Whither Are We Drifting? Primary Education Policy in Jamaica

A dissertation presented to
the faculty of
the College of Education of Ohio University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Winsome M. Chunnu
June 2009

© 2009 Winsome M. Chunnu. All Rights Reserved.
This dissertation titled
Whither Are We Drifting? Primary Education Policy in Jamaica

by
WINSOME M. CHUNNU

has been approved for
the Department of Educational Studies
and the College of Education by

Francis E. Godwyll
Assistant Professor of Educational Studies

Renée A. Middleton
Dean, College of Education
ABSTRACT
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Director of Dissertation: Francis E. Godwyll

This study sought to understand the factors that influenced primary educational policy implementation between 1980 and 1985. Then Minister of Education Mavis Gilmour stated that 80 to 90% of the Jamaican population received no form of education beyond the primary level, and 52% of students who graduated from primary school were unable to read or write. She insisted that major changes had to take place at the primary level to improve the overall education system. This study examines the polices that were introduced to “fix” primary education in Jamaica.

This was a qualitative study conducted in two Jamaican parishes; Kingston and St. Thomas. A case study design was utilized in order to gain indepth insight into the policy implementation process, using postcolonial and the political model as theoretical frameworks. Interviews and document analysis were used as the main sources of data.

The study revealed that education officers in the ministry stated that policies were communicated, while the majority of teachers insisted that they were never informed by the ministry or education officers about these policies. Instead, they heard about them on television, the radio, or read them in the newspaper if they knew at all. Teachers also insisted that they were never provided with guidelines and policy goals were never communicated to them.
The majority of teachers were not aware of an evaluation process although the education officers and the ministry personnel all indicated that an evaluation process was in place. It was also evident that there was a high level of confusion among the implementation team.

Lack of parental involvement, poverty and unemployment significantly influenced the consciousness of the value of education. These challenges are compounded by teenage mothers, absentee fathers, uneducated parents, and a low educational level as well as a low literacy level in communities, all of which influenced primary education.

There needs to be significant improvement in communicating policies as well as in involving teachers in the consultation and implementation process. Providing policy implementation guidelines is also critical. Policy should be tailored to fix specific problems instead of the “cookie cutter” approach in use now.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Primary education was “reduced to shambles.” (Jamaica Hansard, 1981, p.76) These were the words uttered in 1980 by the newly elected Jamaican Minister of Education Mavis Gilmour during her policy speech to the Jamaican Parliament. She acknowledged that the state of primary education prior to independence in 1962 was “grossly inadequate.” Gilmour’s government inherited a school system where teachers were inadequately trained. Services, such as uniforms, books, and the school feeding program, were also insufficient. Facilities and maintenance of school buildings were inadequate, with leaking roofs, and some schools without windows or doors. In addition, the majority of primary schools were overcrowded. As a result, Gilmour promised primary education would be the top priority of educational reform over a five-year period.

What were the results of Gilmour’s commitment to resuscitate primary education? Three years after the announcement, the Jamaica Five-Year Development Plan (JFDP) for 1990-1995 (which examined the education sector performance between 1983 and 1988) reported that primary schools continued to grapple with a shortage of trained teachers, overcrowding, inadequate furniture, insufficient textbooks, absenteeism, high dropout rates, and vandalism, as well as showing almost no improvement to the physical units (schools).

The challenges that primary education is encountering may or may not be the consequence of policy. However, Gilmour indicated that primary education was the foundation of the Jamaican education system, and I am interested in understanding the
factors that influenced implementation of the policies that were articulated to “fix” the overall system of primary education in the parishes of Kingston and St. Thomas.

The overall system of primary education refers to all the elements necessary for effective functioning of the primary education system in Jamaica. According to Miller (1997), there are standards such as input and context that are necessary for the efficient execution of any education system. Inputs include buildings, furniture, and equipment. Context includes home environment, attendance, nutrition and community relations. Miller (1997) stressed that while education policymakers sometimes ignore context factors because they “originate outside the education system,” it is important to understand how these elements interrelate with input to influence the effectiveness of education policies.

This study uses qualitative methods as its research tool, and postcolonial theory and the political model as frameworks. Postcolonial theory was used to explore the historical and social factors that influenced schools and schooling in Jamaica, while the political model was used to explore the nuances of the policy implementation process.

Background of the Study

In 1837, there were 183 primary schools in Jamaica, with 12, 580 students, and an average yearly attendance of 9, 800 (Brown, 1979). Foner (1973) noted that education became the colonial government’s tool for integrating ex-slaves into society. Schooling therefore became an implement used for enculturation. Until 1885, students had to pay to attend primary schools, which was a challenge for the majority of the population at the
time. Primary schools encountered problems with staffing, sporadic attendance, and maintenance of school buildings (Brown, 1979).

During the early 1900s, new education policies resulted in forms of compulsory education and school amalgamation. The Education Act, passed in Jamaica in 1965, stipulated that the Ministry of Education was responsible for formulation, implementation, and management of education (Walker, 2002). One year later, the New Deal for Education in Jamaica was introduced. The New Deal was funded by the World Bank and represents Jamaica’s first comprehensive long-term policy for education. The goals for primary education were laudable: compulsory education for ages six through 15 as well as reduction in class size at the primary level. However, the New Deal did not result in any meaningful change. Following the New Deal, the election in 1974 of Michael Manley as prime minister resulted in increased expenditures for education, from 2.9% to 5.4% of the GDP (Walker, 2002). Nevertheless, increased expenditure on primary education did not garner any significant results.

Gilmour declared that she would address several areas of deficiency that continued to challenge primary education. After a two-year study, she identified “areas of deficiency” (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 187). Therefore, this study will examine the implementation of polices designed to address these areas: school feeding program, teacher training/upgrade, compulsory attendance, classroom furniture and physical units (schools).
School Feeding Program

Gilmour identified the school feeding program as an area of deficiency influencing primary education. According to Chang, Grantham-McGregor, Hutchinson, Powell, and Walker (1997), in many developing countries there is evidence that hunger affects achievement in school, and this trend is common among Jamaican primary school students. Additionally, many students in Jamaica come from poor homes, which make them vulnerable to food insecurity. Gilmour stated, “There is a direct relationship between feeding programs and attendance at all primary schools” (Jamaica Hansard, 1981, p. 76).

Before 1980, there were two types of school-feeding programs. One, a snack prepared by an outside nutrition company, consisted of a half-pint of reconstituted milk and a patty (fried vegetables enclosed in a flour pastry shell. However, these patties had limited shelf life and often were spoiled by the time they arrived at the schools. More importantly, they were distributed only to schools in the city of Kingston.

The other program was a hot meal. Sugar, flour, milk solids, and butterfat were delivered directly to schools throughout the country. Even so, most schools did not have adequate storage for food, which resulted in insect infestation. Notably, the majority of schools did not even have a kitchen to prepare the food. As a result, the school lunch was prepared outdoors. Gilmour described a rural woman who cooked chicken and dumplings (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 189). The pot was propped up on three stones with wood serving as the fuel. While the woman prepared the chicken, a piece fell to the ground. There was no running water, so she picked it up and added it back to the larger batch.
Approximately 150 to 200 students had to be fed, but there were only 30 plates. Again, with no running water each plate was rinsed in a pan of fly-contaminated water, and was then used to serve the next student. In order to address this unsanitary lunch preparation process, Gilmour stipulated that her sanitary school feeding program would replace these two methods of food preparation. Her administration introduced a bun (nutribun and milk) that provided 50 percent of the student’s daily protein, carbohydrate, vitamin, and mineral requirement, plus a pint of milk (Jamaica Hansard, 1981, p. 189). She emphasized that the nutribun and milk is an efficient, convenient, and hygienic way of providing a balanced meal for students.

Teacher Training

Gilmour also identified the lack of adequate training for teachers as an area of deficiency. She stated that in the 1960s the government began large-scale construction of secondary schools. As a result, many teachers left the primary school system to take positions in the secondary school system (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p.188). In order to attract primary teachers, the government devised a Two Plus One Programme (2+1). This allowed potential teachers to spend two years in college and one year in the classroom under supervision as opposed to three years in college. The Two Plus One Programme was later criticized by educators who believed it was insufficient to provide primary teachers with the necessary preparation to produce quality primary school graduates.

Gilmour proposed a plan that was supported by teacher educators, consisting of three years in college for teachers. Additionally, Franklin McKnight (1981) lauded the expansion of opportunities for those needing training, emphasizing that there was also
significant need to train additional teachers to reduce overcrowding. Many teachers were struggling with the high pupil/teacher ratio. The student to teacher ratio increased from 39:1 in the 1970s to 42:1 in 1987/88. The JFDP indicated that some schools even had ratios of 60:1, which contributed to the excess enrollment experienced by some schools. The figures in Table 1 illustrate that the parishes included in this study could not accommodate students needing places in primary school. Gilmour stated that the ministry was unable to reduce the teacher/pupil ratio. (*Jamaica Hansard*, 1983, p. 190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Primary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


After the introduction of Gilmour’s policy the JFDP, which examined the education sector’s performance between 1983 and 1988, reported that in 1988/89 the percentage of unqualified teachers in primary schools saw a 6.6 % increase. There was also a decline in enrollment at teachers’ colleges from 1313 in 1982/83 to 614 in 1988/89. The JFDP also indicated that there had been no ongoing systematic in-service training for teachers.
Compulsory Primary School Attendance

The Compulsory Attendance Act was introduced in Jamaica in 1965. It granted the Minister of Education the authority to declare the age and schools to which compulsory attendance should apply. According to the act, parents were required to send students to school five days per week, or to pay a fine. The fine varied from monetary obligation to jail time. The act was never enforced (Jamaica Hansard, 1983). Gilmour noted a primary school attendance rate above 90% in Barbados and Trinidad, which had introduced compulsory attendance about the same time as Jamaica. She stated that before compulsory attendance was introduced attendance rate in Jamaica was 66% (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 190). Additionally, the first Scientific Survey on Attendance on primary school attendance in Jamaica confirmed that, “the single greatest deterrent to learning at Primary School age was irregular attendance” (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 190). Gilmour introduced compulsory attendance in primary schools as a part of her overall policy initiatives to improve retention as well as the overall primary education system. St. Thomas (one of the parishes in this study) was selected as a pilot parish.

Classroom Furniture

Gilmour maintained that school desks were related to the emotional development of students (Jamaica Hansard, 1982, p. 190). In her address to parliament, she noted that most of the classroom furniture was poorly constructed. Additionally she stressed that the design was obsolete and did not facilitate rearrangement. The standard furniture (desk) in primary classrooms was a two-seater bench with an attached table unit. Although the desks were designed for two, in most schools there were five, sometimes six, students on
one bench. In their homes, most primary school students slept six to a bed, shared utensils, plates, clothes, and space. Gilmour noted that the continuous sharing of space has resulted in a sociological need among students for their own space.

According to Gilmour, this old desk design promotes the spreading of contagious diseases and causes increased irritability among students, which detracts from learning. Gilmour introduced the single seaters, which she stated provided support for students’ backs and could be rearranged to provide more room in cramped classrooms. The purpose of the new desk and chair combination, Gilmour noted, was to provide emotional development because it gave students something that they could call their own (Jamaica Hansard, 1982, p. 190).

**Physical Units**

School repairs (physical units) were also identified as an area of deficiency. Many of the primary school buildings were old; others were in an advanced state of disrepair. In many schools, there were no walls between classrooms, only corridors separated by chalkboards. Gilmour states: “Fifty-five students are on one side of the chalkboard learning singing and the other fifty-five are on the other side of the chalkboard learning Mathematics” (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 188). Vandalism by community members was rampant and continues to strain the budgets of primary schools. Gilmour stated, “In some places we put in the toilets on Friday and before the children get to school on Monday they were taken or destroyed.” (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 188). The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1983) report endorsed
Gilmour’s assessment, which stated that in some areas there were cases where sanitary facilities were stolen as soon as they were replaced.

In 1983, two years after Gilmour placed primary education at the forefront of her educational policy, UNESCO reported that seven factors contributed to the deficiencies in primary education. UNESCO (1983) cited:

- early streaming leading to student groups that are classified early in their educational careers according to their expected performance; these groups become relatively impermeable and the result is a self-fulfilling prophecy;
- the crowded conditions that prevail in many primary schools due to lack of adequate premises;
- the general lack of instructional materials, such as texts and exercise books;
- the lack of in-service teacher training, as well as supervision and professional advice and support, leading to a sense of relative professional isolation on the part of many teachers;
- a curriculum that is, in reality, determined by individual schools more as a function of the Common Entrance Examination (for placement into secondary school) than by the ministry’s guidelines, leading to a situation in which students are often drilled to pass an examination rather than led through curricula material;
- malnutrition of pupils; and
- low attendance.

The UNESCO (1983) study attributed the blame to primary schools for students performing below acceptable standards in secondary schools, noting, “Unless the blatant deficiencies of primary education are cured, secondary education will remain in a precarious situation” (UNESCO, 1983, p. 21).

Statement of the Problem

The issues which primary education grappled with in the 1800s continued to challenge primary education in the 1980s, and into the 21st Century: Inadequate facilities, overcrowded classrooms, low attendance, and inadequately trained teachers. In addition, stealing from schools increased substantially. Gilmour noted that thieves went to
Maggotty school to steal food that should have been delivered. When they discovered that the food was not available they “burnt down the school as vengeance for their disappointment” (Jamaica Hansard, 1981, p.76). As noted earlier, some schools reported that toilets were installed on Friday, and were taken or destroyed before the students arrived on Monday. In other cases, four sets of toilets that were installed in January of 1983 were all destroyed or stolen by April of the same year (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p.188). Gilmour stated that even schools with Watchmen (security guards) reported constant theft and vandalism by members of the community. Is this symbiotic relationship between school and the community a result of what happens when policy fails? What does it say when the community steals from the school? What does it say about the socioeconomic situation in Jamaica? What forces maintain this dysfunction?

Primary education has become the focus of many governments because it is seen as a major tool in poverty reduction (Kadzamira & Rose, 2003). Therefore, a Jamaica for Jamaicans must look to where its resources are. Gilmour concluded that Jamaica’s resource is her people and Jamaica needed to educate her children to join a developing Jamaican society of middle-class participatory citizens. However, at the end of her five-year term, there was no improvement, and primary education had even lost ground (UNESCO, 1983).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand the factors that influenced primary educational policy implementation between 1980 and 1985. Primary education is and school attendance was compulsory to the age of 16, yet, the costs for books, uniforms,
lunch, and transport continued to deter many families from sending their children to school. These problems are complex, but most scholars (Evan, 2001; Foner, 1973; Harriott, 2003) agree that they are related to poverty, inequality, and the historical evolution of the school system in Jamaica.

Research Questions

1. What were the views of selected stakeholders about the five tenets of Primary Education and their implementation policy in Jamaica during 1980-1985?

2. What is the process of policy implementation in the Ministry of Education?

3. In what ways was the implementation of primary education policies during 1980-1985 influenced by: Historical factors, Political Factors, Economic Factors, and Social Factors?

The goal of this research is to examine policy implementation aimed at improving Jamaican primary education during 1980-1985, in order to understand the factors that influenced the implementation of those policies.

Significance of the Study

Marshall and Rossman (2006) state, “The significance of a study for policy can be developed by discussing formal policy development in that area and presenting data that show how often the problem occurs and how costly it can be” (p.36). The significance of this study lies in its potential to understand the factors influencing primary educational policy implementation during 1980-1985.

Forojalla (1993) declared, “Educational policy becomes a country’s political choices or options, traditions and values and its vision for the future, these cannot be
reduced to quantitative targets” (p. 90). This study sought to understand the factors that influenced implementation of primary school educational policy in Jamaican society from the Ministry of Education to the school level. Marshall and Rossman (1995) also state, “The researcher must show that practitioners need the information that the research will provide” (p. 33). Linking a study to policy issues can assist in convincing policymakers of its importance (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The findings in this study will provide an understanding of factors that influenced policy implementation. This assessment will provide an analysis that may also serve as a platform for implementing new policies.

This research fits into the realm of formative research, which, according to Patton (1990), serves “the purpose of improving a specific program, policy, and group of staff or product” (p. 156). Additionally Miller (1997) stressed that gap in theoretical framework, rather than practice of education, drives university researchers. Theoretical focused research seems to offer minimal value to education policymakers. On the other hand, this research has a theoretical and a practical component, which links input and context standards.

