must consult teachers as a professional body on changes that are going to be made, instead of how it obtains now. In other words, changes are top-down, and teachers only learn of these changes, for example, the changes to the multiple-choice examination paper, after it has been decided and enunciated by CXC. A more democratic approach, where teachers are involved at the initiation stage in curriculum development is recommended where their opinions on policy matters are validated. This means that teachers must be given the “space to act with a minimum degree of freedom and creativity” (Troudi and Alwan, 2010, p. 118). Teachers should then be given training and guidance in this endeavour so that they would have the necessary skills and knowledge to develop curriculum.

Furthermore, for the CAPE Communication Studies innovation to be implemented effectively it is critical to develop “structures and communication systems to enable shared learning [as] a normal part of curriculum change planning” (Grassick and Wedell, 2018, p. 347). This would also involve the participation and input of key stakeholders at the micro- and macro-context, “since practitioners do and will mediate policy” (Priestley, 2011, p. 233). The entire “process must be more inclusive, pluralist rather than elitist in approach” (Mitchell, 2012, p. 161). Policy developers and curriculum planners must value, as Grassick and Wedell (2018, p. 346) assert, “the importance of learning from and
about those who will (in various roles) be responsible for implementation”.

6.6 Future research

The contribution and limitation of this study offer possibilities for future research. This study has provided a comprehensive picture of the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in one educational district in Trinidad and Tobago. However, more research of this type should be conducted in other educational districts to augment the findings illuminated in this study. A more longitudinal study, similar to this one will highlight whether the findings of this study are congruent with studies from other educational districts in Trinidad and Tobago. Additionally, there is need for future research within the region on CAPE Communication Studies given that the subject is offered in sixteen Caribbean territories. This study utilized both interviews and observations as data collection tools which unleashed critical data concerning the implementation process. Therefore, I recommend that the other studies mentioned should continue along similar lines.

The data from this study highlights that extra-lessons are a barrier to implementation. The teacher-directed classes that characterized extra-lessons, which are linked to the examination-oriented system (invisible context) somewhat undermined the student-centred activities promulgated in the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus. Therefore, further empirical work is necessary to be carried out to see if extra-lessons are also an emerging barrier in other studies in Trinidad and Tobago.

The findings from this study also revealed that high-stakes tests had a negative wash-back effect on teachers’ teaching approach, selection of content and selection of teaching material and resources. Therefore, further research needs to be done to find out the role that high-
stakes tests have on teachers’ implementation of the curriculum innovation in the classroom. This will reveal greater insights on this issue especially whether the high-stakes tests can also have a positive wash-back effect on the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation.

In this study there were nineteen participants, sixteen were female and three were male. Evidently, this imbalance of the sample is difficult for me to comment on as to whether gender was an issue at all. Therefore, further research needs to be conducted to see if gender plays an important part in how the CAPE Communication Studies innovation is being implemented.

6.7 Reflections on my own learning

Conducting this study threw light on Marshall and Rossman’s (2016, p. 214) notion that qualitative data analysis is a “messy, ambiguous, time consuming, creative and fascinating” process which “does not proceed in a linear fashion; it is not neat”. The many days and hours spent manually transcribing interviews and observation data were gruelling at times, but it allowed me to become familiar with the data many times over, which would have been grossly absent using qualitative data analytical software. Moreover, I realised that listening carefully to participants allowed me to be alert to the nuances and valuable cues that surfaced in the interviews and I understood first-hand, not vicariously, the significance of establishing trust and making sure that the participants felt comfortable and at ease. Furthermore, based on my experience of conducting this study, I concur with Geelan (2003), that qualitative research is collaborative in nature. At this stage of having completed the study, I feel grateful to have worked with the participants, gatekeepers, as well as with my appointed supervisor. From the outset my supervisor tried
to move me along in my study and very early pointed me to salient readings on the phenomenon. The dialogue and deliberations we had at Leicester and via telephone conversations about research questions, trustworthiness issues, especially sampling and data collection and analysis were very critical which allowed me to comfortably interrogate the issue and be more alert and reflective in everything that I do.

I began this journey with the premise that there is need to uncover what is happening inside the ‘black box’ or put differently the implementation phase. Unearthing these critical factors that influence implementation can aid in successful implementation of curriculum innovations and teachers are critical to this endeavour. I therefore hold tenaciously to the conviction that teachers’ voices need to be validated as they are critical to understanding the problems affiliated with curriculum implementation. In fact, the teachers in the study profess that they felt a sense of satisfaction being involved in it as it gave them a voice which was overlooked, denied and ignored for many years on issues that directly affected them. This avenue allowed them to feel a ‘sense of catharsis’ as one teacher proclaimed, since they were able to “say it as it is” on what they perceived as an overlooked area in the Trinidad and Tobago context. To deny them their voice would be a gross act of turpitude against these teachers.

In retrospect, engaging in the process of qualitative research, which is “quintessentially interactive” (Rossman and Rallis, 2003, p. 35), has been a humbling experience and has untapped the value and potential of reflexivity. Additionally, I have garnered new insights into the implementation process, especially the barriers and facilitators that influence teachers’ implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Trinidad and Tobago. The findings of this study therefore, brought intrinsic satisfaction to me. For now, at this first step of my research journey, I take consolation in one of the teacher’s maxim “so
many challenges we still endure after so many years, if only they came to us, to hear us, then we could begin to fix this, but now is not too late.”
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Appendix 1: The sixteen (16) Caribbean countries participating in CXC CAPE examination:

1) Anguilla
2) Antigua and Barbuda
3) Barbados
4) Belize
5) British Virgin Islands
6) Cayman Islands
7) Dominica
8) Grenada
9) Guyana
10) Jamaica
11) Montserrat
12) St. Kitts and Nevis
13) St. Lucia
14) St. Vincent and the Grenadines
15) Trinidad and Tobago
16) Turks and Caicos

Appendix 2: Sample poem entitled “Trini Talk”

Trini Talk

Trinidadians are a special people of dat there is no doubt,
Doh care what odders say of how dey run dey mouth.
But of all de special talents dat we Trinis possess,
Is de way we talk dat ranks us among de best.
At de street corners, in de shop or at work on any given day,
Is to hear us speak and carry on in our own special way.
De colourful words, de antics and de accent all combine,
To create a whole language dat has stood de test of time.
De way we express ourselves and de way we converse,
Is truly an art of which every Trini can boast. Look at de many words dat we Trinis create,
Just to make it easier for us to communicate.
Words like bobbol, skylark, commess and bobolee,
Are words dat yuh cyah find in any English dictionary.
Coskel, boobooloops, lahay and dingolay,
Mou Mou, bazodie, jagabat and tootoolbay.
So when yuh thin and frail, we say yuh maga or merasme.
And when yuh fat or overweight, we say yuh obzokee.
And when something small, we say chinkey instead.
And we say tabanca when a woman tie up a man head.
And a person who lazy, we call dem a locho.
And an inquisitive person is simply a maco. Is our colourful history, yes our glorious past,
Dat give us a language dat very few could surpass,
So many Trinis doh speak patois again.
But we use words like doux doux and langniappe all de same.
So mauvais langue is when yuh bad talk people yuh doh even know.
And a flaming torch we still call a flambeau.
Maljo is when yuh put bad eye on everything yuh see.
And when yuh shake and shiver, we call dat malkadee.
And patois give us so much place names like Blanchisseuse and La Fillette.
And left over food from de night before we call macafoucette. And East Indian words yuh could guess so easy.
Listen to doolahin, beta, bap and dhoti.
And we love dalporee, bodi and khumar,
Baigan, barra, sahina and kuchela.
Jadoo is magic dat women does use to get dey husband house and car.
And if yuh talking nonsense it so easy to say gobar. And for animals and fruits look at de names we does use.
De pronunciation and spelling is enough to get yuh confused.
Chenette, pommecythere, pomerac and sour sop.
Pewah, dongs, balata and mammie seepot.
And Trini does hunt for tatoo, agouti and lappe.
And instead of ants, we does say batchac.
Trinis fraid macajuel, batimamselle and crapaud.
And de big black vultures we call corbeaux.
Trini mouth does water for crab and callaloo.
Doh talk 'bout cavindajh, pelau, pastelle and cascadoux.
For seasoning, shadow beni beat back all de rest.
While veti-verve does make de clothes smell nice and fresh. And when we talking is like
to a special rhythm dat others doh know.
We have to move de whole body from we head to we toe.
Watch how de hands does move as if we killing flies.
And when we vex is cuya mouth or roll up de eyes.
And sometimes is de mouth alone dat does all de work.
Is to hear us laugh out loud when we hear a good joke.
And when we laughing de mouth does open wider dan a carite.
And when it come out with "Oui Foute" or "Mama Yo" it does soun' real sweet.
So doh laugh at we and think we antics funny.
Is what we need and use to talk more effectively.
But watching us talking and moving from right to left,
Yuh swear is sign language to talk to de deaf. And we have a communication network
dat is one of the greatest around.
It beat back any newspaper, TV or computer dat dey have in town.
So Maxie does tell Jane a secret story or a story.
And in two seconds Jane does run and tell she boyfriend Gary.
And den Gary does tell he partners liming on de corner,
So de whole ah town would know 'bout two hours later.
But when de story reach back to de original source,
Is never de same, it always off course.
Yes, gossip does change a story from a dongs to a grapefruit just so.
Where de new story come from nobody doh know.
So always be careful who yuh liming with and what yuh speak,
'Cause before yuh look good all yuh business on de street. And when we start to argue is
trouble in de gang,
'cause we does argue everything except de issue at hand.
We Trinis does start off on one particular topic,
And in no time at all we does stray from it.
We does go round in circles, yes vikey vi.
And end up giving picong and mamaguy.
But when things get heated, den de real trouble does start.
Words harder dan rock stone does pass in de brew.
And if yuh only take sides, yuh go get a good 'buse-ing too.
And some does use de poor ancestors to make dey attack.
Dey would trace de whole family tree from yuh mudder go back.
And when dat doh work, some does turn to de anatomy,
Talking 'bout parts of yuh body dat dey never even see. And telling stories is a special
talent we got.
Trinis could make up a story right dere on de spot.
Listen to a husband when he reach home late,
He would never say dat wid de outside woman he had a date.
He go tell his wife 'bout parang or late night class.
How he working overtime and de car run out of gas.
And when de cocaine disappear from de police station without a trace.
It easy to blame de greedy rats and done de case.
And dats why we does have Commission of Enquiry every odder day.
So each one could tell de same story in a different way.
But when it come to stories, politicians are de very best.
Promising brighter days and a better life and nothing less.
Yes, Trinis smart and it is little wonder den.
Dat up de islands dey does say Trickydadian;

So, talk, for we Trinis is a way of life.
Is how we assume ourselves and deal wid strife.
Listen to de sweet-talk of a true Trini male,
Dat could win de heart of any Trini female.
And every spectator does turn a coach at a cricket or football match.
Shouting out advice for bad play or dropping a catch.
Man we know how to talk before we could creep.
We could out talk all odders in one clean sweep.
A Trini who cyah talk will laugh instead.
And if he cah do dat, he better off dead.

Source: Browne (1999, p. 21-22)
Appendix 3: Literature review search strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Terms (These were searched for in phrases)</th>
<th>Barriers to the effective implementation of curriculum innovation, the factors that influence curriculum innovation, teachers’ perspectives on the factors that influence curriculum implementation, factors that facilitate curriculum implementation in developing countries, factors that facilitate implementation in developed countries, barriers and facilitators to curriculum implementation and change, teachers’ perspectives on the factors that impede or hamper curriculum change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Journal articles, electronic articles, newspaper articles, conference papers, governmental documentation, books, doctoral thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Sample excerpts from my reflective journal

Excerpt one: Interview with participants- June 3rd, 2015

Teachers were willing to share their views on the implementation of the “CAPE Communication Studies innovation. Teachers were experiencing so many challenges in their implementation efforts. The school capacity to support seemed elusive. Many changes were taking place, but they had no voice in those matters. Another barrier that seemed to emerge is lack of resources to implement the innovation. Teachers didn’t seem to have the time to really complete all that the syllabus demanded. They seemed overwhelmed with a multiplicity of factors in their context that worked against the innovation.

Excerpt Two: Reflections on observations- April 28th, 2016

After careful reflection of the data from observations and field notes based on teachers’ classroom practice it seemed to illuminate a significant disconnect between teachers’ positive orientation and belief as pertains the CAPE Communication Studies innovation and student–centred activities suggested and what ensued in the actual classroom. Most prevalent by all the teachers were didactic teaching and whole-class discussions. The textbook and test papers took centre stage throughout the sessions and teachers kept using CAPE examination papers after each topic. Some reminded students that if they wanted to get “ones” they must work on past exams papers to get the right “answer”. It seems that the in local context – the examination culture is most pervasive and although they are very successful in terms of passes, teachers are not implementing several features and principles of CAPE Communication Studies.
**Excerpt Three: Follow-up interviews- April 29th, 2016**

In the follow-up interviews, teachers agreed that the CAPE Communication Studies innovation was a good idea and needed in the Caribbean region. However, they indicated that given the reality of their schools, classrooms and the wider socio-cultural context they could not implement all that the innovation demanded. They indicated that society placed high value on academic success and high expectations on them to produce students with grade one passes. This forced them to teach to the test, skipping and skimming areas that are not included in the examinations. Moreover, they reiterated that Trinidad and Tobago is rooted in an examination-oriented culture. Other factors such as large classes, time, heavy workload, traditional school culture, top-down approaches and lack of teaching resources also compounded their implementation efforts. The teachers contented that these factors affected what occur in the classroom and what was intended. It appears there is incompatibility between the curriculum innovation and the teachers’ local reality.