I have not seen other studies that examine implementation at the grassroots level. Other studies from Proquest Dissertations and Theses, such as Robinson’s (2003) unpublished dissertation, examine policy formulation in the Ministry of Education. Lindsay’s (2002) unpublished dissertation examines more broadly, how the comprehensive high school system was implemented in Jamaica. Walker (1984) explored the impact of governmental decisions on the Jamaican educational system from 1960-
1980, and Adolph (1991) investigated the attitudes of principals and chairpersons of school boards towards the financing of public education on Jamaica.

This study is also significant because it covers the first time in the history of Jamaican education that primary education became the focus of education policies. Gilmour articulated these policies, and she was the second woman appointed as a full Cabinet Minister after being elected by popular vote, and the first to serve as Minister of Education (Lee, 1977).

According to McLaughlin (1987), before the factors that influence implementation problems were discovered, economists described poor program “outcomes as market failures” (McLaughlin, 1987, p.171), while sociologists and organization theorists described them as “inadequate organizational control.”(McLaughlin, 1987, p.171) All demanded more “oversight and penalties.”(p.171) Therefore, this study will also add to the literature on the factors that influence policy implementation in general, and Jamaica and the Caribbean in particular.

Delimitations

The focus of this study is limited to Jamaica. Findings of the study concern Jamaican education in general and factors influencing policy implementation in particular. The research results for educational policy in Jamaica are sparse and extremely limited for implementation. This study will not cover all party policies in Jamaica; nor is it concerned with the totality of the policy formulation process. It is not concerned with just what happens in the schools. This study is concerned with how these
policies work to invoke ideas about education, and seeks to give voice to members of the educational system who are otherwise ignored.

Regardless of this study’s boundaries (Marshall & Rossman, 2006), the data collection process was rigorous. The study employs qualitative research methodology in its discourse because I believe this model offers the potential for deeper interrogation of the material under scrutiny, as opposed to the cause-and-effect relationship model. This method is not generalizable; however, it could have implications for education policy and policy implementation in other countries with similar education history and policymaking.

Definitions of Terms
This study will reference the following terms and acronyms:

*All-Age*— Grades one through nine

*CEE*— Common Entrance Examination, qualifying exam to enter high school

*Colonial Period*— British occupation, 1655 to 1962

*Comprehensive High School*— Combination of technical and traditional courses

*Double Shifts*— School operates from 7:00am to 1:00pm and from 12:00pm to 6:00pm

*GSAT*— *Grade Six Achievement Test*

*IMF*— *International Monetary Fund*— International Lending Agency

*JFDP*— Jamaica Five Year Development Plan

*Parish*— Geographical subdivision

*Primary School*— Grades one to six

*Traditional High School*— Focus on university preparation
Organization of Study

The study is organized into seven chapters. Chapter One includes a background statement of the problem, significance of the study, delimitation of the study, definition of operational terms, and organization of study. Chapter Two examines research relating to disparity in Jamaican education, and education history and policy, as well as policy implementation studies. Chapter Three outlines the methodology, theoretical frameworks and instruments that will be used to conduct the study. Chapter Four presents the results and analysis relating to the policies that Jamaican Minister of Education Gilmour introduced. Chapter Five outlines the policy implementation and evaluation findings and analysis. Chapter Six outlines the findings and analysis of the factors influencing policy implementation. Chapter Seven summarizes all the findings as well as makes recommendations for further studies.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review “provides evidence for the significance of the study for practice and policy and for its contribution to the ongoing discourse about the topic” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 26). The first part of this chapter presents a critical review of the Caribbean, Jamaica, the educational history and policy of Jamaica, and the history of primary schools. Miller (1997) input and context standards will be used to examine the school system and sociocultural factors. The economic and political factors influencing the school system are also explored.

The second part of the literature review examines policy components of this study. The study addressing the policymaking mechanism at the Ministry of Education was conducted in 2003. Nevertheless, it provides a framework for understanding the policymaking process, it is essential for a comprehensive understanding of the policy arena in Jamaica, and can provide context for the policy implementation process. Although most of the research on implementation was conducted in developed countries, the literature on policy implementation will provide a context for understanding the factors influencing policy implementation as well as present a framework for analysis. This chapter will conclude with an examination of the theories that will inform the study.

The Caribbean

According to William Demas (1978), the English-speaking Caribbean, the Commonwealth, or the West Indies are all members of Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM). These include Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados, Guyana,
Antigua, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent. The Bahamian islands are outside the community as are the British colonies of the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, and the Turks and Caicos Islands.

The second group of islands comprises Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, Suriname, Netherlands Antilles (six self-governing islands, with the Kingdom of the Netherlands being responsible for defense and external affairs); the three French islands of Martinique, Guadeloupe, and Cayenne are considered the Caribbean archipelago. More recently, however, the term “Caribbean basin” has been used to describe the archipelago, as well as Mexico, five Central American Republics, Panama, Colombia, and Venezuela (Demas, 1978).

According to Demas (1978), the Caribbean countries have a common historical legacy: sugar plantations, slavery, indentured labor, and monoculture economies. There are four different languages (English, Spanish, French, and Dutch) spoken throughout the region, which makes the Caribbean a cultural, political, linguistic, economic, and social montage (Demas, 1978). The Caribbean economies have been highly dependent on various metropolitan countries in terms of trade, transport and communications, technology, economic aid, and direct foreign investment. Even today, the Caribbean remains one of the world’s most highly economically fragmented areas (Demas, 1978), which contributes to the considerable income gap.

Jamaica

Jamaica was colonized by the British in 1655, and remained a British colony until 1962. It is a small island (4,441 sq. km) in the Caribbean, south of Cuba, with a
population of 2.7 million and a Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of $13.47 billion. The main sectors of the economy are bauxite, textiles, bananas, sugar, tourism, and manufacturing. Income distribution in Jamaica is heavily skewed to the most affluent members of society. The wealthiest 30% receive 72% of the income. The poorest 50% receive 12.8% of the income (Edwards & Graham, 1984).

Before independence, two major political parties emerged: Peoples National Party (PNP) in 1938, which, according to Biddle and Stephens (1989), adopted a social democratic economic ideology, and the Jamaica Labor Party (JLP) in 1942, which adopted a conservative economic stance. Norman Manley, an Oxford-trained lawyer, founded the Peoples National Party (PNP) in 1938. It stressed socialist values, promoted political education, and appealed to the middle class. Manley tried to create a structure conducive to policy and ideological debates within the party (Stone, 1980). The Jamaica Labour Party (JLP), according to Stone (1980), was formed by followers of union leader Alexander Bustamante, emerging from the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union. The union members established a political party to compete in Jamaica’s first election in 1944. Stone (1980) states:

The JLP set the pace in the transition towards pork-barrel, machine politics. It de-emphasized formal organizational structure, relying mainly on clientelistic networks of personal support for its political bosses and particularly on the demagogic crowd appeal of the flamboyant Bustamante. (p. 112)

Bustamante championed the rights of the poor, while commenting on the excesses of the middle class.
Stone (1980) states, “The PNP copied the personalism and clientelism of the JLP while the JLP imitated the formal organizational structures of the PNP” (p. 113). Stone (1980) described the policymaking styles of the PNP at this time as outward looking, seeking anticolonial inputs. The JLP policymaking style was described as local and cautious. Stone (1980) noted that in each party, democratic procedures were eventually eroded, and allegiance to the party leader became more important than policy or ideology.

From 1962 to 1972, the JLP attracted foreign investment by offering relief from income taxes for up to 15 years. This policy generated some growth, but it did not trickle down to the majority of the people, and according to Bernal (1984), the JLP administration was widely believed to be corrupt. In the 1972 general election, the PNP defeated the JLP on a “better must come” platform. The PNP, headed by Michael Manley, began a policy of growth and redistribution, including a literacy campaign, food subsidies, rent controls, free education, a national minimum wage, and loans to small business (Bernal, 1984).

However, the oil crisis of 1974; world inflation; and a decline in export, tourism, and investment sent the economy from a surplus to a deficit (Bernal, 1984). The economy shrunk, unemployment rose to an unprecedented level, production stagnated, and in 1978, the average real income fell by 25.9%. By the 1980 general elections, Bernal (1984) asserted that the JLP’s party platform was to take advantage of the economic crisis by pursuing two lines of propaganda and criticism. According to Bernal (1984), the first strategy was to assert that the prevailing economic crisis and the economic hardships
being experienced were solely and directly the result of the PNP’s economic mismanagement. The second maintained that the expansion of the state was intended to transform Jamaica into a communist country. Consequently, the JLP, headed by Edward Seaga, was successful in the 1980 election.

After 18 years in the opposition, the JLP returned to power on September 3, 2007. The party leader, Prime Minister Bruce Golding, continues to grapple with issues surrounding disparity that exists within the population, rooted in the history of Jamaica’s educational system (Evans, 2001).

A History of Jamaica’s Educational System

In 1655, the British settled Jamaica. As the cultivation of sugar cane was introduced, Africans were imported as slaves to work on sugar plantations. The provision of schooling for slaves has been deeply questioned. The continually emerging body of literature indicates that the history of schooling during slavery has been told from multiple perspectives (Brown, 1979; Evans, 2001; Latrobe, 1838; Whyte, 1977). However, in Jamaica, schooling was part of the colonization process, and poorly trained Anglican ministers started schools to supplement their incomes (Whyte, 1977). Several churches (mainly the Church of England) played a central role in educational policy and school construction. Several benefactors even donated money to build schools for the slaves. Whyte (1977) noted that in 1721 Charles Drax donated his estate to establish the Free School for “eight poor boys and eight poor girls.”

The provision of church schools was not unique to Jamaica. Throughout the rest of the Caribbean, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria the colonial
government did not play a central role in the provision of formal education. The schools that were established were staffed by missionaries who, according to Rodney (1972), “gave schooling for their own Christianizing purposes…” (p.241). Similar to the colonial schools throughout Africa, the colonial schools in Jamaica had no formal curricula. Whyte (1977) in her study, *A Short History of Education, in Jamaica*, indicated that these schools taught that submission was the slave’s passport to heaven. Reverend John Sterling, in his assessment of the missionary schools, indicated that these schools had “poor buildings, large classes, poor and untrained teachers, and senseless methods of rote learning” (Whyte, 1977, p. 19).

**The Negro Education Grant**

Three broad chronological periods inform the development of education and education policy in Jamaica. The first period preceded the abolition of slavery, when the British parliament established the Negro Education Grant. This grant allotted £7,500 to provide for the “moral and religious education of the negroes” (Whyte, 1977, p. 29). The grant also allotted £5,000 for the building of a teacher-training school. Yet the Negro Education Grant failed because the money allocated by the British government was seldom spent on education; instead, it was dispersed to religious missions (Foner, 1973).

In 1838, the British government sent Charles Latrobe, an inspector of schools, to assess the education system in Jamaica. Latrobe (1838) found that there had been too few schools built because the missionaries had underestimated the costs of the buildings. Additionally, internal rivalries among the churches led to wasted resources because several churches built schools close to one another. Latrobe (1838) indicated that the
geographic locations of these schools did not serve the slave population. Latrobe also noted that students, who attended schools regularly Monday through Thursdays, stayed home on Fridays to help their parents (Latrobe, 1838). The Negro Education Grant was withdrawn in 1841; the responsibility for financing education was left to the church and the legislature (Whyte, 1977).

_Jamaica School Commission_

During the second period in the development of education in Jamaica, the government played a small role in financing schools. However, trusts, grants, and contributions from wealthy church denominations remained the major means for providing for school construction and maintenance. In addition, a significant policy shift occurred in 1880 with the establishment of the Jamaica Schools Commission to oversee the construction and administration of schools. The members of the commission were appointed by the Jamaican governor and were primarily men from the Anglican Church or the legal profession. The commission governed admittance, course of study, and financing of schools (Whyte, 1977).

The new policies of the commission resulted in various forms of compulsory education and school consolidation. School levels were also reorganized. Prior to the reorganization, students were schooled in one-room schoolhouses. The new system saw the construction of primary schools for students ages six to 12, and junior secondary schools for students ages 12 to 15. Play centers and nursery schools were established.

By the late 1930s, education in Jamaica was decentralized. Elementary and teacher education were under the purview of the Department of Education, while the
Jamaica Schools Commission supervised secondary education. In 1943, a committee was appointed to assess secondary education. The chair of the committee, Professor Isaac Kandel, made several recommendations including that a single body should control both elementary and secondary education, schools should be reclassified as primary and secondary, and a common examination should be instituted that would facilitate the transfer of students from primary to secondary schools.

In 1944, a new constitution granted Jamaica a representative government. Adults 21 and older voted for ministers, among them a minister of education, J. A. McPherson (Whyte, 1977). The election of a minister of education resulted for the first time in education being placed on the national policy agenda.

The Ministry of Education was established in 1953. From the time of its establishment, to Jamaica’s independence in 1962, a national education policy was developed, which expanded the scope of education and redefined educational priorities. According to Foner (1972), in 1962 the government built several primary schools, revised the curricula, provided teachers with college training, developed “basic school” for children under six, introduced vocational training, and increased the number of scholarships for secondary schools.

Secondary Schools and the 70/30 Plan

The 1963 70/30 Plan resulted from demands by the lower class for spaces in secondary schools. Coupled with major school construction, the 70/30 Plan was also a prominent policy shift during the second phase of education development. The Ministry of Education decided to allocate a percentage of places for students from the lower class.
The places would be allocated based on performance on the Common Entrance Examinations. Under the plan, 70% of the places in secondary schools were assigned to students from the public schools, and 30% were assigned to students from private schools.

However, as in the institution of other policies, the 70/30 Plan did not accomplish its desired outcome. Several factors contributed to its failure. First, Miller (1992) reports, students from private schools performed better on the exams because they were better prepared. Second, some parents enrolled their children in private schools and then enrolled them in a public school six months prior to the exams. Consequently, when the secondary school student body was assessed after the implementation of the 70/30 Plan, the results showed that 60% were from the wealthier class, 28% were from the middle class, and only 12% came from the lower socioeconomic class (Cogan, 1983).

According to Cogan (1983), secondary education in Jamaica emerged from two needs. First, the middle class was developing and the wealthier citizens decided that their children should be educated above the primary level; second, the White governing class wanted to relieve themselves of the burden of sending their children to school in England (Cogan, 1983).

The development of secondary education was “education for all.” However, when the secondary schools were inspected in 1911, the enrollment at the 12 schools equaled only 1% of the eligible school age population (Cogan, 1983). The secondary educational reforms implemented during colonization, and after independence, had positive but limited effects. Greater access to education was the main accomplishment of the reform
process, but limited funding lowered the quality of education for the increased numbers of students attending schools. Some scholars argue that the introduction of universally free secondary education was a major step in removing the institutional barriers confronting some students. However, Foner (1973), in her study of a rural Jamaican community, contended that despite increased opportunity only a small percentage of students moved on to secondary schools. She also indicated that for every child who attended school, seven remained in the fields.

*The New Deal*

In 1965, an Education Act was passed in Jamaica, which stipulated that the Ministry of Education was responsible for formulation, implementation, and management of education (Walker, 2002). According to Walker, the act defined the powers of the minister and ministry:

- To promote the education of the people of Jamaica and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose;
- To frame an educational policy designed to provide a varied and comprehensive educational service in Jamaica;
- To secure the effective execution of the educational policy of the Government of Jamaica, and
- To establish a co-ordinated educational system organized in accordance with the provisions of the Act. (p.151)

The New Deal represented the third major phase in the development Jamaica’s educational system. The New Deal for Education in 1966, following the Education Act of 1965, outlined the government’s educational policy. The New Deal was funded by the World Bank and represented Jamaica’s first comprehensive long-term policy for education. The goals were laudable: compulsory education for ages six through 15,
additional facilities for preschool education, and free junior secondary for all, training for teachers, revision of syllabi, and reduction in class sizes at the primary level.

The junior secondary schools built under the New Deal were primarily for students ages 12 through 15. This New Deal policy had unintended consequences. The junior secondary schools were criticized because of the limitations of the coursework. These schools absorbed students from the lower class and provided mainly vocational education.

Primary Schools

In 1837, there were 183 elementary (primary) schools in Jamaica, with 12,580 students, with an average yearly attendance of 9,800 (Brown, 1979). Moore and Johnson (2004), in their study *Neither Led nor Driven: Contesting British Cultural Imperialism in Jamaica, 1865-1920*, state:

Elementary education, so called, was intended to provide the lower classes in particular with the ideological tenets to become civilized, loyal British colonial subjects, and to equip them with basic skills of literacy and numeracy to function at the bottom of society in their presumed role of dependent agricultural laborers. (p.205)

In the late 1800s primary schools encountered problems with staffing, sporadic attendance, and maintenance of school buildings (Brown, 1979). At the time, access seemed to be the major problem affecting primary education. Until 1885, students had to pay to attend primary school, which was a challenge for the majority of the population at the time (Brown, 1979).
After the abolition of fees, attendance continued to decline throughout the British Caribbean. Parents could not afford to provide meals for students while they were at school; and in Guyana, Trinidad, and Jamaica parents continued to rely on their children to assist them in the fields. Ten years after primary school fees were abolished, there were 104,149 students registered with a 65,995 average yearly attendance (Brown, 1979). Attendance in Jamaica was also affected by outbreaks of measles and influenza in 1882 and 1910 respectively (Brown, 1979). Rodney (1972) also noted that in colonial Africa there was a 50% drop-out rate among primary schools (p. 243).

In Jamaica, student and teacher tardiness also presented several challenges for primary education. Moore and Johnson (2004) state: “The evils of truancy and tardiness were thus held responsible for the failure of the education system to produce the desired results of enlightenment and civilization” (p. 214). Moore and Johnson (2004) also indicated that the Quakers even described some of the children as “stupid” and their parents as “utterly illiterate.” In 1880, several members of the Jamaican Assembly introduced the idea of compulsory education as a response to the issue of tardiness. However, the majority of the Jamaican Assembly opposed the idea. Unlike in Trinidad, the Jamaican inspector of schools noted that the cost of implementing such a system could not be borne by the Jamaican government. Regarding compulsory education, then-Governor Musgrave stated:

Compulsory education is…far too much advanced treatment for the lower strata of population which fifty years ago had not emerged from a debasing state of slavery in which any education was at all forbidden and even marriage was
discouraged. What these people first need is all the help that can be afforded to them in moral training, in improving the character of their homes, and their standard of domestic and social life. When these are sufficiently raised there is ample evidence that they will be keenly alive to the advantage of secular education. To stimulate that now by artificial pressure can I fear only produce a distorted development, and more of a class of which there are already too many[;] the half educated vagabonds who are too proud of their smattering of knowledge to be able to dig, but to beg are not ashamed. (Moore & Johnson, 2004, p. 217)

Implicit in these remarks is that education would encourage people to leave agriculture to pursue other careers. Primary education was designed to teach lower socioeconomic children to be good moral citizens of sound character and to continue working in agriculture (Moore & Johnson, 2004). Therefore, Moore and Johnson noted that education was to focus on moral and character development, yet, that same education should also be a reminder of status. In Guyana, compulsory education was introduced in 1876. Compulsory education was finally introduced in Jamaica in 1912.

Schooling was supposed to bolster a new moral order, and primary schools came under the control of various religious denominations. Churches remained active in the provision of primary education even after a central Board of Education was established in 1885. Brown (1979) states, “Of the 698 elementary schools in Jamaica in 1911, the government controlled 22” (p. 84). In Trinidad, the government played a major role in
primary education. However, in Jamaica that role was relegated to various churches (see Table 2).

Table 2: Church-controlled Schools in Jamaica in 1911

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church</th>
<th>No. of Schools Controlled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptists</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moravian</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Missionary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Friends</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Denominational</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Brown, A. (1979), *Color, Class, and Politics in Jamaica*, p. 84.

In *Color, Class, and Politics in Jamaica* Brown (1979) argued that the churches that were competing for students built schools unnecessarily and staffed them with poor teachers. Some churches even refused to admit students if their parents were not church members. In addition, the Jamaican Assembly gave generous annual stipends to the Anglican clergy, while only a fraction of funds went to school maintenance (Brown, 1979).

Still Moore and Johnson (2004) reported that after the First World War, only one-quarter of eligible Jamaican students were registered in school. Additionally, there was a significant gap between registration and attendance for “the percentage of registered children who actually attended school never reached 60 percent; even more alarming, less
than 30 percent of the total number of school-age children did so” (Moore and Johnson, 2004, p. 213).

Jamaica Ministry of Education

As of September 3, 2007, Andrew Holness assumed the position of Minister of Education in the Ministry of Education and Youth (see Figure 1, organizational chart of the Ministry of Education). The government administers the majority of schools in Jamaica, although churches or trusts own some (Evans, 2001).
Figure 1: Organizational Chart, Ministry of Education. Source: Ministry of Education.
The educational system includes the ministry and six regional offices (see Figure 2 Map of Jamaica).
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**Figure 2:** Map of Jamaica Divided by Education Regions.

*Source: Ministry Of Education, Jamaica.*

These regional offices oversee school personnel, supervision, and maintenance. Each regional office is staffed by an education officer whose main responsibility is the supervision of schools from the preprimary to the secondary levels. The educational system serves approximately 800,000 students in public and private institutions. There are over 22,000 teachers employed in 1,000 public institutions. Of the 22,000, only 20% are trained university graduates (Task Force on Educational Reform, 2004).

The formal educational system in Jamaica consists of four levels: early childhood, primary, secondary, and tertiary. The early childhood level, also known as infant or basic
school, comprises student ages four to six. At 91%, Jamaica has one of highest enrollment rates of children in preprimary education in the Caribbean (Task Force on Educational Reform, 2004). Primary education comprises students ages six to 12. Secondary education is available in various institutions, new secondary, comprehensive high, traditional high, and agricultural and independent high schools (Task Force on Educational Reform, 2004). The high schools service grades seven to 13 (The 12th and 13th years of high school serve as preparation for university matriculation). At the advanced level, there are trade schools, vocational institutes, and the university. The government also administers a school for students with disabilities (Evans, 2001).

Factors Influencing the School System

Miller’s (1997) input and context standards are used to examine sociocultural and school system factors. According to Whyte (1977), most of the research on Jamaica’s education system is available only in unpublished theses and dissertations at the University of the West Indies. Miller (1997) compiled abstracts of 50 such studies in his book Jamaican Primary Education: A Review of Policy-Relevant Studies. Some of these studies, which address both input and context standards, were also selected because they address various aspects of this research.

Input Standards

Cultural attitudes are reflected in the school settings, and these attitudes are reinforced by pedagogical traditions (Evans, 2001). Student achievement is closely related to learning conditions and environment. School system factors relate to Miller’s (1997) input standard, which includes school buildings, furniture, supervision and
management, and curriculum. The following discussion considers the influence of such school factors on education.

After independence, the Jamaican government adopted several strategies aimed at improving the education system. Several studies examined the implementation of these strategies. In his analysis of one such strategy, Cummings’s (1986) *Low-Cost Primary Education* found that structural problems continued to impede the development of rural education in Jamaica. In 1974, a group of educators organized a Southeast Asian organization called the Regional Centre for Educational Innovation and Technology. The group was later renamed Instructional Management by Parents, Community, and Teachers (IMPACT). Cummings’s (1986) work is an examination of six countries where this project was implemented. This review will examine only his work on Jamaica.

The IMPACT project was launched in Mandeville in 1978 at a rural all-age school, one of the poorest rural schools in Jamaica. Cummings found that the teachers chosen to carry out the project in its first year disliked the new materials. In addition, students in the experiment lacked the reading skills needed to comprehend the tasks involved with the project. Cummings (1986) also noted that community members grew despondent because the promised changes to the physical structure of the school were not realized.

Cummings (1986) argued that the project was limited by problems in Jamaican society. The personnel at the Ministry of Education who were assigned to the project did not possess a thorough understanding of the project; the project staff was based in Kingston and did not comprehend the rural school setting. Jamaica changed prime
ministers in 1974, and, subsequently, the project was assigned a lower place on the list of priorities at the Ministry of Education. He postulated that while the government’s push to bring education to all social and economic classes showed some success, the system continued to be plagued by absenteeism, school dropouts, teenage pregnancies, and poverty. This analysis led Cummings (1986) to conclude that the project was marred by the structural problems facing Jamaican society. According to Cummings (1986), this project was instituted in six countries and Jamaica was the least successful.

School infrastructure is another factor that influences students’ educational attainment. Eyre (1972) in “The Shantytowns of Montego Bay,” examines shantytowns as well as the role of squatter settlements in human and economic development in Jamaica. She describes shantytowns as “uncontrolled settlements, squatter settlements.” The shantytowns in Jamaica are usually located on the border between urban and rural towns. The residents are those who cannot afford rent in the city, as well as rural residents who have moved near the city in search of a better life. These residents do not possess title to the land. Although Eyre’s (1972) study does not explicitly examine development, she uses census data to provide information on the effects of the social and class structures and the schooling systems in shantytowns.

Eyre (1972) found that some residents’ decision to live in squatter settlements stems mainly from unemployment. Although rural residents move to these settlements to pursue a better life, they encounter structural and social problems similar to those in their rural communities. In Flanker, a settlement in Montego Bay, 500 residents all relied on one source of running water. It was rationed and residents only had water from it for two
hours per day. Although these shantytowns are located close to cities, the public transportation systems do not serve these areas, and residents are forced to walk.

Eyre (1972) argued that the most critical problem in these shantytowns was education. She described the schools as “unbelievably inadequate.” Some schools were dark and dirty, while in others schools children had to wait outside to get into classes that were “standing room only.” Flanker had no school, and all the children walked three miles to a city school; some walked even farther to rural schools. She noted that some families spent as much as one-tenth of their weekly income on taxis to keep their children in school.

Eyre (1972) also found that shantytown dwellers possessed several positive characteristics; they were good money savers and they were industrious. These residents longed for security, and for jobs, electricity, education, water, and transportation. Eyre (1972) saw shantytown dwellers as hardworking members of society; however, their low social status prevented them from realizing the benefits of education.

Another aspect of the school system was the curriculum. Curriculum content and the way it is designed and implemented can have a significant impact on achievement. Jamaican curriculum design is a centralized process and allows little room for input from teachers (Evans, 2001). Eggleston, Jackson, and Hardee (1999) addressed the use of contraception and its implication in the social context of education. This discussion is important because of the high rate of teenage pregnancy amongst Jamaican youth, which in turn influenced educational outcomes (Cummings, 1986; World Bank, 2003).

Eggleston et al. (1999) explored the reproductive behavior and attitudes of poor Jamaican
students in underperforming schools, surveying 945 (490 girls and 455 boys) Jamaican students, ages 11 to 14. They also conducted several focus groups with some members of the survey group. The students attended both rural and urban schools.

Eggleston et al., (1999) found that boys felt a need to be sexually active at a young age, because they felt doing so projected their sense of masculinity. On the other hand, it was frowned upon for girls to engage in similar behavior. Because of these social norms, 64% of boys said they experienced sexual intercourse compared with 6% of girls. The only contraceptive methods either group knew of were condoms and pills; however, they lacked knowledge of their proper use. Some girls also associated contraceptive use with promiscuity.

According to Eggleston et al. (1999), the sexual experience among boys ages 12 and above was high. While the overall view of contraceptive use between both groups was high, less than 50% of them had used contraception during their first intercourse. Although some of the teens reported that they used a condom with their first sexual encounter, the participants revealed that most of them did not possess knowledge about contraception and instead relied on information provided by friends. A male student indicated that he would not tell his mother he had sex, and a female student indicated that a girl would be thrown out of her parents’ house if she became pregnant.

Eggleston et al. (1999) also found that sexual attitudes and behaviors were shaped by sociocultural and gender norms. However, both boys and girls had inaccurate information about reproductive issues. Teenage pregnancy was common, and most said the grandparents would help raise the child. Eggleston et al. (1999) argued that
adolescent sexual behavior has been associated with poverty and low levels of education; however, they also argued that the educational system contributes to this early sexual activity by not providing information on birth control.

Evans’ (2001) *Inside Jamaican Schools* gives breadth and depth to the experiences of students and teachers in the Jamaican classroom through a detailed description of the historical legacy of education in Jamaica as well as the theoretical frameworks for understanding schools and schooling.

In exploring the education policies, scholars often examine the change in curriculum. Curriculum also represents one element of Miller’s input factors influencing primary education. Evans (2001) examined the curriculum and process of teaching and learning in Jamaica. She also highlighted the lack of resources such as chalk and books, yet the new curriculum was calling for computers in every school. She also addressed streaming in relation to how students from socioeconomic status are disproportionately tracked into lower streams.

The Creole language (Patois) in society is a major challenge for the educational system. Many students from low socioeconomic backgrounds are only exposed to Standard English (language of instruction) when they enroll in school. As a result, teachers who are committed to providing an inclusive classroom have to navigate between the two languages. Additionally, many patois speakers are aware of the hegemonic position of the English language, and this awareness decreases their participation in class discussions (Evans, 2001).
Evans (2001) also examines gender in the classroom, and the marginalization of boys (World Bank, 2003). These issues are important because they are how the Jamaican school system has been structured historically. The former Minister of Education Youth and Culture in Jamaica, Maxine Henry Wilson, stated in an interview with UNESCO (2004) that most schools in the inner city were performing below other schools especially in the area of attendance. This, I would argue, correlates with Evans’ (2001) argument that until historical legacies are addressed certain students will always be disadvantaged.

White’s (1979) “Placement, Intern Supervision, School and Intern Characteristics in Relation to Achievement,” study was carried out during the Two Plus One model of teacher training. White (1979) explored the relationship between placement and supervision as it relates to achievement. Interns from four teachers’ colleges dispersed around the country were interviewed and observed during their internship year. White (1979) found that community involvement and adequate physical facilities greatly improved interns’ morale. More importantly, interns participated in their evaluation process and were aware of expectations, which were facilitated through openness with their supervisors.

**Context Standards**

This section provides a review of sociocultural factors as they relate to schools and communities in Jamaica. These reviews closely reflect the Jamaican society of the 1980s. They relate to aspects of Miller’s (1997) context standard, which includes home environment, attendance, nutrition, and school and community relations.
Most of the traditions in Jamaica support the idea that education is a major tool for advancement. Yet in many communities, some students are marginalized because of race, religious beliefs, and social class (Evans, 2001, Foner 1973). Preferential treatment of students who attend church and the negative view many teachers have about marijuana consumption, which they see as an aspect of parenting as well as a major barrier to formal education, must also be factored in when discussing cultural practices of the poor.

In her study on relations in Jamaica, “The Plural Framework of Jamaican Society,” Smith (1961) sought to understand the local attitude toward race. Smith (1961) classified the racial groups as White, Brown, and Black. She claimed each racial group possesses its own unique characteristics. Members of the White group, the smallest, are mostly educated outside Jamaica. They own the majority of the local businesses and control a disproportionate amount of the resources. As a rule, Whites place considerable emphasis on marriage, though their families are small, and they may be agnostic or Christian.

By contrast, the Black section, which represents the majority of the population, has retained some African cultural practices such as religious practices and communal families. Most are uneducated and do not own businesses or control resources. Smith (1961) also characterized members of the Black group as participating in sexual relations outside of marriage; having large families with a matriarchal authority structure; and following religious practices that sometimes include spirit possession, magic, witchcraft, and sacrifice.
The Brown group is a cultural blend of the practices from the White and Black groups. The family size in the Brown group varies, the authority structure is patriarchal, and the religious practice is mainly denominational Christianity.

Of the major characteristics in each group, Smith (1961) found that education is the most distinctive feature. The White group consists mainly of educated professionals; the Brown group consists mainly of students educated at local secondary schools; and the Black group consists of students who were either educated at local elementary schools, possess no formal secondary education, or had no schooling at all. Smith (1961) indicates that the majority of school dropouts come from the Black section; consequently, they can only find manual employment on farms or work in menial positions.

Smith (1961) also suggests that materialism dominates the White section, social status dominates the Brown section, and immediate physical gratification (which Smith describes as spiritual or secular) dominates the Black section. Values and morals are interpreted differently, and these interpretations are constantly competing, with each group trying to assert cultural and social dominance.

According to Smith (1961), education also plays a significant role in the way these various groups interact regarding religious practices; there is a relationship between the level of education and the church one attends. Among the White and Brown population, the Pentecostal churches, the dominant protestant category, were seen as loud and unsophisticated; therefore, educated residents would rather attend a Catholic church.

Smith (1961) also indicates that education is closely linked to economics. The economic system in Jamaica rewards knowledge and skills acquired through formal
education. In rural areas, secondary school education does not cater to vocations such as farming; and, as a result, the farmer who has mastered practical applications, such as cultivation methods and dispensing local herbs, is never as valued for his or her skills compared with someone with a formal education.