**Excerpt Four: Classroom observations- May 24th, 2016**

Most teachers when they teach a topic would refer to past examination papers. Teaching was mostly didactic. Teachers were basically at the front of the class. This was becoming a pattern with all the teachers that I observed. Examinations seemed to be the focus of teaching and preparation for the intended assessment. After five observations the focus seemed to be on writing skills and content areas that were aligned with the examination. Group work and activities were minimal and mostly to answer examination questions.
Excerpt Five: lessons learned December 18th, 2017

Based on my experience of conducting this study, I concur with Geelan (2003), that qualitative research is based on collaboration with many persons, one of which is your research supervisor. At this stage of having completed the study, I feel grateful to have worked with the teachers, principals, gatekeepers, as well as with my appointed supervisor. From the outset my supervisor tried to move me along in my study and very early pointed me to salient readings on the phenomenon. I recall that the dialogue and deliberations we had at Leicester and via telephone conversations about research questions, trustworthiness issues, especially sampling and data collection and analysis were very critical which allowed me to comfortably interrogate the issue and be more alert and reflective in everything that I do. Moreover, I always appreciated his comments, though copious, on the written work that I e-mailed. For instance, I remembered sending a few of my coded transcript to him and he provided constructive criticisms on how I can improve it even more. Therefore, Geelan’s (2003) dictum effectively captures the essence of my collaborative efforts:

“In the overgrown jingle of qualitative inquiry at the beginning of the 21st century, there is no substitute for an excellent native guide with a machete if you want to make it through alive” (p. 180).
Appendix 5: Consent form for interview and classroom observation

PhD Thesis Research

Name of Researcher: Sharmila Harry of the School of Education, University of Leicester

Title of Research: The Implementation of the Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination (CAPE) Communication Studies curriculum innovation in Secondary Schools in Trinidad and Tobago: Teachers’ Perspectives.”

- I confirm that I have read and understood the Letter of Information for the above research and have had the opportunity to ask questions.

- I have been informed of the steps that will be taken to ensure confidentiality of all research information.

- I understand that any information that I provide will be treated with confidence and that my identity will not be disclosed even though the findings of the study may be published.

- I am aware of the purpose, procedures and uses of the research.

- I have been informed that interviews and classroom observations will be audio-taped.

- I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time during the research without providing a reason for my withdrawal.

- I understand that the researcher may publish the findings of the study.

- I have been informed that the findings of the completed study will be made available upon request.
  nharrypapan@hotmail.com
• I understand that my responses will be anonymised before analysis. I give permission for the researcher to have access to my anonymised responses.

• I agree to take part in the above research project.

• I have had the opportunity to discuss this study and if I have any further concerns or question, I can contact Ms. Sharmila Nisha Harry at 766-9188 or ______________________________ ________________________

Name of Participant / Date / Signature
(or legal representative)

_________________________ ________________________
Name of Researcher / Date / Signature

To be signed and dated in presence of the participant

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study.
Appendix 6: Sample of letter of information for teachers

Dear Sir/ Madam,

I am writing to request your participation in a research that I am conducting in pursuit of my Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree at the University of Leicester in the United Kingdom (UK). I am a part-time graduate student in the School of Education at this university.


This letter will explain the purpose and procedures of the research study as well as, request that you indicate your decision to participate in the study on the attached Informed Consent Form.

The purpose of this study is to examine the implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies innovation as perceived through the eyes of teachers. The main purpose of the study is to examine factors that influence English Language teachers’ implementation of CAPE Communication Studies in secondary schools in the Trinidad and Tobago context.

The proposed method involves semi-structured interviews and classroom observations. Teachers will be interviewed for about forty-five (45) minutes to sixty minutes each and classroom observations will occur two times during regular class intervals. The sample will be purposive and involve English Language teachers that are teaching the CAPE Communication Studies Syllabus in one educational district in Trinidad.

Ethically, confidentiality of research data will be assured. This will be done by making sure that documentation is not discussed accidentally, and records kept private and secure. Names of participants and the names of schools will
not be used in the data when the study is presented or for any published work. Pseudonyms will be used. Moreover, participation in this research is voluntary; as such participants can withdraw from the study at any time without prejudice. I will ensure that throughout the research no harm comes to the participants. Since interviews and observations will be audio-taped, participants’ permission will be sought.

I would be grateful if you consider my request to conduct research and I look forward to hearing from you. I will make myself available if you have any queries, questions or concerns pertaining to my proposed research. Please contact me at 766-9188 or nharrypapan@hotmail.com

Thanking you in advance for your kind consideration.

Yours respectfully,

Sharmila Nisha Harry

PhD student (part-time) University of Leicester, UK

B.A-English (Hons); Postgraduate Diploma in Education (Dist.); M.A-English (Dist); MEd-Education Curriculum Studies (Dist)
Appendix 7: Sample of follow-up interview

I just wanted to verify what topic or module you did?
Module 2, Language and Community.
Can you clarify the topic?
Today we wanted to look at the elements of Language so we looked at Dialectal relations, Communicative Behaviours, Attitudes to Language and Register.
I noticed that you did a topic and then you used the past examination papers relevant to the topic and focused on that. Can you tell me the reasons that you choose to do it?
Really it was to emphasise what they had already learnt today in class. Practice for a exam as time is limited. It is like teaching to the test.
What are your reasons for teaching to the test?
Really for our students we do have to focus on teaching for the exam. Really if we are to touch on all that the curriculum asks we would never finish because the times are not allow us to do that and in order to try and get the students to pass and cause our statistics are also looked at in terms of passing grades. We are judged by ciety- parents, principals, the Ministry. To try and attain a good passing grade I teach the exam for those reasons.
What are other factors that influence how you implement the Communication Studies solution?
Time as I said, so less time for group activities suggested in the teaching and learning activities of the syllabus. So I try every two weeks to do 15 minutes of group activities but given the time constraints, limited resources and heavy workload, it really reeks. Pair activities I do even less.
And what about other skills suggested like listening and oral skills?

Listening skills, we develop listening skills in various ways, we would have students present in some instances and have their peers comment or their classmates comment, even though we are targeting the exam we are also trying to develop listening but the focus is more on writing.
Can you tell me why you focus more on Writing?
It is mainly tested in the examination in all modules. That’s the reality. The school still use traditional exams and academic success so as you would have noticed I use exam papers in my class. I can’t risk my students doing badly in examinations. They ant a nice change but it doesn’t match my working conditions.