Smith (1961) suggests that lack of sufficient resources for elementary schools contributes to high rates of absenteeism. Lamenting the concentration of power and policymaking decisions in the hands of the wealthier citizens, she also highlights the structural lapses in the system, which allows the elites to use economics as a tool of control to bribe political leaders and promote conservative values. Smith indicates that the education, economic, and religious systems operate in tandem and, consequently, perpetuate inequality among Jamaicans.

Foner (1973), *Status and Power in Rural Jamaica*, writing about how sociocultural practices affect schools, used one community’s story to illustrate how schools raised some residents’ expectations for upward mobility. Foner employed observations and interviews to explore the importance of education in a rural community called Coco Hill, which had a population of 3,500 people, predominantly poor and Black. According to Foner (1973), few of the adults in Coco Hill had gone to school beyond the sixth grade.

Foner (1973) noted that the reading classes comprised over 250 students with one teacher. Schools were crowded and, as a result, most teachers concentrated on the students from the higher economic bracket whom they believed were capable of moving on to higher education. She suggested that the teachers would seat the children from the
wealthier families in the front of the room and relegate the children from low socioeconomic families to the back where they could more easily be ignored.

According to Foner (1973), many of the residents in Coco Hill saw going to secondary school and getting a low-level civil service job as a great accomplishment. She conducted a survey that asked residents to comment on the availability of secondary education. The survey revealed that the residents saw it as the only means of gaining economic benefits and improving social standing. However, not all residents could afford to send their children to secondary school.

Additionally, Foner (1973) points out that there is also a close correlation between church membership and children’s educational attainment. White-collar workers, entrepreneurs, large farmers, and teachers mostly attended Catholic, Baptist, Anglican, and Methodist churches. The small farmers who are successful attended Baptist Tabernacle, Seventh Day Adventist, the Pentecostal Church, and the Church of God. The low socioeconomic farmers who attended church were perceived as godly and hard working. She noted that 33% of the parents of unsuccessful children did not attend church.

Foner (1973) also found that the inability to send children to secondary school was played out in other social aspects of life in Coco Hill. There was ongoing animosity among neighbors and family members. The villagers whose children were not successful expressed their frustrations through conflicts, and obeah (a type of magic that involves using power to send spirits to harm the living). Although some disputes were settled in a few days, some lingered for years.
Foner (1973) provided a comprehensive overview of the Jamaican educational system showing that school does not operate in a vacuum. Instead, schools influence and are influenced by the community in which they are located. Foner (1973) provided an inside view of the structural problems plaguing Jamaican rural society and school systems, but she did not examine the role of education policy in perpetuating these structural problems. Her analysis of school and sociocultural practices also did not account for the colonial legacies of schooling in Jamaica. Foner’s (1973) study was conducted in one community, and, therefore its findings should not be generalized to the entire country.

Social practices are important considerations in understanding the sociocultural aspects of education. Dreher (1984) “Schoolchildren and Ganja: Marijuana Consumption in Rural Jamaica,” describes this sociocultural feature through description of life in schools and the larger community via an interesting socialization framework. She provided a detailed view of home and school life through the ideology behind children’s consumption of marijuana. Examining two rural Jamaican communities, Dreher utilized observation and interviews to arrive at her conclusions. Marijuana in Jamaica is consumed by smoking or drinking it in the form of a tea. The female members of society make teas or tonics that are administered to children sometimes shortly after they are born.

Dover, one of the communities that Dreher (1984) studied, consisted mainly of sugar estates, several shops, a post office, and an elementary school. The sugar estates provided jobs for the women and men of Dover as well as migrant workers. Hawley, the
second community studied, was only 25 miles from the nearest city but was isolated in the mountains and had no electricity. The school, post office, police and health clinics were located seven miles away; and there was no public transportation to this area.

Dreher (1984) noted that although there were more jobs in Dover and the school was closer, school attendance was poor. Parents complained that they could not afford books and uniforms. Furthermore, the school facilities were dilapidated, classrooms were crowded, and teachers’ morale was low. The children in Dover who attended school seldom went beyond the primary level. By contrast, in Hawley, more children attended school even though it was further away from their homes. The community was involved with the school, and parents helped maintain the building. Although absenteeism was a problem in Hawley, the reasons cited as indicated above, were different from those given by residents of Dover. In Hawley, children usually had to help in the fields on Thursdays and Fridays or take care of younger children while their parents went to the market.

Dreher (1984) stated that women in both communities administered marijuana to children for three reasons: to enhance health, to increase strength for physical work, and to improve academic performance. However, teachers opposed this use of marijuana among children and described the children who took it as “lazy, careless and mad.” The teachers all rejected the mothers’ notion that marijuana improved student performance. However, Dreher (1984) found that “[h]igh performing children also had the highest average ganja (marijuana) use” (p. 145).

Dreher (1984) used the issue of marijuana consumption to illustrate the social conflict between parents and teachers. Although teachers’ assumption about who was
consuming marijuana was incorrect, these assumptions about the students in Dover led to further isolation of those students by the teachers. Dreher’s (1984) major argument, however, highlights a lacuna between the symbolic use of marijuana and teachers’ perception. Teachers’ attitudes are a key component of students’ schooling experience, and the students in Dover who were perceived as marijuana smokers did not receive an equitable education, which further marginalized them.

Dreher (1984) concluded that the assumptions among parents that marijuana consumption would improve school performance and among the teachers that it would reduce performance, could not be resolved through her study. However, many of the findings from these two communities contradict the widely held opinions about the negative effects of marijuana use. Dreher states that she is not promoting widespread use of marijuana but advocates that it is important to understand how community members perceive its use.

Other studies examining the sociocultural aspects of schooling place emphasis on the role of schools in creating change. Dove (1980) in “The Role of the Community in Rural Transformation in Developing Countries,” explored the role of schools in initiating social change through a literature review on primary schools in various countries. She stated that “[s]chools then have generally responded to rather than led or initiated changes in rural communities” (p.70). Dove (1980), however, indicated that one rural school in Jamaica defied the notion that rural schools could not create change. Dove (1980) study described the work of Reverend Chenery who inspired his students and community to build a school in the isolated High Rocks district in Jamaica. She argued
that the community members responded to the school because there was a benefit for
them.

She suggested that when a community shares mainstream values, then all children
will attend the community’s school; however, if a community sees itself as removed, it
will shun the school as an outside, imperialist institution. She found that when
communities have control over the schools, the possibility that these schools will serve
the “felt need” of the students is higher. This is because the average rural resident sees
rural elites as controlling access to certain jobs. Therefore, a school that supports social
change and equality may pose a threat to the power of the wealthier citizens. If schools
are accountable to local communities, members will participate if they see their own
needs being met through programs responsive to local needs and concerns.

Dove (1980) cites the case of a school in Bangladesh with a high level of social
stratification. While the community had shared religious practices, language, and social
relations, the economic structure dictated that one group served the other. Five levels of
peasants were identified in a poor rural village, and Dove (1980) found that the school
was used for the betterment of the richer peasants. For example, because of the high
poverty rate, the community voted that free lunches should be served in the schools;
however, those students who benefited from the free lunch were the ones who could
afford lunch, because the truly poor children could not attend school.

Dove (1980) argued that rural schools that push for social and economic change
do not thrive in their communities. She noted rural communities that are indecisive about
sending their children to school pose a unique problem for a government that is trying to
integrate rural communities into mainstream economic life. What the governments need are schools that provide self-help to the community but at the same time pose no threat to the unity of rural communities, which value kinship, local language, religion, particular territory, and a unique culture.

As Dove (1980) states, “Each community has its own structural quality and patterns” (p. 71). Thus, elements, such as school, community, politics, and the culture of rural communities, will determine if these schools will create change. She argues that schools are a reflection of the rural elites; as a result, the economic and social power in these communities will never be challenged. Unless inherent structural and social policies are changed, rural schools will continue to favor elites. Dove (1980) concluded that despite the commitment of government and international institutions, schools will not serve communities unless there is a shift in the power structure of these rural communities.

There is ample evidence that home environment also influenced students’ performance. Anderson (1984) in “The Effects of Certain Home Environmental Variables on Academic Motivation Displayed by Primary School Students,” randomly sampled 160 students (80 girls and 80 boys) to assess the effects of home environment on academic motivation at the end of primary school in Jamaica. She examined school type, gender and stream in relationship to parental interest, pressure and expectations. The students were selected from three primary schools and one preparatory school, all located in Kingston. Anderson (1984) found that girls and boys had the same level of motivation. On the issue of school type, preparatory school students showed higher levels of
motivation than those in primary school. Additionally, motivation was higher among students in higher streams compared to those in lower streams. Although parental interest and pressure varied according to gender, Anderson (1984) found that parental expectation was a strong determinant of a student’s performance. Anderson’s (1984) findings on parental expectation were verified by Stewart (1988) who found that grade four students from rural peasant farming backgrounds who were from more supportive home environments performed better than those from less supportive home environments.

Another context factor influencing primary school was attendance. Blair’s (1986) “Comparative Study of the Compulsory Attendance Programme in Selected Primary and All-Age Schools in Trelawny and St. Thomas,” investigated the impact of compulsory attendance in St. Thomas and Trelawny. Blair (1986) distributed questionnaires among eight schools. The research results from her questionnaire revealed that during the period 1980-1985, all the schools had the staffing that was needed; however, all were in disrepair and many were “grossly overcrowded” (as cited in Miller, 1997, p.38).

Blair (1986) found that three schools had no individual classrooms, one school was 300% over capacity, and all the schools had leaking roofs and missing windowpanes. Of the eight schools in the study, only two had staff rooms for teachers. More alarmingly, one school had only a partial supply of electricity and one other school had no electricity. The nutribun and milk that were promised as a measure to improve attendance were not received by two schools. Blair noted that during the first year enrollment in St. Thomas increased significantly because of “promised welfare support” On the other hand, 1983-1984 witnessed a significant decline in attendance.
Coomarsingh (1989) in “A Study of Four Schools in Southern Clarendon Just Prior to and Immediately After the Implementation of the Compulsory Education,” utilized questionnaires, interviews and observations as data collection methods. Four primary schools were included in this study. Principals, teachers and parents were the participants. Similar to the Blair (1986) study, participants were asked about physical facilities, the school feeding program, attendance rates and support services. Coomarsingh (1989) also examined the Ministry of Education’s role in providing the necessary elements for compulsory attendance to be effective. Unlike Blair (1986), Coomarsingh (1989) found that there was adequate classroom space, and facilities were not dilapidated. However, the nutribun and milk were never supplied to schools, nor were truant officers to monitor attendance provided. Coomarsingh (1989) found the attendance pattern of students remained unchanged.

Nutrition was identified as a context factor influencing primary schools. Clarke’s (1990) “Health and Nutritional Determinants of Academic Achievement in Jamaican Primary School Children,” employed a survey to assess how biological and social disadvantages lead to poor achievement in school. The nutritional intake of grade five students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, residing in depressed urban communities in Kingston, was used to determine school achievement.

Clarke (1990) found that students who succeeded were the ones who received breakfast. These students’ weight and height were also proportional to their age. On the other hand, the students described as failing had a negative breakfast pattern, and their weight and height were not proportional to their age. A significant number of failing
students also reported some form of sickness, such as cold or fever, during the period under study. Clarke (1990) emphasized that being hungry in school is associated with lack of achievement. Miller (1997) noted that poverty alleviation measures with a focus on health and nutrition of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds would more likely improve attendance and achievement.

Economic Factors

In addition to the input and context standards, the education system is also challenged by economics, and politics. What does poor or lower socioeconomic class mean in Jamaica? This researcher has not seen a study or report that defines “poor” in Jamaica by a dollar amount. The 2003 World Bank study, *Jamaica: The Road to Sustained Growth Country Economic Memorandum* states:

The absolute poverty lines used in estimating poverty in Jamaica are based on the food energy intake method and also factor in consumption of basic non-food necessities. The minimum food consumption basket was determined by the Ministry of Health based on a dietary survey of the bottom two quintiles of the population. (p. 34)

Similar to other countries, poverty in Jamaica is linked to several interrelated factors—large households, households headed by females, low educational attainment, unemployment, and dependence on rural employment. The 2003 World Bank Study further stated: “In Jamaica, poverty also appears to be strongly correlated with social factors including: teenage pregnancy single parenting; drug abuse; domestic violence;
child abuse and delinquency” (p. 36). The 2000 *Country Assistance Strategy of the World Bank Group for Jamaica*, notes that:

Per capita GDP growth being negative for most of the last 25 years, average incomes in Jamaica have not improved for the last three decades. This has occurred despite very high investment to GDP ratios of around 30 percent (implying very inefficient investment), aided by active development partner engagement. (p. 2)

In the 2004 annual Human Development Reports, Jamaica ranked 104 of the 175 countries assessed, placing it among the poorest countries in the world. The 2003 World Bank report indicates that poverty in Jamaica seems to have gone through four phases. In the first, from 1966 to 1973, the Jamaican economy grew. This growth was attributed mainly to the boom in bauxite and tourism. In the second phase, from the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s, poverty rose, especially in the mid-1980s, the period under study.

The second phase was marked by a second oil price shock in 1979, higher external interest rates, higher inflation, and lower growth. The period of 1978 witnessed the first significant devaluation of the Jamaican dollar (Levi, 1990). With that came the idea that the government had to fix the economy. As a result, a lot of educational and social development got frozen at this point. So Gilmour came to office in 1980, in a period of economic downturn characterized by the IMF’s structural adjustments programs. The Jamaican government instituted serious rigors to correct the economy and wages were frozen, as well as public sector jobs eliminated (Levi, 1990).
Between 1980 and 1986 the GDP per capita was -2.5. The central government’s overall balance minus revenues and expenditure was -10.6. Most importantly, the external public debt as a percentage of GDP was 90.7. The 2000 Country Assistance Strategy of the World Bank Group for Jamaica, states:

By 1986, progress had been made in correcting an overvalued exchange rate and to some extent in reducing the size of the public sector. However, bountiful availability of external financing encouraged a delay in many areas of reform and created a pile-up of external debt. Growth was sporadic during this period. (p. 3)

The third phase, from the late 1980s to 1998, reflects a decline in poverty, interrupted in 1991 by inflation and rising food prices. In the fourth phase, from 1998 to 2001, poverty had leveled off. According to the 2003 World Bank Study, Jamaica: The Road to Sustained Growth Country Economic Memorandum,

There are some serious problems in the distribution of public expenditure. Public expenditure on early childhood, primary, and secondary education is equitably distributed amongst rich and poor students. However, tertiary education expenditure is distributed very inequitably, with the top quintile receiving 77% of the expenditure, which is not surprising given the enrollment patterns. Also, per student recurrent expenditure is much higher for tertiary education (US$3464 in 1999/00), compared to US$85 in early childhood, US$313 in primary, US$1925 in special education and $533 in secondary education. As a result, overall education expenditure is regressive, with the top quintile getting 34 percent, and the bottom two quintiles getting 32 percent. (pp.113-114)
The Jamaican government finances 80% of the budget for the university compared with 55% to 60% of the budget for community and teacher colleges. The government has been criticized for this allocation, since the university serves mainly students from wealthier homes (Evans, 2001). According to Minister of Education Gilmour, for 1981-1982, the government’s allocation to education was 19.6% of the nation’s total recurrent budget (Jamaica Hansard, April 6, 1982). Of this allocation, 70.85% was allocated to teachers’ salaries, while 16.44% went to school maintenance, instructional material and supplies (See Appendix A).

Education expenditure in Jamaica increased from 3.4% of GDP in the 1990s to 6.1% in 2002. When compared with other countries in the Caribbean, such as Dominica, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, Guyana, Barbados, and St. Kitts, Jamaica’s real expenditure on education more than doubles that in these other countries. However, Jamaican students perform lower than average on the Caribbean examinations (World Bank, 2003). The World Bank (2003) attributes this to less instructional time in Jamaica compared to other Caribbean countries. This reduction in instructional time results from crime and civil disturbances, which force school closures.

Jamaica is also amongst the most violent countries in the world. The World Bank (2003) attributes this to social problems, such as growing urbanization, high levels of unemployment, increase in gang activities, increase in slums, and drug trafficking. Crime costs Jamaica about 4% of the GDP. According to Harriott (2003), crime in Jamaica is a fundamental issue that prevents children from lower socioeconomic classes from gaining access to educational institutions.
Since 2000, the government has committed to spending 15% to 20% of the national budget on education. However, public debt continues to consume a larger percentage of the GDP. Debt servicing increased from 45.3% in 1996 to 58.2% in 2000 (World Bank, 2003). As a result, social services in Jamaica have suffered severe cuts in budget allocation. According to Gallagher (1993), when the education budget is reduced, primary education tends to lose more than its share. The current education budget is $35.1 billion, or 11.2% of the total national expenditure budgeted for the financial year 2006-2007 (Estimates of expenditure 2006).