Comment [sh1]: Topic observed
Comment [sh2]: Use of past examination papers
Comment [sh3]: Exam practice
Comment [sh4]: Limited time
Comment [sh5]: Teaching to the test
Comment [sh6]: Teaching to the test
Comment [sh7]: Time constraint
Comment [sh8]: Held accountable and judged in society
Comment [sh9]: Minimal group activities
Comment [sh10]: Time constraints, limited resources, demanding workload
Comment [sh11]: Minimal pair activities
Comment [sh12]: Minimal focus on listening skills
Comment [sh13]: Focus more on writing skills
Comment [sh14]: Use of exam papers
Comment [sh15]: Local reality does not match the expectations
## Appendix 8: Sample of interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What perspectives do teachers hold about the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? | • Can you tell me your views about the new CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?  
• To what extent do you think that Caribbean cultural content and resources should be included in the syllabus?  
• Can you tell me your views about the inclusion of the three modules in the syllabus?  
• What are your views about the teaching approaches and classroom activities proposed by CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? Do you find them helpful?  
• What are your views about traditional and internal forms of assessment?  
• Can you tell me your views about the role of the teacher in the classroom as suggested by the syllabus? |
| 2. How are teachers implementing the intended CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? | • How do you conduct your classroom teaching to achieve the objectives of the CAPE Communication Studies syllabus?  
• How do you organize your classroom activities that allow students to work in group and pairs?  
• To what extent do you use multimedia in the teaching and learning process?  
• Can you tell me to what extent you use the five modes of communication in the teaching activity?  
• Can you tell me to what extent are you engaged in team teaching as suggested in the syllabus?  
• Can you tell me about the teaching modules and resources that you use in your teaching activity as suggested in the syllabus?  
• To what extent do you include all the skills suggested in the syllabus in your teaching and learning activities? |
| 3. What are teachers’ perspectives of the barriers to the implementation of CAPE Communication | • What innovation related factors impede your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?  
What teacher-related factors impede your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies curriculum innovation?</th>
<th>What student-related factors impede your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What school-contextual factors impede your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What external-contextual factors impede your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are teachers’ perspectives of the factors that facilitate the implementation of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
<td>What innovation related factors facilitate your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What teacher-related factors facilitate your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What student-related factors facilitate your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What school-contextual factors facilitate your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What external-contextual factors facilitate your implementation of the CAPE Communication Studies curriculum innovation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Sample of observation guide

General Information:

Teacher:

Number of pupils:

Observer:

School:

Classroom:

Topic:

Time:

Date:

Areas of Focus of the Classroom Observation

1) What approach (es) does the teacher use to implement the CAPE Communication Studies innovation?

2) What classroom activities does the teacher use in the classroom?

3) What is the role of the teacher and the student in the classroom?

4) Does the teacher use group work activities and pair-work in the classroom for teaching and learning?

5) Does the examination and Internal Assessment (IA) have any influence on the teacher’s classroom practice?

6) Are students actively taking part in teaching and learning exercise?

7) Does the teacher use multimedia in the teaching and learning activities?
8) Is the teacher using the five modes of communication for teaching and learning?

9) Are language awareness, comprehension and expression skills included in the classroom teaching?

10) What resources and curriculum content does the teacher use in the classroom for teaching and learning?

11) Generally, what aspects of CAPE Communication Studies curriculum is the teacher implementing?
Appendix 10: Sample interview transcript- T 9
(16/4/2015)

Interviewer: Can you tell me how long you have been in the teaching service?
Teacher: Well, about 7 years I have been in the teaching service.

I: Can you tell me how long you have been teaching CAPE Communication Studies?
T: I think it is about 5 years now, a year or two after its inception in Trinidad and Tobago, because you know it came much later to us than the other Caribbean islands.

I: Can you tell me about your qualifications?
T: I have an undergraduate degree in English and a Masters of Arts degree in Literatures in English.

I: What is your present status?
T: I am a teacher 111 and also a dean.

I: Can you tell me what views you hold about CAPE Communication Studies Innovation?
T: Well, in several ways it is a wonderful innovation, some aspects could be improved but I think it is definitely a positive introduction. It is geared for a more holistic development of the students. It will, if you can do all it asks, produce a better, all-round student, with various skills and abilities. It gives students the opportunity to take ownership of their learning and develop critical skills. What it intends is good, but in reality there are challenges. But I will stay on the question you asked for now. So, yes in certain ways it is definitely a positive introduction. You see it is more relevant to who we are, our culture and identity. Take for instance, they put in module 2, Language and Community which is wonderful as it helps the students to position themselves within the Caribbean and feel a sense of identity. I really like the content of this module since it deals with our own Caribbean and local reality. More than that students have the opportunity to understand and value their first language which is not Standard English. Some of them didn't even know that. So it is not just about developing their competencies in Standard English.

T: Can you say more about that?

Y: Well, there is the inclusion of language awareness and language varieties which help students appreciate their own language heritage. Some of them come believing that it is inferior and broken. That it is negative. So this
curriculum can help them understand the role that language plays in who they are, their identity and heritage.

I: What do you think about the other two modules?

Y: Well, the content in all are relevant. Gathering and Processing Information, module 1, helps with students' research skills, summary skills and both oral and written skills. My thinking is that it has its benefits. As for the Speaking and Writing module 3, I also believe that it has merit and important as it encourages students to gain varied competencies and express themselves effectively orally and in writing. So, well, I like the new curriculum but as I said, it's a lot to do as it is quite expansive and from all the years I have been teaching it, I can tell you, you can't do all that it demands.

I: To what extent do you think that Caribbean Cultural Content and Cultural resources should be included in the curriculum?

Y: It is a good thing. I am, view it as a positive. I do really appreciate the inclusion of Module 2 and all the modules. But Module 2 has a lot of Caribbean Cultural Content in the form of language varieties, creole languages, the role of language in Caribbean society and the role of language in Caribbean identity. So I value that. But it is not so easy to teach
because you need a Linguistics and Language background. Many teachers get trouble with this module. I do like it but sometimes the depth CXC requires, for example, to know the structures and the features of Jamaican, Guyanese and other Caribbean territories Creole are too much. Just doing Trinidadian Creole is a lot, and you must have that deep knowledge. And, um, in terms of cultural resources, I think it is wonderful, but not all are available to us. Sometimes even if I try to source it myself it is difficult, but I get some. For instance, I like the videotaped films such as “My Fair Lady” and “Oliver at Large” and audiotapes by Paul Keeser Douglas. There are also a wide range of suggested text books but not all helpful though. We need better, more updated textbooks. There is a very good one by Edlin Rochford though. So inclusion of our local texts that are good are important. Inclusion of Caribbean content then is critical because for so long we only used foreign text books and materials. Our own indigenous resources really is a plus and gives us a greater understanding of who we are. However, there must be a balance; we also need other resources and other world views.

I: What are your views about the inclusion of both traditional and internal (IA) forms of assessments?

T: Well, I think that both are important and should be included. The Internal
Assessment is really a portfolio that is supposed to help students in getting the relevant skills and knowledge in Communication Studies. Also, it is an avenue for students to take ownership for their learning. Be more independent and become analytical thinkers. However, whether this in reality actually happens is another story due to several challenges. So a lot of the times what is intended is good and positive but when put in the reality of the context or situation, it is fraught with constraints. For instance, the percentage is 80% for the traditional exam and 20% for the IA. So still the traditional outweighs the other one. And the IA is over time consuming. Yes students get to do several drafts but it involves many drafts and it takes a lot of time. Mostly they want to get over with it. It’s not really about their experience of it. Perhaps to with the IA, one of the creative, reflective pieces could have asked the students to do it in creole, this is an inconsistency in my view.