Politics

Politics have consistently informed the development of educational policy in Jamaica. According to Stone (1980), the PNP, the political supporters of which were mainly urban, have been under pressure to provide social policy benefits such as health, education, and unemployment compensation. As a result, the election of Michael Manley as prime minister in 1974 resulted in increased expenditure for education, 2.9% to 5.4% of the Gross National Product (GNP) (Walker, 2002).

The Manley administration did not embark on a unitary approach to education. Instead, the approach was broad and defined educational policy with the overall developmental policy for Jamaica. There were several notable advancements in education: a three-year assessment of the educational system, free education up to age 14, improvement in administration, and the establishment of a service corps where graduates were expected to work on social development activities. Tuition-free secondary schools also became a reality in 1973. Walker (2002) also states, “In 1974, the Ministry of
Education was allocated and spent the largest public-sector disbursement of any ministry in the independent history of Jamaica” (p. 169). Walker also implied that Miller orchestrated the implementation of almost all of Manley’s educational reforms.

Walker (2002) indicated that the election of a new prime minister, Edward Seaga (JLP), in 1980 resulted in a reduction of expenditure for Jamaica’s educational system. During the Seaga administration, the two major educational policy initiatives occurred in secondary education. First, textbooks were available on a rental basis. Second, 14 secondary schools were upgraded to high schools (Brown, 1998). According to Evans (2001), the textbook program failed because it lacked proper administration, and the books were not compatible for the reading level of most students. More importantly, the costs for books, uniforms, lunch, and transport still deterred many families from sending their children to school. The Seaga administration’s management of the educational system resulted in the need for external funding.

Consequently, the 1980s saw an increase in the role of international agencies in the formulation of educational policy in Jamaica. The United States Aid to International Development (USAID) funded educational projects such as the Organization of American States (OAS) project on curriculum development, USAID’s Family Life Education Project, and the United Nations Development Programme prevocational studies project for grades seven through nine.
Policy Formulation, Models and Implementation Studies

Policy Formulation at the Ministry of Education

This section of the literature review examines the policy component of this study. Cooper, Lance, Fusarelli, and Randall (2004) indicate that policymaking in education can be grouped along four dimensions. The normative dimension includes values, beliefs, and ideologies that drive societies to seek improvement. The structural dimension analyzes the role and effects of the government in shaping education policy, and the constituentive dimension analyzes who has access to power. Finally, the technical dimension analyzes education planning and evaluation. Since implementation is only one aspect of the policy process, in order to understand the process, an overview of the formulation area is necessary (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980).

At the Ministry of Education, the minister formulates educational policy as well as ensures its implementation. According to Robinson (2003) in Sustaining Jamaica’s Indigenous Policy Capacity in the Social Sector: The Role of Policy Formulation Styles in the Bureaucracy, there are two forums within the Ministry of Education where polices are discussed. The first forum is the Senior Executive, made up of the education minister, the minister of state, the permanent secretary, and the chief education officer. The second, the Senior Policymaking Group, includes senior executives, and divisional, as well as other, senior directors. The second forum reviews policy briefs prepared by the Policy Analysis Unit. According to Robinson, these briefs can originate from the Senior Policymaking Group, or the Policy Analysis Unit may compile a brief based on implementation outcomes.
In her assessment of policymaking at the Ministry of Education, Robinson (2003) conducted a comprehensive analysis of three policymaking cases: boarding school subsidy, language education, and budget endorsement (this third case, Robinson points out, was placed on the policy agenda by two mid-level bureaucrats). These three cases revealed issues that will be discussed in chapters 4 and 5 of this study. She indicated that in all three cases, the problems were analyzed and solutions generated. The Policy Analysis Unit drafted the final report, which was presented to the director. The feedback from the director served as the debate tool; then it was returned to the Policy Analysis Group, where a final report was drafted.

Robinson (2003) noted that there are several weaknesses in the policy process at the Ministry of Education. First, alternative solutions were never presented to policymakers. This contrasts sharply with the traditional model of policy formulation as well as with the recommendations of the cabinet office of the Government of Jamaica. Furthermore, without alternatives it is almost impossible to determine all the nuances that are related to a particular policy; in addition, alternatives provide a basis for the comprehensive understanding of a policy. As Robinson (2003) notes, “If advisors do not submit alternative responses to the policy problem, the policy maker can have little basis for assessing the appropriateness of the recommended solution” (p. 130).

Robinson (2003) also stressed that in the case of the boarding school subsidies, the analysts were not experts on boarding school systems but relied on their experience as education officers and policy analysts. Robinson stated, “The output from the study was a set of recommendations that was very responsive to the resource constraints of the
ministry’s budget” (p. 151). In the language education policy, the coordinator of the Core Curriculum Unit was not a language specialist. More importantly, the advisors in the Ministry of Education were only vaguely familiar with the technicalities of the issues.

The third case, the budget endorsement process, required consultations with stakeholders. However, Robinson (2003) states, “There are no formal guidelines as to who should be consulted, how they are to be selected, or what constitutes effective consultations” (p. 158). She notes that the formalization of procedures for policymaking in the Ministry of Education was dismal, and “The Ministry of Education responded in a piecemeal fashion to issues that were salient to senior management who funded activities out of the Ministry’s resources” (p. 272). She concluded that even the positive element of knowledge sharing at the Ministry of Education did not always encourage the growth of policy.

Models of Policy Analysis

Several models can used to explain educational policymaking: The Political Streams Model (Kingdon, 1995), McLaughlin’s variability in implementation (1982, 1987, 1988), and the Policy Environments Model (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980). However, Goggin (1986) notes that these models present problems because implementation is fluid and complex, and sometimes investigators “interpret instances of implementation by intuition” (p. 334). Goggin (1986) states, “Even the most sophisticated and most costly statistical correlation studies to date (e.g., Beyer and Trice, 1978) do not yield a variegated theory of implementation” (p. 334). He notes that the
third generation of implementation studies should move beyond the success/failure perspective and employ an extensive analysis of factors that influence implementation.

According to LaRocque (1986), there are three major theoretical frameworks regarding policy implementation. The *classical or technological model* assumes that the relationship between policymakers and policy implementers is based on one group dominating the other. The *political model* asserts that policy implementation is interactive and the process is flexible with continuous negotiation. The *cultural or evolutionary model* maintains that the policymakers and policy implementers hold values and beliefs that are so different that the process is always in flux, and one group cannot understand the other.

Kingdon (1995), in *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, considers the policymaking process as comprising agenda setting, specifying alternatives from which a choice is to be made (a legislative vote or presidential decision), and which represents a choice among the alternatives presented, and the implementation of the decision. According to Kingdon (1995), the agenda is a list of subjects or problems that governmental agencies and officials are considering at any given time. The agenda process narrows the list of subjects or problems to what actually makes it to the agenda. Specifying alternatives operates similarly to agenda setting. Several alternatives are considered for agenda items. These alternatives are later narrowed to a set that Kingdon states are “seriously considered” (p. 4).

Three steps determine the process of agenda setting and alternative specification: problems, policies, and politics (Kingdon, 1995, p.16). Problems can be triggered by a
A bridge collapse or influx of immigrants may trigger public pressure to create policies addressing these issues. Policies that become agenda items can also be generated by scholarly studies. Studies shedding light on an issue may rise higher on the agenda, or “fads” may be generated through constant discussions. Politics can affect the agenda through national mood swings, changes in administration, or public opinion on certain issues. Kingdon (1995) indicates that these processes can operate parallel to or independent of each other (p. 88); they are called streams. Most times, the streams are “largely separate from one another, largely governed by different forces, different considerations, and different styles” (p. 88).

Within the policymaking apparatus are policy communities, which are made up of people who possess detailed knowledge and technical expertise in one or many subjects. Policy communities concentrate on collecting data and conducting studies and cost-benefit analyses. Political communities, on the other hand, are made up of people who are elected politicians; they are involved in many issues but mostly are interested in getting re-elected and promoting party politics. Kingdon (1995) notes, the two communities may not always agree but join during times of an open policy window (p. 229). A policy window occurs when the conditions for promoting a certain policy issue are favorable.

When the streams operate in tandem, Kingdon (1995) referred to this action as their coupling. A problem is identified, a solution is generated, and the political climate supports this shift. Some advocates even develop proposals and wait for a problem to develop or for an administration to change and so they can then attach the proposals. Kingdon (1995) notes, however, that not every condition is seen as a problem. People
must be convinced that they should be doing more to create change. This convincing is done based on personal values, comparisons between people, or comparisons between countries.

Kingdon (1995) asserts that, “Implementation is one major preoccupation of career bureaucrats” (p. 31). Bureaucrats administer existing programs and are disconnected from new agenda items. If bureaucrats discover that some programs are not working or could be more effective, this might lead to policy change. However, there are times when the bureaucrats mask these inefficiencies so that programs in place are not scrutinized because if implementation uncovers problems, this may open up an opportunity for follow-up legislation.

Elmore and McLaughlin (1988) stress the importance of the interpersonal relationships between formulators and implementers of policy. In their analysis of data collected from a RAND corporation study of federal programs, they concluded that variability in local response to educational policy reform could generate both problems and opportunities for policymakers. According to Elmore and McLaughlin (1982), variability can be a problem for many reasons. It can mean that reform goals have not been met evenly or not at all. Variability means that policy effects are not always predictable, that the level, nature and quality of services provided students under a national reform effort can differ considerably and often unacceptably across states or districts or even within the same school system. Variability can also signal resistance to a policy because the policy does not align with local goals. (Elmore & McLaughlin, 1988, p. 51)
Elmore and McLaughlin (1988) state, however, that variability “represents an important opportunity for policymakers to learn more effective ways to influence practice” (p.51). Understanding variability in local practice helps policymakers identify the factors that support teachers’ willingness to carry out policies’ goals. Elmore and McLaughlin (1988) indicate that policies can aim to reduce teacher discretion, and, in essence, reduce variability, which can impede effective teaching. Understanding local behavior is not only necessary but also vitally important, especially when policies formulated nationally are aimed at controlling local behavior.

Policymaking and Implementation

Forojalla (1993) states that the aims and objectives of education are guided by politics. In a one-party state, there can be a national policy on education such as the 1977 Nigerian National Policy on Education, the Arusha Declaration in Tanzania, or the Common Man Charter in Uganda. However, in a two-party, or multiparty state, education policy is all-encompassing. Forojalla (1993) notes that education should have three main objectives. The first includes the political objectives, which form the foundation for stability and prosperity; the second cites socioeconomic objectives, which relate to overall economic health; and the third regards the development and educational objectives, which are related to the development of intellectual capacity as well as to moral and ethical principles (p. 91).

According to Anderson (2006), policies are designed to accomplish certain goals. Dye (1976) describes policy as what governments want to do. Taylor et al. (1997) define policy as “a process, to refer to the politics involved in the recognition of a problem
which requires a policy response…” (p. 24). In Jamaica, most policies originate at the executive level.

According to Stone (1980), pluralism, elitism, corporatism, and the wealthier class’s influences all affect the formulation of public policy in Jamaica. Stone (1980) states, “The respective agencies, however, tend on many policy issues to reflect the thinking of private interests and the leaders who dominate the representational bodies” (p. 209). Public policy at the government-agency level is highly influenced by private interests. Some private interests, Stone explains, “Implement rather than make broad national economic policies into which the operational programs of their agency function” (Stone, 1980, p. 210).

While policy is formulated at the ministerial and prime ministerial level, independent interest groups influence the implementation process. According to Stone (1980), this is problematic because, with the exception of trade unions, interest groups are not consulted regarding policies affecting their interests.

Policy Implementation

Ripley and Franklin (1986) state that policy implementation assesses agencies and individuals, their procedures, and techniques, as well as the political support they receive, when carrying out policy goals. The uncertainty of a policy accomplishing its goal(s), its effectiveness, or consequences “makes the study of policy implementation interesting and worthwhile” (Anderson, 2006, p. 200). Anderson added: “If implementation fails, then all that preceded was of no avail” (p. 201).
According Gunn (1980), there are 10 preconditions that are necessary to improve implementation:

- That circumstances external to the implementing agency do not impose crippling restraints.
- That adequate time and resources are made available to the programme.
- That not only are there no constraints in terms of overall resources, but also that, at each stage in the implementation process, the required combination of resources is available.
- That the policy to be implemented is based upon a valid theory of cause and effect.
- That the relationship between cause and effect is direct and that there are few, if any, interviewing links.
- That there is a single implementing agency which need not depend upon other agencies for success or, if other agencies must be involved, that the dependency relationships are minimal in number and importance.
- That there is a complete understanding of, and agreement upon, the objectives to be achieved, and that these conditions persist throughout the implementation process.
- That in moving towards agreed objectives it is possible to specify in complete detail and perfect sequence the tasks to be performed by each participant.
- That there is perfect communication among, and co-ordination of, the various elements or agencies involved in the programme.
- That those in authority can depend upon and obtain obedience.

(Gunn as cited in Younis, 1990, pp. 6-7)

Implementation literature emerged in the 1970s through the work of Pressman and Wildavsky (Implementation, The Oakland Project, 1973) whose study reviewed the failure of a large federal job creation scheme in Oakland, California (Younis & Davidson, 1990). Since then, several scholars have contributed to the literature on implementation. According to Goggin (1986) in “The Too Few Cases/Too Many Variables: Problems in Implementation Research,” there are three generations of implementation studies. The first generation, Pressman and Wildavsky (1973, 1979), described implementation being carried out as a single decision in a single location, but they also
discovered that there is a peculiar relationship between policies outlined and policies implemented (McLaughlin, 1987). The second generation of implementation studies (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983), on the other hand, approached implementation as having a “political as well as a managerial dimension” (p.328). This provided frameworks and models for implementation scholars to dissect the implementation process, with the goal of understanding the relationship between policy and practice. McLaughlin (1987) notes that policy is not the sole determinant of outcome at the local level; values and beliefs are central to perception of policy, as such, implementation varies. The third generation of implementation studies should give priority to various outcomes and move from the question of “Who did what and why?” to “To what effect?” For the third generation, McLaughlin states the challenge is to integrate policymakers with individual implementers.

Matland (1995) examines the two models used to study policy implementation: Top down and bottom up. Top-down models (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; Mazmanian & Sabatier 1983) perceive policy designers as the major actors, as opposed to bottom-up models (Hull & Hjern, 1987; Berman 1980) that recognize policy as delivered at the local level. According to Matland, the top-down models argue that policy should be clear, with a small number of actors, and should be implemented by persons or officials who are sympathetic towards the policy’s goal. The top-down model has been criticized for ignoring decisions made earlier in the policy process. These earlier decisions are important because as Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), in their study *The Politics of Policy Implementation* note, the formulation stage provides clues such as compromises
that were made. Tanner and Tanner, in *History of the School Curriculum* (1990) state: “What makes schools’ situation especially difficult is that reform proposals are often politically rather than educationally motivated” (p. 14). Top-downers are also criticized for isolating implementation to mostly an administrative function while ignoring the politics of policy formulation. Policy often contains vague, ambiguous language; therefore, the notion that policy should be clear and explicit is unrealistic (Matland, 1995). Matland also noted that unlike the bottom-up model, the top-down model perceives local actors as obstacles to implementation.

Proponents of the bottom-up model state that in order to understand implementation, the goals of the local implementers should be understood: “It is at the micro level that policy directly affects people” (Matland, 1995, p. 149). McDonnell and McLaughlin (1982), Elmore and McLaughlin (1988), Elmore (1977), Van Meter and Van Horn (1975), and Hull and Hjern (1987) also note that national policies most times ignore local conditions as well as the goals and power of the local implementers. Hull and Hjern (1987) outline four functions of implementation:

- **Planning**: Decide what policy activity to pursue
- **Resource Mobilization**: Acquire the resource necessary to carry-out policy objectives
- **Effectuation**: Translating the plan as well as the resource into local action
- **Evaluation**: Assessing what was successful (Hull & Hjern, 1987, p. 24)

The purpose of these implementation functions is to understand how actors are linked in the implementation process as well as the motives or interests of certain actors. The implementation structure approach posits that it is individuals, rather than organizations, that primarily participate in implementation. Hull and Hjern (1987) acknowledge the role
of organizations; they insist that it is the testing of individuals in the organization’s objectives that determines how policy is implemented. However, the bottom-up model is criticized for putting policy power into the hands of people who are not accountable to voters (Matland, 1995).