I: Can you tell me what are your views about the teaching approaches proposed by the CAPE Communication Studies innovation?

T: Well, um, there are several approaches suggested. Firstly, team teaching which I endorse and believe it would help greatly in my teaching of Communication Studies. Team teaching involves collaboration with peers and ongoing dialogue. This is pertinent and would be very helpful as you
can get to the information in a deep way by brainstorming ideas and
deconstructing things. You are not working in isolation so it will help with
implementation. So I think it is helpful, however, in my school we do not
have team teaching. All the teachers teach separately. We meet to talk about
exams and so on but no team teaching or collaboration. No arrangements
are put in place for this, or to facilitate it. Also, another approach is of
course integration of the modules, which I see the benefit of. Although they
are separate, in a subject like Communication Studies, you cannot teach it
separately! Then there is pair work, groups, work and use of the multimedia
in the classroom. A lot of student centered activities are suggested which I
do believe are important to let students be active participants in their
learning and to develop more creative, critical thinkers. Group work is
important but historically, we taught more teacher-centered. I like the
suggested activities but can’t do a lot of it because I still have to cover the
syllabus to prepare students for examinations. Am, the use of multimedia
and technology can only add to learning and make it more interesting and
visual helps in understanding. I am all for it. However, in reality, I can’t use
a lot given the pressure from everyone to complete the syllabus. And I am
still in a system that is structured, uniform, monitored and traditional. So
you have this nice curriculum but in same old structure and that is a
problem. The timetable is very rigid, no flexibility at all and we have the

Comment [nh35]: Team teaching and collaboration can help implementation
Comment [nh36]: No team-teaching or collaboration
Comment [nh37]: No arrangements to facilitate

Comment [nh38]: Integration beneficial
Comment [nh39]: Student activities important
Comment [nh40]: Active participants and creative, critical thinkers
Comment [nh41]: Group work important
Comment [nh42]: Historically teacher-centered instruction
Comment [nh43]: Focus on coverage of syllabus and examination
Comment [nh44]: Multimedia adds to learning and understanding

Comment [nh45]: Pressure to complete the syllabus in a non-lecture format
Comment [nh46]: Structured, uniform, monitored and traditional system
Comment [nh47]: New curriculum in old structure=problem
115. demands of exams.

116. T: How do you conduct your classroom teaching to achieve the objectives of the CAPE Communication Studies Syllabus?

117. T: Well, hmm, as I said before I believe in using several approaches but in reality I use more a traditional teacher-centered approach. Let me explain. Firstly, Communication Studies is a high stake examination, and given our exam-oriented system, this approach is better as the students, administration and parents focus is on getting the best grades. Also, the curriculum itself has 80% of the marks for the traditional examination. So teaching to the test will produce these high grades in my opinion, with limited time, I also do some of the suggested teaching and learning activities as suggested by the syllabus. Some of these are group work, for example I let them collect different samples of various types of writing. Then I ask them to discuss in groups the differences in terms of usage, listening devices and style. After they were asked to present it. This was time-consuming and took very long even to organize. A lot of time was spent on it and in the end, students still did not present deep thoughtful responses. They take individual work more seriously. And there are other activities I want to do such as, let students present orally on a creative piece of their choice and audiotape them, then have them evaluate themselves. However, I never got the time. There are other activities as well I want to use, such as a lot of the multimedia with especially with listening skills but for one the multimedia is hard to get and time consuming. If it was available as I walked into the classroom it would help.

Comment [nb48]: Timetable rigid and exam demands

Comment [nb49]: Believe in several approaches

Comment [nb50]: Use more teacher-centred approach given exam oriented system and for best grades

Comment [nb51]: Teaching to test to produce high grades

Comment [nb52]: Some group work but time consuming

Comment [nb53]: Students take individual work more seriously

Comment [nb54]: No time for some activities

Comment [nb55]: Multimedia not easily available
## Appendix 11: Sample interview data- themes and sub-themes linked to chunks of text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-Theme</th>
<th>Supporting Details – Portions of Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>Students are unfortunately more qualification-oriented and certification-oriented because we all know this is a high-stake exam for them. We are answerable to the principal, parents, teachers, alumni [and] everyone else. And it is not that we don’t want to spend the time to get into the depth of the work, we have to do it in a limited way. Students want what is necessary for the examination. You have to let them know; well you need to have a holistic view of things, but at the end of the day I may be looking at that in my classroom, but they are seeing it from the perspective of what is the requirement of the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>We have no choice but to teach for the exam. Too little time and too much pressure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>I guess to me is not the listening as much as the writing skills I stress. The writing will be there because the exam is going to be written at the end of the day. The writing skills are there and students have to be able to complete essays in the allotted time and so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>My philosophy is that education should be about learning and not just about preparing to pass an exam. I find often times we end up trying to train the children to pass the exam and, so learning is really hampered. So, you know they leave, they pass the exam. Sometimes I question myself as a teacher, did I do an injustice to the students, did I actually help them? Yes, they got the certificate…fantastic, [but] how much did they learn at the end of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>Well I teach to facilitate the exam right. If I have to teach the entire syllabus we would not be able to meet the needs of the exam. So that happens with a lot of subjects as well, you teach for the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>I want to teach for the all-round development of my students but too many challenges. At the end of the day, I have to think of the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>To be honest with you the orals that were also a big limitation because again time and the subject matter content. Orals are given very little attention and maybe twice we had a practice in terms of only preparing for the IA. As I said it is very exam-oriented. It was just done basically because they had to prepare for this IA where they had to give a ten-minute speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
<td>We have to teach for the exam, you know. Everybody looking for ones in the exam: principals, students, parents and the Ministry of Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9       | External-contextual factor | Examination-oriented system        | What is a great challenge is the examination system? You know CAPE is a major high-stakes exam and that is demanding, we have three, SEA, CSEC and CAPE. So, our system is exam oriented and it influences in a serious way what we do in class. Everything is about best passes at examinations, success of it. Our system is one of meritocracy. So, there is pressure to get scholarships and ones from everyone – the students, parents, principal and MOE and society at large. This is the emphasis, so it’s a nice innovation, but in the same old shell, it has to fit. So, I can’t implement everything I
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>External-contextual Factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>External-contextual factor</td>
<td>Examination-oriented system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

want in class all the time, like group activities, more oral, more listening, more technology. Because of this pressure of exams, I use a lot of exam papers and textbooks. Exam influences which university the student goes to. Everyone wants scholarships and without a grade one in Communication Studies, that won’t happen.

I try to include lots of stuff. Am. But then I focus on the areas that come in the exam because if I don’t then time may run out.

Well the exam is at the back of everyone’s mind. You can’t help it.

So much to do. So little time and resources. And then this exam. pressure.

As you know this is an exam society. Parents, teachers [and] students, we all grow up learning that we have to write…examination and we must perform the best at it no matter what.

As much as you would like to do…in depth analysis of Caribbean culture, identity, communication, you can’t. End result is to get a one in the [examination] and a scholarship…You have to focus on what is coming for the exam and gear yourself towards that rather [than] go in-depth

We teach towards passing the exam and we miss out on a lot, you know, that discussion in class. I would have loved to do some outings [school excursions], and bring in resource persons to talk about language. But because of time constraints and working toward this exam and passing the exam, we can’t. And in a school like this especially…a Prestige school they work towards scholarships. You have to get a one in Communication Studies and you have to get a scholarship. There is that extra pressure to do well, to pass the exam and sometimes I feel I miss out on class time for that

Our society is exam- oriented. We are judged by this. We are blamed if we do not get passes.

Well I do other things. Group work I try but little, time and the big exam doesn’t help.

We use a lot of past papers from all over…[W]e start…module one essay writing very early because that is the five hundred-word essay and that is where you get the problem.

This school, I can’t understand the ‘board’ sometimes. They display your results and they would put your name up with a graph from last term to this term, and they would look at the results. They may not give you the resources and all of that to help you, but all they looking at is the graph. How [many] ones, how [many] twos and how [many] threes. So, you could understand sometimes how demotivated it could be for some teachers
Appendix 12: Extract classroom observation-T4

T: Teacher
S: Individual student
SS: Group of Students
Italics: Comment

T: Good morning. ..... Let’s begin. You are the students and I am the teacher. I am going to make a few comments and you are to listen and then I am going to ask you some questions.
So I am gonna say:
‘Dena eh eh girl you eh see how she was talking today she feel like she real big up eh like she come from away eh.
S: All right Miss, no problem.
T: I am the teacher; Dena was still the student. You heard that conversation? You heard what I said to her? The comment I made? Can you tell me what dialect I used in that comment?
S: Basilect
T: Basilect? And what kind of English?
S: Trinidadian Creole
S: Basilect

T: Basilect? And what kind of English?

S: Trinidadian Creole

T: Right so it was Trinidadian creole. Right can you tell me what register I used?

S: Informal

T: Informal. Can you tell me what communicative behaviour was used?

S: Gestures

T: What gesture?

S: hand movements

T: What hand gesture? Any particular hand gesture?

S: Point

T: I pointed right! Did I demonstrate an attitude to language?

S: Yes

T: What attitude to language did I demonstrate?

S: inaudible

T: So it was Trinidadian Standard English. So I want you to look at these four elements on the board and these four elements are what you are required to use to do your analysis for section three of your portfolio. It is also going to be tested as you know for your exam. This morning because the analytical part of your IAs ... I want to focus very much on these four elements this morning. To do so I just need you all to remind me if you were able to identify them in the comments that I made but let's just quickly go back a little bit and make sure we have in our minds what each term means. When we talk about dialect your exam requires you to analyze what we call dialectal variations. When you hear the term dialectal variation what do you understand by the term dialectal variation? Just to recap. What do we mean by this term? What is a dialect?

S: A variation of language

T: Speak up I need to hear you.

S: A variation of a language.

T: A variation of a language. When we talk about dialectal variations what are we talking about?

S: Miss, like when a person speaking like Trinidadian Creole and they switch to Trinidadian
T: A variation of a language. When we talk about dialectal variations what are we talking about?

S: Miss, like when a person speaking like Trinadian Creole and they switch to Trinadian Standard English.

T: Yes, so we are talking about the kinds of English in our case the kinds of English that is being used in a dialogue, in a piece of writing. As you correctly pointed out it is either in our instant it can be the Standard English whether it is Trinadian, Jamaican as the case may be or creole. Good so which variety, which variety of the dialect, which version of the language? In terms of register what do you understand by the term register?

S: It is like the situation in which the dialect is being used.

T: Right but when we look at register we are looking at what about the situation and the register?

S: Miss, for example if you go to a formal setting or a ceremony or funeral you will use a formal register instead of informal like when you having a conversation with a personal friend or a family member you will tend to use it because they will understand.

T: Going back to the comment that I made as a teacher to Deena would you consider that register of what I said to Deena to be appropriate at that time?

S: No.

T: Why not?

S: Because it is a classroom and in a classroom you have to use formal register.

T: Right what else?

S: Appropriate use of register for the situation.

T: Right very good. When we talk about register we are talking about the appropriateness of the use of the register, the appropriateness of the use of that register for the situation. When we are determining whether the register is appropriate or not we need to take two or three things into consideration when we are assessing and analyzing like we are required to do for our IAs. What are the three things we need to keep in mind or to assess whether the register is appropriate or not?

S: Your audience.

T: Very good the audience.

S: Your context.

T: Your context or situation and your purpose. In terms of communicative behaviour, you said I pointed. What did my pointing do in that comment that I made?

S: It add emphasis; it indicated who you were speaking to.
S: It add emphasis; it indicated who you were speaking to

T: Right so it gave some sort of direction and it emphasised who I was speaking to. If you remember correctly communicative behaviours have different functions. Do you remember what the functions are? Maybe before I jump to that can you tell me the different types of communicative behaviours we need to look for? Let’s do that first. What are the types of communicative behaviours we need to pay attention to, to look for, in our pieces of writing, in any extract? What do we consider communicative behaviour?

S: We have the hand gestures; we have the body language

T: Right

S: The pitch and tone

T: First of all we talk about all that fall under the broad heading non verbal right? Good. Non verbal and we’re looking at hand gestures, you said body movements, what else? Are these the only two communicative behaviours? Casey what other communicative behaviours do you know?

S: Artifacts

T: Artifacts. What is artifacts by the way? Just remind me what do we mean by artefacts?

S: Miss like props or objects

T: Yes but how? Instead of using words I am doing what with the gestures? There are four words that start with S. I am not saying it. Instead of the words I am...

S: Is not signal?

T: It’s not signal. I don’t want to use my words. I am substituting. The functions we said was to substitute, to emphasize, what else?

S: To direct

T: Right to direct, what else? Remember the example I gave the last time when we were now doing this lesson?

S: To emphasize

T: Right to emphasize, to repeat. If you go to a dance and somebody asked you to dance and you said no but you are shaking what are you sending?

S: Contradicting

T: Right contradicting so you’re reinforcing, you’re substituting, you’re regulating, you are contradicting what you are saying. So these are the functions when you analyze it is not sufficient to identify the functions they perform and you have to justify. In terms of attitude to
S: Response to language

T: Right we are looking at someone’s response to the language used, the language variety spoken by another person and that response as Simone correctly said it could be positive or negative. How do we know that it is positive or negative? We are not going to say positive or negative, what are some words we learned to describe people’s attitude to language? Coming back to the comment I made to Deena what is my attitude to the language that Keshel used?

S: Disgust

T: Disgust

S: Scornful

T: Right so I showed disgust and contempt and scorn in that situation in her use of Standard English. So those are some of the words we can use to describe people’s attitude towards a language. Let’s move on to a question now that I have here for us. In fact it’s a past paper question and it deals with exactly what we are speaking about. As you can see the copies unfortunately aren’t of the best quality. Let’s look at this extract. Let’s go through the extract a bit. Can somebody volunteer to read please? Yes don’t all rush at the same time. A volunteer please?