McLaughlin’s (1987) “Learning from Experience: Lessons from Policy Implementation” examines several lessons garnered from the field. McLaughlin (1987) addressed the realities on the ground and concluded that these lessons should be relevant to policymakers as they think broadly about implementation. First, policy success depends on local capacity and will; the implementer’s motivation is more important than money, expertise, and training. McLaughlin (1987) noted that mandated parent involvement associated with federal programs failed because teachers and administrators could not see the merit of such programs. Successful implementation requires a combination of pressure and policy support. However, pressure alone is not sufficient to effect change and is almost impossible in the “multi-layered world of schools and education policy” (McLaughlin, 1987, p.173). While support is needed to facilitate implementation, this can be counterproductive with “vague mandates and weak guidelines.” (McLaughlin, 1987, p.173)

Unlike Pressman and Wildvasky’s (1973) earlier work, which focuses on analysis of institutions and institutional goals, McLaughlin (1987) shifts that focus to the individuals and individual incentives, beliefs, and capacity.” (p.174) McLaughlin contends that individuals implement change, and they act on personal motivations. For
example, teachers are sometimes described as “resistant to change” or “lazy” because they refuse to implement mandates.

McLaughlin (1987) stressed that implementation takes place in a fluid setting; therefore, implementation problems persist. As the process unfolds, there are always new issues and challenges arising. This period can also be erratic as new budget restrictions may arise. For example, McLaughlin noted that school improvement may be deflected by new curriculum requirements. McLaughlin’s (1987) final lessons from the field are the “slam-bang” policy effect, which disrupts the daily operations and practices and may cripple the implementing system. In exploring implementation, McLaughlin suggests that the frame of analysis should be the implementing system. McLaughlin indicted that this comprehensive view examines supports, incentives, constraints, capacity, and motivation. A program may be successful if it is assessed in isolation. However, in the broader implementation context, this program may have caused shortfalls in other programs. So McLaughlin (1987) is proposing that third-generation implementation analysts undertake the challenge of linking the macrolevel and microlevel of implementation (p.177).

Implementation Studies

Trider and Leithwood’s (1988) “Exploring the Influences on Principal Behavior” describes two studies that assess the influences of principals’ actions during the implementation of a special education policy in Ontario, Canada. The first study was conducted utilizing interviews and questionnaires incorporating cognitive psychology as a theoretical framework. This was a longitudinal study carried out over three years in five school systems. The study’s focus was “Bill 82” which imposed elaborate regulations on
schools to provide for and diagnose students with special needs. Trider and Leithwood noted that the bill demanded considerable time commitment from teachers and administrators, while school boards were required to submit an implementation plan to the Ministry of Education. The assessment tool used in evaluating principals’ implementation program was developed from 42 implementation studies in various academic and nonacademic environments.

Trider and Leithwood (1988) identified three major factors as a framework for assessing implementing outcomes: (1) specifications-regulation identified in the policy, (2) political and organizational context-political environment, and (3) the personal context- implementers’ values, beliefs and experiences. According to Trider and Leithwood (1988), principals exhibited four dominant patterns of practice: systematic problem solving, school curriculum management, nurturing interpersonal relations; and monitoring administrative procedures and policies (Trider & Leithwood, 1988, p.295). These practices varied amongst principals. Some practices may be more pronounced than others. However, principals identified these factors as influences that determined how they engaged in the policy implementation process in their various schools. These factors were used to identify level of influence of some policies.

The questionnaire asked principals to identify their implementation tasks. An analysis of their answers showed considerable variation. They identified five implementation tasks in three different ways. That is, the weight of the patterns of practice directly influenced how each task was carried out. According to Trider and Leithwood (1988) the principals who identified managing school curricula as the most
important pattern of practice also encouraged their teachers to carefully assess their students for special needs.

The second study was a pilot test carried out with 12 principals after which a questionnaire was developed and distributed to 150 elementary and secondary school principals. The survey identified 71 factors widely used in implementation studies. The principals were asked to rate the strength of influence on their policy implementation practices. The questionnaires were supported by post survey interviews with 12 principals. According to Trider and Leithwood (1988), the most influential aspect was the personal context factors. If principals’ values, beliefs, opinions about change, and opinions of what is best for students are evident in the policy then the principals make substantial efforts to implement it. To encourage successful implementation, they suggest that policy implementation planners should identify the patterns in principals regarding implementation.

According to Hughes and Keith’s (1980) “Teacher Perceptions of an Innovation and Degree of Implementation,” failed or partial implementation has been attributed to unsuccessful educational innovations. In order to understand this trend, Hughes and Keith (1980) explored the relationship between teachers’ perception of an innovative elementary science curriculum and the degree to which it was implemented, based on five attributes. Relative advantage, is when the innovation has an advantage over current practice; this may be “increased class participation.” Compatibility refers to innovations that require minimal changes to the existing system. Complexity refers to the degree of perceived difficulty involved with new programs. Trialability means the innovation may
be integrated with the existing system on a limited basis. Finally, *observability* means innovation results can be observed by others, mainly “peers and superiors.”

Hughes and Keith (1980) sampled 30 science teachers who were “potential adopters of a new innovation.” (p.45) The teachers were from two school systems, one rural and one urban, in Nova Scotia, Canada; 70% were women. All indicated an awareness of the official departmental science curriculum and all recognized that this was a considerable improvement over the previous curriculum.

Hughes and Keith (1980) utilized the Classroom Observational Rating Form (CORF) developed by Ashley and Butts (1970). CORF provided for an in-class assessment, which is based on observation for 30 minutes of teacher-student interaction and enthusiasm. This was followed by a Lickert-type questionnaire that asked teachers to rate matters such as objectives and teaching strategies based on the five attributes named above. The results illustrate that the degree of implementation was greater when compatibility, trialibility, observability, and relative advantage were all present (Hughes & Keith, 1980, p.48). Complexity was not a significant factor of degree of implementation. However, Hughes and Keith (1980) warned that implementation is an ongoing process and this case was observed only once.

LaRocque’s (1986) “Policy Implementation in a School District: A Multiperspective Approach” used the implementation of two policies as a framework for assessing the beliefs and assumptions of policy implementation by school boards, district administrators, principals, and teachers in one district in Western Canada. The polices examined were *community relations*, improving school relationship by the establishment
of a parent advisory council, and elementary school self-assessment in which elementary schools were required to engage in ongoing evaluation of practices and services.

Diverse in age, socioeconomic status, and languages spoken, the school district has 45 elementary and secondary schools, with over 1,100 teachers, 500 continuing education instructors, and 450 nonteaching staff. Four schools were chosen to be part of the study. They differed in size and location, but the administration confirmed that they were typical of schools in the district. Three were elementary and one was secondary. The data were collected mostly through formal and informal interviews although document analysis and observations were also used. The district-level respondents were those directly involved in policy implementation. The school-level respondents were principals, vice-principals, head teachers, and selected teachers.

The results revealed three different perspectives on policy implementation. The school board indicated that the policy itself should be the focus of change; that is, the board devoted a considerable number of hours to perfecting the policy statements but did not discuss implementation. Additionally, when the board perceived that some schools were not eager to establish the parent advisory committees, it created another policy making the committees mandatory. Although the principal and one teacher from each school attended a workshop for the community relations policy, the policy was not received favorably by teachers who were disappointed because they did not have input into its formulation. The teachers also believed the board created the policy in order to garner votes (LaRocque, 1986, p. 493).
According to LaRocque (1986), it took two and a half years to develop a policy and booklet for the elementary school assessment. The superintendent at the time came in and repaired a divisive relationship between the district and schools. The relationship saw the involvement of teachers and principals in policy development relevant to them. Unlike the community relations policy, a committee of teachers, principals, and school staff created the elementary school assessment. However, the principals did not favorably receive this policy because the original idea came from the ministry and the principals considered it an attempt by the board to gain votes and remove some teachers (LaRocque, 1986, p. 493). The superintendents even instructed the elementary schools to cease all self-assessments until the district policy was ready to be implemented. Similar to the top-down model, the board members would pass on their displeasure to the superintendents who passed the information on to the principals, who passed it on to the teachers. A workshop was planned for the self-assessment but was cancelled as this policy implementation was postponed indefinitely.

LaRocque (1986) found that the legal authority of the board was not sufficient to ensure implementation. The school staff (principals and teachers) did not object to the policies’ goals but to the fact that it disrupted their procedures. The teachers asserted that implementation required time that could be better spent with students. The self-assessment concerned instruction and curriculum that they preferred to deal with on an individual basis. Some felt it was not the teachers’ responsibility to implement these polices and that the schools were already performing well in these areas. According to LaRocque (1986), “The more the policy challenged or threatened established patterns, the
greater the resistance to it.” (p. 495). Although beliefs and values are important (McLaughlin, 1987), individual beliefs and values among actors within the districts are also important.

Smit (2003) in “Can Qualitative Research Inform Policy Implementation? Evidence and Arguments from a Developing Country Context,” addresses teachers’ voices in the implementation process. Smits (2003) conducted a microlevel examination of policy implementation in a South African elementary school with schoolteachers who were in the process of implementing the 2005 Outcomes Based Education Curriculum. Teachers were asked to speak about their experiences with education policy change and curriculum change after apartheid. The responses were analyzed using grounded theory. According to Smit (2003), teachers’ emotional experiences and resistance affects the manner in which polices are implemented for, “Teachers do not receive policies as empty vessels” (Smit, 2003, p.2).

Smits’ (2003) findings (similar to LaRocque [1986] and McLaughlin [1987]) were that teachers select the parts of policies that are aligned with their personal values and beliefs about education. Emotions also played a significant role in responses and reactions to education policy. She also found that teachers resented policies in which they did not have a voice and that these invoked negative and uncomfortable emotions. Some teachers, rather than show overt resistance, were indirectly uncooperative which indicated a “direct correlation between resistant and anxious behavior.” Teachers with more experience can manipulate the system and massage polices to comply with their old ways of performing. Some may be reluctant to learn new things, and others may doubt their
ability to learn new things-- in this case resistance is amplified. As a result, these reluctant teachers would influence younger and junior staff to resist also. Sometimes a policy can be legally enforced and appears to be implemented, but teachers can impair it by doing things incorrectly. Smit (2003) also notes that the results show that the principal’s response to policy is also essential. If the principal supports incorporating the old system into new polices, then teachers will feel empowered.

Cooksey and Krieg’s (1996) “Metropolitan Health Policy Development: Barriers to Implementation,” examined 25 health policy initiatives in the Chicago metropolitan area from 1987 through 1994. The issues included healthcare reform, infant mortality, mental health services, lead poisoning, and community health problems. The policy development span was three to 30 months.

The first stage of the study was a gathering of health policy initiatives developed by various governmental, university, and civic policy bodies (Cooksey & Krieg, 1996, p.263). This was followed by a report from each body. The criteria used to assess the policy development were “participants, level of problem description and option analysis, the presence or absence of an implementation plan, and the level and types of financial analysis.” (P. 264) In the second stage, recommendations from the various initiatives were ranked based on “full implementation, significant progress, limited progress, and not implemented” (Cooksey and Krieg, 1994, p.264). The ratings were based on interviews with agency staff, reviewing reports, and interviews with informants who were experts in local health and policy issues. The study concluded by identifying barriers to
policy implementation. This was achieved by an assessment of recommendations that were not implemented or only partially implemented.

According to Cooksey and Krieg (1996), 312 recommendations were analyzed. One-third of the reports provided comprehensive implementation procedures, one-third provided limited implementation suggestions, and the other reports did not provide any implementation procedures or suggestions. One-fifth of the reports discussed how projects would be financed, two-fifths provided some discussion on possible funding sources, and the other reports did not mention financing. Of the recommendations, only 10.3% had a full recommendation and all recommendations had been implemented. In addition, 19.2% had significant progress and considerable improvement had been made; 42.3% had limited progress and some minor steps were taken. Finally, 28.2% were not implemented at all (Cooksey & Krieg, 1996, p. 265).

Cooksey and Krieg (1996) identified four areas that were barriers to implementation: “deficiencies in policy design, inadequate political support, organizational barriers, and resource constraint” (p.267). Regarding policy design, there were limited background and limited options presented in the policy, and no specific steps on implementation such as agency responsibility. With inadequate political support, “political leadership and support was a key issue” (p.268). Political infighting prevented a number of recommendations from being implemented. If the chief executive perceived that his or her political constituents were not in favor, then “recommendations were not viewed as priority policy measures requiring significant political or budgetary support” (p.268).
Additionally, Cooksey and Krieg (1996) noted that the initiatives were not connected to the state or local legislative process (p. 268). There were only a small number of provisions made to brief legislators and their staffs, and recommendations and final reports did not correspond to legislative calendars. Organizational barriers, with organizational resistance to change, were also a major block to implementation, as were rigid internal policies and procedures, lack of information, no incentives to change, and personnel lacking required training. The service providers lacked a coordinated system. Workers in health and social systems needed information about drug abuse and alcohol services. Similarly, some policy recommendations required the assistance of other agencies, such as housing and transportation, but these were not included in the policy development process (Cooksey & Krieg, 1996).

Finally, Cooksey and Krieg (1996) noted that there were resource constraints. Although Illinois was facing severe financial constraints during the period under study, only a small number of initiatives researched the financial feasibility of the recommendations.

Anyon (1995) in “Race, Social Class, and Educational Reform in an Inner-city School” describes an urban school in a majority Black and poor school district in New Jersey. She spent ten months observing as well as working with teachers and their classes. This review focuses on Anyon’s (1995) critique of the implementation system only. The schools in this district shared several similarities with many schools in Jamaica. A majority of students qualified for free lunches, many families lived below the poverty line, many students were plagued by problems associated with extreme poverty: “chaotic
lives, neglect and/or abuse...emotional stress, anxiety and anger.” (p. 73). Additionally, many of the students were in the care of relatives or friends, while others had young parents were noted as “disenfranchised”

The schools were also in disrepair. One principal stated, “This school was built over a hundred years ago. They just replaced the original windows five years ago! With the decades of neglect in this ward, it’ll take years to fix it up” (p.85). Anyon (1995) described how sociocultural differences between the reformers, parents, and school personnel obstructed the implementation of reform projects. The school’s superintendent recruited two blond suburban women to provide training in collaboration for teachers in the predominantly Black system. She noted that on several occasions these blond women complained to her that the teachers were seeking “immediate gratification” and the teachers complained the consultants were racist and did not have enough knowledge about the students or challenges of the school. Anyon (1995) also stressed that other improvement projects were resisted by parents because of complaints of racism and unfamiliarity with the challenges of the school district. She emphasized that as a result of tension among teachers, parents and consultants several reform efforts and improvement efforts were never implemented.

Theoretical Approach

While using several theories can add credibility to research, Silverman (2000) agrees that theory is not necessarily relevant to a dissertation, and what a dissertation needs is independent critical thought engaging with theory. However, he does not discount the use of theory. Silverman (2000) provides a guide for theorizing about the
data: first there is chronology-- gather data to look at change; context--how the data is contextualized in different settings; comparison--compare data with other relevant data; implications--how your research relates to broader issues; lateral thinking--explore the relations between diverse models; and, finally, the theory should emerge.

The focus of this study is to identify the factors that influenced primary educational policy implementation between 1980 and 1985 in Jamaica. Postcolonial theory and the political model Policy Environments Model (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980) will serve as the theoretical framework. These are used to address different aspects of this research. Postcolonial theory was selected because Jamaica’s educational system has been influenced by colonial and postcolonial educational policies and practices. Anderson (2006) states that political scientists are still trying to conceptualize a theory that identifies specific variables successful to policy implementation. Nevertheless, the political model was selected because it offers an understanding of the implementation process; is suited for interrogating the findings on the ground; can provide flexibility in the discussion of the complexity of policy implementation; and, most importantly, the political model offers an examination of politics and the political actor’s role in policy decisions (LaRocque, 1986).