---

Student reads from a CXC CAPE Communication Studies past paper (2010, Section B Module 2 - Language and Community Question 2)

Student (reads): They lived in a tenement yard in August Town. An L-shaped row of rooms housed several families, each family occupying one room, and all sharing a long, red-tiled verandah that ran along the building.

Mrs. Jackson had cooked rice and peas and fried chicken, a real Sunday meal made a day too early. Carrot juice sweetened with condensed milk was already in a plastic jug on the table.

‘Sit down, sit down, please,’ Mrs. Jackson said. ‘Sorry the place not bigger.’

‘It’s nice, it’s nice,’ Andrea assured her. ‘And what a lovely bedspread.’

‘Yes, is real linen, you know. My sister in England sent it for me.’

‘It’s lovely.’

They ate. The food was spicy and delicious. Andrea chewed slowly; she didn’t want to offend by not eating enough but she also wanted them to have some food left for tomorrow.

‘Heat up, heat up,’ Mrs. Jackson said. ‘I don’t have no fridge, so if we don’t heat everything it gwine spoil.’

‘The word is “eat”, manna, not “heat”,’ Natasha corrected her mother sternly. Mrs. Jackson looked at her with pride.
The child tightened her face scornful and angry as she looked at her mother. Mrs Jackson smiled gently and several emotions went across Natasha’s face. Andrea watched her, knowing she loved her mother but was ashamed of her. She too had felt that way, until her mother died when she was sixteen, three years ago. But her reasons had been different. Mrs. Jackson didn’t seem the type who would drink white rum like a man and go to bars where she was the only woman. Andrea closed her eyes briefly.

“You've decorated your home so nicely Mrs. Jackson,” she said. “Have you lived here long?”

“Thank you love. I have been living here since Natasha born. Her father abroad you know. He working so he can send for the two of us.” Natasha had heard this since she was old enough to ask where her father was.

T: Ok thank you Keshel. So this question is asking you to analyze these four elements that we just discussed in terms of the story or the extract in terms of registers, dialectical variations, attitudes to language and communicative behaviours. So what I would like us to do very quickly maybe in pairs. I am giving you about 15 minutes I think that should be sufficient time just to identify what was used in the passage and of course to try and offer some justification, explanation for your answer.

T: Of course let me just interrupt a minute you have to present right to the class your findings so be prepared to speak.

Students worked in pairs for 15 minutes to answer the past paper questions.

After 15 minutes the teacher stops the students indicating that their time has ended. The teacher takes control of the class standing to the front.

T: Ok so your time is about up so if you are finished did I rob you a minute or two? I think everybody is finished from what I have gathered so let’s begin and I will ask you for one person between the two, to present their findings on the extract. So we start with the pair that deals with register. You can both go to support each other that’s fine.

Student presentation (in pairs) lasted about 15 minutes. After the presentation the teacher goes again to the front of the class.

T: So then if you look at the question at the back of the sheet you are asked to do an essay in no more than 300 words exactly what the IA is asking of you and to do an analysis of the extract using two of the four items we identified on the board. We did all four items and what we did was an analysis, that is what the word analysis means, to interpret and explain your point when you read. When you read you have to identify your points, explain, justify, interpret that is what the term analyze means. So because as you know we are practicing for our IAs as well as for our exam I want us to delve straight into that piece of writing. Before we do so let’s just quickly remind ourselves what we need to write when we are pulling our essays together. We already did
the analysis now we need to put it together in a piece of writing. So what are you going to pay
attention to when you write this essay in three hundred words? What do you need to do in your
essay? What does essay mean? What do I expect when I hear the word essay? What does it mean
to write an essay class? Have you done essays before?

SS: Yes

T: Right so what does it mean to write an essay? What do I expect?

S: At the beginning you expect to make mention of the two considerations that you are going to
discuss in your essay. Lower down you will take like two paragraphs to discuss like two or three
examples of one of the considerations that you took and then you close it.

T: So I expect first of all a long continuous piece of writing. And somebody whispered
paragraphing. But as Keshel rightly pointed out I expect to see an introduction that points to the
two items that you are going to discuss. And because we have only 300 words it is not going to
be a long winding piece of introduction or thesis statement And then in the paragraph that
follows remember our first sentence must have our, we must develop a topic sentence where we
are going to explain what we are writing. The topic sentence will tell us what that paragraph is
about. Then we are explaining as Keshel says if we choose register make a general statement that
is our topic sentence is about register. We did all this already it is just recap really. And then you
are going to identify what the registers are, we’ve already done that. Give your examples, explain
ok? How do we move from one paragraph to another? We must have connectives connecting
words and phrases so that it can be cohesive. What does a conclusion do?

S: Summarize

T: Right so you summarize all that you have written. And of course remember what we should
not do in a conclusion?

S: State any new points.

T: Right we are not to state any new points, stay within what we have discussed. Let’s try we
have exactly 25mins so let’s see if we can pull it together in 25mins which I will collect because
I am not sure we have time to present. 25mins let’s see you do that. [We’ve practiced before and
this is what we call a drill exercise practicing under some time constraints so you can function
during your exams]
Appendix 13: Sample observation field note – T4

Classroom Observation (FN) Field Notes

T4

90 minutes

Topic Focus: Module Two (II) – Language and Community “Dialectal Variation, Register, Communicative Behaviour and Attitude to Language”

The teaching method was teacher-centred. It was a traditional classroom setting. The teacher was mostly in front of the class and students seated in rows. The teacher used the blackboard and chalk to put down important points. However, the lesson was taught using whole class instruction. The teacher asked questions and the students provided answers when they could. If the teacher was not satisfied with the responses from the students, then she answered. The teacher, therefore, did most of the talking and was the authority figure in the class.

At the start, the teacher introduced the Module and topic that she would be teaching. She reminded students that the topic is important in relation to the internal assessment (IA) and examination. Whole class discussion was the method used to teach the content area. The teacher referred to the relevant content area in the examination paper and stressed the importance of practicing examination questions. The teacher selected a student to read the passage from the Examination Past Paper 2010 Section B Module 2 that related to the lesson taught. The teacher then put students into pairs/groups to discuss specific questions on the examination paper for 15 minutes. Each group had to analyse different areas:

Group 1 – Register

Group 2 – Dialectal Variation
Group 3 – Attitudes

Group 4 – Communicative Behaviours

The teacher then passed around once and assisted each group with their work for 15 minutes. After 15 minutes, each group presented their question. Students stood at the front of the class and presented briefly (one member presented). The teacher helped them to get more examples by eliciting answers to her questions.

The teacher referred again to the question based on the past examination paper (2010). She reminded the students that for the examination they will have to do an essay of no more than 300 words. The emphasis is on writing skills and organization for the exam. Also, she reiterated that the content, knowledge and skills for the essay are also relevant for the IA assessment, particularly the analytical part of it. The teacher explained again the strategies necessary for writing an effective essay for example, an introduction, development of topic sentences, use of connectives and a conclusion.

Finally, individual students had to write the essay in class. They were given 25 minutes to do so. The teacher noted it was a drill exercise in order to function within the time constraints of the examination. The teacher noted that the students did drill exercises before.

My Comments

The teacher structured her classroom to deliver certain aspects of the syllabus in tandem with the examination. Generally, 90 minutes was spent on transmitting the content to students relevant to answering the written essay from Section B Module 2. Delivery of different parts of the syllabus required different teaching styles. However, the teacher-centred style was mostly used to develop students’ writing competencies. Pair work was
used briefly. Also, individual students had to write their essay during class time but did not have the time to present it. The teacher also used the lesson to develop other competencies such as reading comprehension, listening, speaking, but this was minimal and given minority time.
Appendix 14: Sample teacher’s work plan

Introduction - Describe the scenario, explain your role, Outline what you intend to do in the essay.

Media/Channels - List, Explain, Justify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stewards</th>
<th>Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Media</td>
<td>Channels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlets</td>
<td>Print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Post</td>
<td>Social Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Messaging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog - schools, malls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurants, hospitals, health centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies to persuade convince - Explain, justify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stewards</th>
<th>Providers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pathos Emotion</td>
<td>Appreciation for all they do and volunteering for more even though they are busy and patriotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patriotic duty as citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos Intellect</td>
<td>Benefits of Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of support for the promotion of good health through sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethos Character</td>
<td>Loyalty as community member representing their country in a locally organized international event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approach through well respected doctors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE PAWPAW

Four little boys tattered,
Fingers and faces splattered
With mud, and climbed
In the rain and caught
A pawpaw which they brought
Like a bomb, to my house I saw
Them coming: a serious mumbling,
Tumbling bunch who stopped
At the steps in a hunch.
Releasing the fruit from the leaf
It was wrapped in, I watched them
Carefully wash the pawpaw
Like a nugget of gold. This done,
With rainwater, till it shone
They climbed into the house
To present the present to me.
A mocking sign of the doom of all flesh?’
Or The purest gold in the kingdom?

Appendix 16: Sample teaching material- model answer T10

The extract adapted from the Merle Hodge, Crick Crack Monkey tells of the experience of a young Grenadian girl who appears to be employed in a Trinidad household. The narrative extract would be examined in consideration to various characters social status, attitude to language and the social tensions that arise between characters.

Eudora is relegated a generally low status in Aunt Beatrice’s household. Her work includes taking care of a troublesome and disrespectful young child. She comes from Grenada, a country and its people also held in little regard by her employers. In their presence she feels defeated and “always looks as though she was in the point of crying.” When they are not around, she is happy, “boisterous” and playful.

Eudora spoke in Grenadian Creole, an attitude which infuriated Aunt Beatrice. She used the word “frack” for dress, referred to the child as “damn lil red ants” and says to her visitor “Gwan, you hear…” She appears to be quite comfortable and commented using this dialect. When Aunt Beatrice complains about her “talking like Grenadian people” she does not respond except for singing mournful Grenadian folk song. She seems unable rather than unwilling to change how she speaks a fact which may be accounted for only having gone up to “T’ird” Standard in Grenada.

Aunt Beatrice on the other hand feels socially superior. She looks down and speaks down to Eudora. She has a take charge approach to running her household affairs. Aunt Beatrice generally speaks in a Trinidadian Standard English which she regards as superior. She is “near hysterical” when Carol, following Eudora, calls her dress a “frack”. She associates “backwardness” with Eudora’s use of Grenadian Creole and
cannot comprehend Eudora’s unwillingness to “better herself” by speaking “properly”.

It is evident that there is some social tension between Eudora and Carol. Although Eudora is an adult and Carol a child, Carol seems to have adapted her mother’s attitude to Eudora. She throws a “tantrum”, she screams at Eudora to “hurry up” and enjoys running all over the house with “Eudora shouting after her.” Eudora at least would sometimes mutter a curse under her breath, “you damn lil red ants,” but does not openly say anything. This tension is considered the natural order of things so evidential when Eudora addresses and somewhat sarcastically “Awright white-lady” which betrays the child’s sense of superiority over her.

The passage is entertaining, and the character’s use of language effectively captures their respective character. Merle Hodge does an excellent job of creating realistic characters who use natural and convincingly realistic language. The extract also highlights the typical rivalry of linguistic superiority between the two islands of Trinidad and Grenada.
Appendix 17: Teaching resource- sample notes from textbook

Characteristics or features of Creole Languages

All Caribbean Creole languages have elements of syntax, semantics and phonology. All of these creoles show similarities to those languages of the slaves from West Africa. As a result of these similarities there are common linguistic features within the Caribbean creoles despite their base language. Some features of English-based creoles in the Caribbean which can be attributed to linguistic differences or a person’s perception:

➢ The most common plural marker ‘s’ in Standard English is shown differently in Creole.
  • Mary and dem went out.
  • Can you look at these book?
  • We have plenty orange on our tree.
  • My mom bought some book for me.
  • Ben has ten marble in his bag.
  • The market have a set of fruit in it these days.

Each of these sentences contains a plural noun, but in Creole there is no ‘s’ ending as is the rule in English.

➢ Creole speakers express possessive nouns differently; the owner is placed directly before that which is owned.
  • We are going to my uncle house.
  • “John, can you bring Mark shoe for him?”
  • That is the man book.

Appendix 18: Internal assessment (IA) rubric

Internal Assessment

PORTFOLIO

Each candidate will compile a portfolio on a theme selected, determined by the candidate and approved by the teacher. The portfolio should be internally coherent and be organized under four sections as follows:

1. General Introduction (12 marks)

This section should be no more than 200 words. It should relate to the other three sections, identifying the theme selected and the purpose of selecting it and showing how it relates to the candidate’s academic, work-related and personal interests.

2. Exposition (16 marks)

This section of the portfolio will be orally presented and examined. The duration should be no more than ten minutes per candidate. Topics chosen in this section should be current. A candidate should collect at least two pieces of related information on the selected topic.

A candidate’s presentation should be well organized and effectively delivered and should feature:

   I. a discussion of the issues raised and the challenges experienced in exploring the selected topic;

   II. an evaluation of the effect of source, context and medium (or channel) on the reliability and validity of information gathered. (Refer to page 6, content 4c (v).

Candidates may bring to the examination room a single cue card, 4” by 6”, with headings (and nothing else) related to their presentation. Teachers must ensure that each candidate’s card is free of additional information.
3. **Reflection** (14 marks)

A candidate will create ONE sample of original work which should not exceed **800 words**. The sample created should cover ONE literary genre. Please note that the sample created must relate to the theme selected.

For this sample, candidates should write a **preface** of no more than **200 words**, specifying:

a. the purpose;

b. the intended audience;

c. the context