*Postcolonial Theory*

According to Pilcher and Whelehan (2004),

The term “post-colonial” was originally used in the 1970s to refer to nations who have moved beyond imperialist rule after the Second World War, and later came
to be used to reflect on how cultures have been affected by European imperialism up until the present day. (p.101)

Young (2003) on the other hand notes:

Postcolonial theory, so-called, is not in fact a theory in the scientific sense, that is a coherently elaborated set of principles that can predict the outcome of a given set of phenomena. It comprises instead a related set of perspectives, which are juxtaposed against one another, on occasion contradictorily. (p.6-7)

Evans (2001) states that postcolonial theory is an approach that seeks to understand and interpret societies that have gone through the colonial experience. Postcolonial theory recognizes that these societies are still grappling with remnants of colonization, such as stratification by race, class, and color. Ashcroft (1995) states that the term postcolonial, “represents the continuing process of imperial suppressions and exchanges throughout this diverse range of societies, in their institutions and their discursive practices. (p. 3)

There is no single definition for postcolonial; similarly, postcolonial theory has a plethora of meanings. According to Pilcher and Whelehan (2004), postcolonial theory emerged in the 1980s. It shares roots with poststructuralism and postmodernism. Pilcher and Whelehan (2004) state: “Post-structuralism emphasizes the importance of language in structuring our experiences of the world- meanings are not inherent in the thing or action itself but are created by words and their relationship to other words” (p. 113). In essence, meanings are eclectic, which allows language to change, “language produces
social reality and this change varies across cultures and time.” (Pilcher & Whelehan, 2004, p. 113)

Postcolonial theory is influenced by the work of Edward Said (1978) and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988) and Fanon (1967, 1968). Postcolonial theory emerged as ongoing movements towards independence which were occurring in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean (Tikly, 1999). According to Tikly (1999), during the independence movements, Third World critics of the system based their argument on tenets of dependency theory, an economic theory of underdevelopment, which uses the nation-state as its unit of analysis. Yet dependency theory does not account for issues of race, culture, language, and identity. Childs and Williams (1997) indicate that Spivak’s concern is the position of the subject. She notes that this is “the place from which someone addresses or conceives of an issue and formulates its areas of importance” (Childs and Williams, 1997, p.157). In recent years C.L.R. James, a Black Trinidadian, also added to the literature on postcolonial theory.

This study utilized Said’s (1978) perspective of the “other.” Said’s concept of “Orientalism” (1978) is concerned with the colonial period. He examines how the West constructs the “Orient” as the other. Said (1978) analyzes the Western representation of those parts of the world identified as the Orient, which he says is rarely discussed. What is discussed is the West’s effort to impose itself on the people and culture. Orientalism presents imperial power as an epistemological system. Said (1978) stressed that this system survived the Second World War and continues to exist in the scholarship of Western academia. Kennedy (2003) states: “The full implication of this analysis is that
the dismantlement of Western mode of domination requires the deconstruction of Western structure of knowledge” (p. 12). According to Said (1978), the West’s representation of the Orient is distorted. Kennedy (2003) states that postcolonial theory stresses that,

West has no meaning apart from the Orient, the colonizer apart from the colonized. The dominant party in these pairings has its own character shaped as a consequence of the shape it gives the character of the other. (p. 19)

This theoretical perspective is intended to provide a framework in which the social and historical factors that influence primary education policy implementation may be understood. Jamaicans are still struggling with breaking some of the educational patterns developed during colonialization. (Evan, 2001)

**Education and Postcolonial Theory**

Understanding Jamaica’s history and the role of education in a postcolonial society is essential to problematizing the inequities, which are critical to current challenges. Tikly (1999) used South Africa as a framework for understanding this concept. When schools in South Africa wanted to develop an alternative to apartheid education, they used South African exiles, teachers, and students of the schools to develop educational policy. The policy described by Tikly (1999) was a complex process of cultural mixing where identity was fluid. This complex process of cultural mixing is relevant to other cultures such as Jamaica.

Foner (1973) earlier indicated that education was seen in two dimensions: class which determined economic dimension, and status, which determined the social
dimension. According to Miller (1992), “Recognition that basic education is not only about reading, writing, counting, computer skills and environmental awareness, but also about the mass mobilization of people around issues of identity, culture, ideology, religion, and heritage brings us to the very heart of the nature of education itself.” (p. 9) Therefore, Miller (1992) stressed that education serves as tool for social mobility; an ideology for social change, and a fundamental marker in identity formation.

In order to understand the construction of the “other” it is essential to be aware of identity and the social construction of class in Jamaica. According to Watson (1974), “Class relations in contemporary Jamaica are derived from the plantation-colonial system, in which the handful at the top controlled most of the wealth, a colored middle class of Afro-Europeans in between, and the Black lower classes as the underdogs.” (p. 333) Smith’s (1961) study on relations in Jamaica provides a comprehensive analysis of stratification in Jamaica by race, class, and color. She sought to understand the local attitude towards race. To facilitate this understanding, Smith (1961) conducted an institutional analysis of the Jamaican society, and suggested that institutional activities create societal norms, which are the fundamentals of a social structure. To understand this racial influence, Smith (1961) used the family structure, education, and religion as her units of analysis. Based on her analysis, the class system in Jamaica developed along the lines of education, religion and skin color, with the Black population occupying the lowest section.
Inside, Outside Identity And the Construction of the “Other”

Jamaica’s national identity is inextricably linked to education. To further extrapolate Smith’s (1961) claims regarding the social behaviors of the three groups, as well as the construction of the “other” I will employ the concept of “inside, outside.” The inside, outside concept was first articulated by Austin (1979). Asserting that someone is uneducated is similar to saying that person is inferior. According to Austin (1979) “Education can mean not only qualification, but also enculturation” (p. 503).

So what constitutes being an outsider or an insider? Inside, outside is based on kinship, work life, and domestic organization. One can be born inside or outside, work inside or outside and live inside or outside. The inside, outside ideology is expressed through education and wealth. According to Austin (1979), the working class is viewed as “uneducated outsiders, inadequately socialized and ill-equipped to participate in mainstream institutions; a sector of Jamaican society with no real culture of its own.” (p. 503). This section would also be classified as Smith’s (1961) Black section, this section is also the “other.”

A person who is educated is perceived as a superior type of human being, or the educated Jamaican. “A statement of identity in terms of kinship can be a statement of identity in terms of class. For a working class person, a statement of superior class affiliation may be also a statement of dependent kinship status.” (Austin, 1979,p. 503). Classes as well as identity may fall into two categories, “haves and have nots” or the “educated and uneducated.” The class ideology extends to marriage. Common law marriage pervades the working class. However, the children born to middle class married
parents are still referred to as inside; while the children of working class common law marriage is referred to as outside. Even children from extra-marital affairs are referred to as outside children. This, Austin (1979) indicated, is a remnant of slavery, when the White plantation staff has affairs with Black and mulatto slaves. The middle-class regards any child born out of wedlock as an outside child whereas the working class uses the term for a child who is not of a cohabitating spouse.

The inside, outside notions of identity is also evident in physical space that these two groups occupy. Outside toilets, washing and cooking facilities, which residents share, are synonymous with tenement yards. Yard living is associated with lack of proper socialization for children. A home with inside facilities is considered middle class. The streets are clean as this environment is considered conducive to promoting good manners which are required of an educated person. Foner (1973) also acknowledges that physical space promotes better school performance. She claims that, the white-collar workers are able to provide more nourishing food for their children. These children also have a special place to study and are not required to assist with most household chores. They can obtain special books to assist in preparing for exams. The children from the poor families do not have an environment that promotes academic emphasis.

Inside work is associated with office work, and outside work is associated with manual labor. Inside work is associated with the educated Jamaican, while outside work is considered low status and poorly paid. Foner (1973) states that success is linked to economic status, which is also linked to power. The working class is viewed as outside by the upper and middle classes. In contrast, the working class sees their situation as
unequal power relationships. The working class is denied secondary education, they work in menial jobs, and they receive low wages which results in most working class Jamaicans living in Yards. Austin (1979) indicated that, “These social means of incorporation into the metropolitan would also compromise the two poles of ‘manners’ and ‘qualification’ which define the Jamaican notion of education.” (p. 509). The concept of the “educated Jamaican” is illusive to the lower class, because interpenetration and reciprocity of the political system does nor trickle down to the lower class. The working class see themselves not as outsiders, but as victims of economic and political dispossession.

In his assessment of cultural and political identity in the French West Indies, Dahomay (2003) describes culture as a means of survival. An examination of the case of Haiti revealed that, “They were fighting for liberation, indeed, but not liberty.” (Dahomay, 2003, 96). He asserts that the Haitians were not fighting for public space and democratic public institutions, but rather they were fighting for a way out of slavery. Unlike the Haitians, Jamaicans’ national identity took the direction of national political identity (this will be further explicated under political factors influencing primary education).

Eyre (1972) refers to as shantytowns and Austins (1979) denotes as yards are evident in the geographical layout of the colonial world that gives insight into the organization of decolonized world (garrisons) (Fanon, 1963, p. 38). The “other,” Governor Musgraves’ “half educated vagabonds” today are the people living in the shantytowns, garrisons and Yards; they are the “outsiders.” These are the people of the
“subaltern.” According to Young (2003), the schools in these communities “help to develop the perspectives from which post colonialism is generated.” (p.15). These people, Young (2003), notes are the ones Fanon (1963) recognizes as “hybridized split existence.” (Young, 2003, p. 23) negotiate between two existences. Young also stresses that these “other’ are controlled by walls, “some of us are walled in…some of us are walled out.” (Young, 2003, p.66). The people that are walled in are Smith’s (1961) Black section. They have been “othered” by the social construction of their physical space, religious practices and educational levels. Nevertheless, Fanon noted that these people should not be held captive solely because of their skin color. He stressed, “My black skin is not the wrapping of specific values” (Fanon, 1963, p. 227).

Some scholars agree that education is the overall tool that leads to development of a society. However, Jamaicans are still struggling with breaking the patterns developed during colonialization. Manley (1974) noted, “Class divisions in Jamaica are so deeply rooted as to create the condition of a plural society.” (p. 159) Institutions such as schools were established by the colonial powers. The challenge, as Cogan (1983), describes it is “…the social-class stratification imposed on the colonized and designed to afford power, status, and privilege to the colonizer at the expense of the colonized.”(170). Cogan (1983) continued to explain that colonial education was designed to maintain Jamaica’s class structure through the control over secondary education. Cogan (1983) also states: “This stratification via education has remained largely intact during the past 100 years” (p. 175).
However, Kennedy (2003) notes that postcolonial theorists write from a Western perspective for Western audiences; they use the other to explain its “otherness.” It is also important to note that postcolonial theory is a Eurocentric concept used to critique the other (Young, 2003).

While these objections are worth articulating, the major tenets of postcolonial theory have been substantiated primarily from evidence within many postcolonial societies that have been observed throughout subsequent decades. Postcolonial theory will allow this researcher to use rich historical descriptions to deconstruct education policies; as well as school policies and practices, to gain insight into factors influencing primary school policy implementation. Evans (2001) postulates: “The social and historical legacy of the Jamaican schools makes a postcolonial perspective very relevant to the study of Jamaican schools and what happens in them” (p. 19). Evans (2001) also states that, “[e]ducation and schooling take place against a social and historical background. They are a very important formative influence in any society but especially in a postcolonial society” (p. 15).

**Political Model**

While postcolonial theory will focus predominantly on the larger social and historic context of policy implementation, the focal point of the political model will be politics of implementation. “Implementation encompasses whatever is done to carry a law into effect, to apply it to the target population” (Anderson (2006), p. 200). Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) state: “Implementation is the process of carrying out, accomplishing, fulfilling, producing, and completing a policy” (p. xiii).
According to LaRocque (1986), the political model asserts that policy implementation is interactive and the process is flexible with continuous negotiation. The model is used to examine the various linkages that comprise policy implementation in Jamaica. These linkages include teachers, ministers and ministry personnel.

Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) also note that the policy process is cyclical and is connected by systems of linkages and elements. They state that the policy process occurs in three interconnected environments, and within these environments, several processes take place: actors are always changing and interacting; the environments are always in flux; and, most importantly, the environments suggest that implementation is not a one-directional process as shown in Figure 3.
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*Figure 3: Environments influencing implementation.*

*Source: Rein and Rabinovitz, in Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980, p.27.*
**Environment One: Policy Formulation**

This environment is usually described as the most structured of all the environments (Anderson, 2006; Kingdon, 1980; Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980). The actors include government officials, presidents, prime ministers, interest groups, and political actors. In this environment, policy can emerge from a crisis, public outcry, and issues in the media (p. 22). Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) state that although policy can be reformulated in other environments, it usually ends when a governmental body legitimates a decision.

**Environment Two: Policy Implementation**

Actors in this environment vary depending on the type of policy that is being considered. The actors are supposed to be guided by mandates, rules, principles, or guidelines outlined in Environment One; however, Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) state that “they can be influenced by their own perceptions and/or attempts to gather support for their implementation efforts” (p. 23). Therefore, implementation efforts can be hampered or enhanced based on the actors in this environment as well as the conditions of the environment. Implementation ends when the policy is terminated or when the actors in Environment One decide that the policy is a success or a failure.

**Environment Three: Policy Evaluation**

Evaluation provides actors in Environment One with tools to assess the effectiveness of a policy (Anderson, 2006). Evaluation can include actors from environments One and Two but can also include academic and public interest groups that were not part of the initial process. However, most of the time, implementers are
involved in the evaluation process because of their intimate involvement with the policy “on the ground.” Usually, the goal of evaluation is to determine success or failure and to develop policy alternatives. As a result, new policies may emerge as a response to evaluation outcomes. Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) indicate that policies emerging in Environment Three will have to be legitimated by actors in Environment One.

*Policy Elements: Linkages*

Communication and compliance linkages form the link between the three environment systems. Communication linkages occur in the policy process because of “(1) garbled messages from sender; (2) misinterpretation by receiver; (3) system failure in terms of transmission breakdowns, overload, ‘noise,’ and inadequate follow-through or compliance mechanisms” (Nakamura and Smallwood, 1980, p. 24). Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) point out that garbled messages can result from verbal and written communication, such as forbidden language and language ambiguity. More often, it is referred to as a “diffuse policy message” which uses words such as “promote the general welfare.” They further state that these words are placed in legislation when a compromise has to be reached, but there are no specifics on how they are to be measured. Misinterpretations of messages (intentional or unintentional) can occur because of receivers’ interests, values, beliefs, and organizational norms that shape perceptions. Implementers sometimes ignore messages that can alter or threaten the bureaucracy or personal goals.

System failures can result when the machinery is not in place to transmit information from one environment to the next. Messages may be sent to the wrong actors
or may not be sent at all. Most importantly, Nakurama and Smallwood (1980) state that system failure results from the absence of follow-up and a compliance mechanism, which would ensure that messages are received accurately and appropriate steps, are being followed. They stress that communication linkage between environments One and Two are very important because the individuals or groups carrying out a policy must know what to do.

Mostly top-down models (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; Mazmanian & Sabatier 1983) who perceive policy designers as the major actors have questioned the theoretical assumptions of the political model. Nevertheless, the political model offers a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of policy implementation and even incorporates tenets of the top-down and bottom-up models (Hull & Hjern, 1987; Berman 1980).

Schools are a microcosm of society, and the political model is operating within this postcolonial framework. In Environment One teachers mentality, behavior, and pedagogy are all influenced by postcolonial legacy. In Environments Two the ministry is a postcolonial structure that was constructed before independence and the evaluation processes in Environment Three are influenced by the colonial legacy. They are working within a framework that is organized and underpinned by colonial forces and we are not entirely independent of these forces. Political model interprets the way these structures work operating within the larger society. The impact of colonialism is embedded in institutions such as the Ministry of Education.
Summary

The literature revealed that teachers and principals play a pivotal role in policy implementation. National policies are actually implemented by local governments and officials in the states or counties. If local or state governments are not involved in the drafting of policies, this may complicate the implementation process. In the United States the Bush Administration introduced the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2001. The goal of the act was to improve public education through testing programs in order to promote accountability. However, Anderson (2006) asserts that the implementation of the act has faced several challenges because local officials were not included in the drafting of implementation regulations.

In the United States and other developed countries, policy is chiefly implemented by administrative agencies; however, in most developing countries, policies relating to social issues, such as education, are implemented by local officials, principals, teachers, and school boards. Various organs of government negatively affect policy implementation. McDonnell and McLaughlin (1982) concluded: “The vagueness or ambivalence of Congressional intent has implications for both Department of Education and state administration of federal grants” (p. 13).

The literature examining the economic, social, political and historic foundation of primary education in Jamaica reveals that formal education in Jamaica was conceptualized to serve two major functions--to reinforce the status quo and to achieve mobility (Foner, 1973). Evans (2001) states that the elementary schools were established
“[t]o maintain Jamaica’s stratified social structure and socializing students to take their place in that structure” (p. 2).

Foner (1973) indicated that only a very small percentage of Jamaican students aspired to secondary education. Foner (1973) and Dove (1980) also found that sending children to secondary school is closely linked to economic status. Findings among all the studies’ research are similar: schools are challenged with absenteeism and high dropout rates, which can be associated with the poverty in Jamaica. Danielson’s (1996) work on development in Jamaica argues that national budget cuts have disproportionately fallen on schools and health clinics. In the area of development, the shantytowns described by Eyre (1972) pose a dilemma for the Jamaican government and the Ministry of Education.

Education and educational policy within the context of Jamaican history have experienced several changes. These changes resulted from resource allocation as well as from socioeconomic policies in Jamaica. However, the educational system was slow to reach most Jamaicans. Even after the abolition of slavery, education remained beyond the reach of ex-slaves. Cogan (1983) stressed that in the late 1800s, the secondary schools that were created in Kingston served primarily the wealthier citizens. The limited availability of schools, especially beyond the primary level, intensified class divisions in this colonial society. Various scholars (Cogan, 1983; Evans, 2001; Foner, 1973) assert that this class division produced a dual system of education. This dual system of education in turn created social and economic disparities in Jamaica.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study seeks to understand the factors that influenced policy implementation in primary education in Jamaica from 1980 to 1985. This chapter discusses the methodology and design used in this research. This includes the role of the researcher, site selection, selection of participants, and data analysis procedure.

Research Methodology

Qualitative methods are appropriate for this study because they will enrich the scholarly field through multiple viewpoints. According to Creswell (1998), “Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem…” (p.15). Additionally, Taylor, Fazal, Lingard, and Henry (1997) state that the aim of policy research is to unravel the complexities of the policy process; therefore, qualitative research is fitting.

Qualitative research is fitting where a small amount of empirical research exits (Patton, 1990). As indicated by the literature review, the data are sparse for the present study’s issues. Qualitative research involves the study and use of various empirical materials (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 5). Denzin and Lincoln (2003) also state that qualitative researchers study phenomenon in their natural settings in hopes of understanding and interpreting meanings in people’s lives. The present study will contribute to solving a real-world problem, and qualitative research offers a researcher the ability to study and understand phenomenon in its space (in this case, Jamaica). Most importantly, this is an exploratory research. According Marshall and Rossman (2006),
“The strengths of qualitative studies should be demonstrated for research that is exploratory or descriptive, and that stresses the importance of context, setting, and participants’ frames of reference” (p. 54).

However, Silverman (2000) indicates that the choice of research methods needs to be defended and that pursuit of people’s experiences does not constitute an adequate defense. The sources of this research are not limited to documenting people’s experience. In this study, the data collection encompasses a number of relevant government publications, newspaper reports, analyses by journalists and scholars, archival sources, and notes from meetings at the Ministry of Education.

According to Fitz (1994), some researchers in implementation studies prefer qualitative methods. Fitz (1994) warns that this approach can focus too much attention on policymakers and implementers, while ignoring the economic and political factors that are prevalent in policy development. As discussed in previous chapters, the present study also addresses the political and economic factors in Jamaica.

Some scholars insist that qualitative research is not objective because qualitative researchers interact with those they study. While it is important to note the objections to qualitative research, the strength of this method should not be ignored. Silverman (2000) states that qualitative research has several strengths such as the ability to focus on actual practice in situ looking at interactions among participants, and the ability to question the conventional wisdom surrounding research. More importantly, qualitative research “cannot be determined by following prescribed formulas. Rather its quality lies in the power of its language to display a picture of the world in which we discover something
about ourselves and our common humanity.” (Buchanan, 1992, p. 133 as cited in Silverman, 2000, p. 289).

Research Design

I utilize a case study that consists of interviews and document analysis. According to Cohen et al., (2000), “The purpose of the research determines the methodology and the design of the research” (p.73). Creswell (1998) defines a case study as being bounded by time and place. This study involves detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information. Creswell (1998) also indicates that a case study involves situating the case in its natural setting. He points out further; a case study involves the widest array of data collection as the researcher attempts to build an in-depth picture of the case.

According to Bassey (1999), there are several categories of educational case studies: theory seeking and theory testing; storytelling and picture drawing; narrative stories and descriptive accounts of educational events, projects and systems; and evaluative. This researcher embarked on an evaluative case study. According to Yin (1994), “An evaluative case study is a single case or collection of case studies in depth with the purpose of providing educational actors or decision makers with information that will help them judge the merit and worth of policies, programmes or institutions.” (As cited in Bassey 1999 p.28). Yin (1994) argues strongly for the importance of theory. Qualitative research most times does not advocate generalization, however, Yin (1994) suggests that “If two or more cases are shown to support the same theory, replication may be claimed” (as cited in Bassey, 1999, p. 31). Patton (1990) also states that formative
evaluators, who want to improve human conditions, rely heavily on case studies and do not seek to generalize findings beyond a specific setting. (p.10). Therefore, I will limit my study to primary schools in two parishes; the bounding is consistent to a qualitative case study design (Creswell, 1994).

Yin (1994) claimed that within the academic community there is opposition to case studies in that they lack rigor and take too long (as cited in Bassey, 1999). Bassey (1999) countered this argument by stating that case study research is unique in its ability to understand complexity in different settings. Case study offers the flexibility of understanding the paradoxes inherent in people, events and settings.

Research Site

The ideal site meets the following conditions:

There is high probability that a rich mix of many of the processes, people, programs, interactions and/or structures that may be a part of the research question will be present, the researcher can maintain presence as long as necessary. (Marshall and Rossman, 1995, p. 54)

The Jamaican parishes of Kingston and St. Thomas were selected as the study sites. Kingdon (1995) states, “The researcher needs to be somewhat conversant with the substantive issues involved in the areas under study and spreading oneself too thin would be a real danger” (p. 231). These parishes were also selected because Taylor et al. (1997) say that implementation issues should be conducted at sites of “the policy in practice” (p. 41). Since implementation is intimate and comprehensive, studying two parishes will
provide thick, rich description that is needed to answer the research questions (McLaughlin, 1982).

Kingston

Kingston (the capital city of Jamaica) was selected both because the policies were implemented there and because Kingston provides a rural/urban perspective. Additionally, the various distribution points for furniture and the school feeding program were located in Kingston. Figure 4 shows the distribution of public schools in Kingston.

The city is made up of people from various socioeconomic backgrounds. There are wealthy neighborhoods, as well as large intercity communities scattered throughout the city. The 1980s was a politically volatile period, and some inner-city schools were plagued with gun battles erupting between rival political factions.
Figure 4: Map of Public Schools in Kingston.

Source: Ministry of Education Planning Division.
During the period, 1980-1985, there were over 40 male teachers and 400 female teachers throughout the primary schools in Kingston, but only half of them were trained teachers (Ministry of Education Teacher Statics, 1980-1985). There were principals, vice-principals, senior teachers, trained teachers, and pretrained teachers in all these schools. The primary schools in Kingston were about 6% overenrolled. In the late 1970s, one school in Kingston had no water, one school had no electricity, and 20 schools had no cooking facilities. There were no written data available for the 1980s. Eleven teachers from Kingston were interviewed and their selection was on based on snowball sampling.

St. Thomas

St. Thomas is a rural parish in eastern Jamaica. It was selected because in 1981 the then Minister of Education Mavis Gilmour stated that St. Thomas lagged considerably behind other parishes in attendance and other issues. As a result, the ministry intended to implement a primary education policy between 1980 and 1985, commencing in St. Thomas. Gilmour established that St. Thomas had the highest level of illiteracy and the lowest average attendance. (*Jamaica Hansard*, 1981, p. 78). Figure 5 shows the distribution of public schools in St. Thomas.
Figure 5: Map of Public Schools in St. Thomas.

Source: Ministry of Education Planning Division.
Gilmour said of the schools in St. Thomas:

We will concentrate on the maintenance and refurbishing of as many of those schools as we can. We will try to ensure the feeding programme and uniform supply. We will do our utmost to have an acceptable pupil/teacher ratio and hopefully we can do this by September 1982. (*Jamaica Hansard*, 1981, p. 78)

St. Thomas comprised people from various socioeconomic groups. Political tensions were present but were not as rampant as in Kingston. During the 1980-1985 period, there were over 18 male teachers and 170 female teachers throughout the primary schools in St. Thomas; fewer than half were trained teachers. There were principals, vice-principals, senior teachers, trained teachers, and pretrained teachers in all these schools. The primary schools in St. Thomas were sometimes as much as 12% underenrolled.

In the late 1970s, two schools had no source of water supply, 24 schools had no electricity, one school had no toilet, 30 schools had pit toilets (outhouses), four schools had no cooking facilities, and three schools used wood as a fuel for cooking. There were no data available for the 1980s. Eleven teachers from St. Thomas were interviewed. Their selection was based on snowball sampling.

Gaining Entree

In August 2007, I went to the University of West Indies Mona campus as well as the Ministry of Education. I talked to several individuals who indicated that this study was essential for several reasons: Minister Gilmour addressed Parliament every year outlining a range of new policies, initiatives, and successes in education, yet, 1980-85 is commonly described as a “dry” period for education policy. My inquiry also revealed that
the theoretical underpinnings of the study should concern postcolonial education and the political model. My conversations further revealed that policy implementation is not an area that is well understood or studied at the Ministry of Education.

During the same period, I made contact with several personnel at the Ministry of Education. Shirlee Morgan, a statistician, was helpful in identifying charts and figures that could be useful to the study. I was introduced to Beulett Hunter who presently works in the policy unit at the ministry, but was a junior teacher in St. Thomas during Gilmour’s administration. Ms. Hunter assisted me in identifying teachers from St. Thomas. I also met Ms. Pinnock, assistant to the present Minister of Education Andrew Holness. She assisted with scheduling an appointment with the minister.

Methods of Data Collection

The two major methods of data collection are primary and secondary sources. Primary sources refer to documents that are original to the problem: letters, manuscripts, memoranda, laws, wills, newspapers, transcriptions, and oral testimony by actual participants. Tanner and Tanner (1990) support the use of primary sources when they state, “By turning to original documents or pieces of research itself, one is best able to avoid the possible misconstruction of others” (p.12). Secondary sources, on the other hand, do not bear direct relationship to the problem and can include quoted material, textbooks, prints, or replicas.

According to Creswell (1998), “data collection is a series of interrelated activities aimed at gathering good information to answer emerging research questions” (p.110).
Qualitative research involves gathering data using several methods (Glesne, 2006). The data collection methods were interviews and document analysis.

**Interviewing**

In-depth interviewing was utilized for this research. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006), “Qualitative, in-depth interviews typically are much more like conversations than formal events with predetermined response categories” (p. 101). There is a series of steps involved in interviewing: identifying interviewees according to purposeful sampling; defining what type of interview is practical and will be most useful in answering the research questions; determining the place; obtaining consent; having questions ready; and allowing time to elaborate (Creswell, 1998). Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful. As Seidman (1991) indicates:

> If the researcher’s goal is to understand the meaning people involved in education make of their experience, then interviewing people provides a necessary, if not always completely sufficient, avenue of inquiry. (Cited in Locke et al., 2000, p. 257)

One fundamental aspect of good interviewing is asking the right questions. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) purport that interview questions must fit the topic and they must be culturally relative. Silverman (2000) indicates that questions should tease out some theory underlying behavior. While some questions may not amount to a theory, they can provide a framework for understanding a phenomenon, which is a forerunner to a theory. Bassey (1999), Creswell (1994) Glesne (2006), and Silverman (2000) suggest
that an interviewer observe body language to see the effects of the questions on the respondent and then adjust to avoid boredom, annoyance, and physical discomfort. An interviewer should attempt to remember the questions, maintain eye contact, retain information on past points, and make connections.

Fundamentally, questions should be open-ended so that people can respond in their own words; this also allows respondents to take whatever direction they choose and use whatever words they want to express what they have to say.

This study utilized the informal conversational interview. In the informal conversational interview, there is no predetermined set of questions; therefore, the questions will flow from the immediate context. This interview design offers flexibility, spontaneity, and responsiveness because questions can be personalized to deepen communication (Patton (2002). However, Patton (2002) also warns that informal conversational interviews may require a greater amount of time to collect data and demand exceptional interviewing skills on the part of the interviewer.

Interview Instrument

I was in the field for two months, June 15 to August 15, 2008, and I interviewed 37 participants. In general, interviews were scheduled ahead of time in locations selected by participants, and lasted from 20 minutes to three hours for a total of 46 hours and 10 minutes. Some participants were more comfortable sharing information, than others. Thirty-one were audiotaped face-to-face, in-depth interviews, one was over the phone but also audio taped, and five were face-to-face written interviews. This does not include follow-up interviews by phone and email.
The informal conversation instruments each consisted of 11 closed and open-ended questions (Appendixes, B, C, and D). Participants were asked about their involvement in the policy implementation process, how their actions were influenced, and their perceived outcome of the policies. The questions were designed to answer the research questions, and identify themes emerging from the literature review, as well as factors affecting policy implementation. The order in which the questions were asked depended on the flow of the conversation. I inserted questions or probing comments depending on the flow of the interview and the information that was provided.

**Selection of Participants**

Two forms of sampling were utilized to identify participants—purposeful sampling and snowball sampling.

*Purposeful Sampling*

Mavis Gilmour (Minister of Education 1980-1985)

Andrew Holness (Present Minister of Education)

These participants were selected because they are in policymaking positions. Qualitative research with policy analysis requires access to key players in the policy process, people such as political advisors, politicians, and senior bureaucrats. Taylor et al. (1997) also stressed that when policymakers are being interviewed, they may provide a version of their role that is distorted or magnified. Therefore, it is important to access as many accounts as possible. Between the two parishes, I interviewed 35 other participants as multiple sources of information.
Snowball Sampling

- Two past-presidents of the Jamaica Teachers Association
- Two members of Gilmour’s cabinet,
- One project manager for School Feeding Programme
- Three education officers (one worked during Gilmour’s administration, the others are current ministry employees)
- One regional director
- One director of Educational Services
- One director of Monitoring and Evaluation Unit
- Two from the Center of Excellence for Teacher Education (CETT) Program, one principal and one country director
- 22 Teachers, 11 from Kingston and 11 from St. Thomas

This second group of participants was selected through snowball sampling where one respondent leads the researcher to other respondents who were involved in the micro-level implementation process. Within the two parishes, principals and teachers provided information about the micro processes that were involved in the implementation of these policies. Smit (2003) states,

Micro-level understanding of policy implementation could narrow the gap between policy as theoretical text and policy as practice. Ultimately, I argue that better informed choices regarding policy implementation could be made if evidence of qualitative findings were to be seriously considered in the development and formulation of policy. (p. 2)
All the participants were interviewed in English, although there were sporadic moments when the Jamaican dialect (patois) was used. Not all participants signed the interview consent form. Gilmour gave approval for her name to be used in reporting the findings. A number of participants made strong political statements about the administrations and were concerned about reprisals. All participants indicated that they did not wish see the interview transcripts, because I assured them that their names would not appear in my report.

Tables 3, 4 and 5 below list biographical information, date of interviews and length of interviews for the participants involved in this study.
Table 3: Biographical Information of Interviewees and Date and Length of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Length of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilmour Minister of Education</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30/06/08 &amp; 8/2/08</td>
<td>2hrs/3hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTA Past-president</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7/29/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTA Past-president</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7/28/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member Senior Management Team</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1/07/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member Chief Education Officer</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/06/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director School Feeding Program</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/21/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Educational Services</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>08/04/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>01/08/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal CETT Program</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/31/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Director CETT Program</td>
<td>60s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>08/05/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Holness Present Minister of Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/18/2008</td>
<td>1hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Officer Kingston</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/15/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Officer St. Thomas</td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/31/2008</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Officer During the 1980s</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/04/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Director Region 3</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/30/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Kingston Teachers - Biographical Information of Interviewees and Date and Length of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Length of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/24/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/22/2008</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/18/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/28/2008</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/22/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/15/2008</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/21/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/17/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/22/2008</td>
<td>30mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/25/2008</td>
<td>40mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: St. Thomas Teachers- Biographical Information of Interviewees and Date of Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Length of Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/07/2008</td>
<td>45mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T13</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/14/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/07/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/07/2008</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T16</td>
<td>50s</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/07/2008</td>
<td>45mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/09/2008</td>
<td>25mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/09/2008</td>
<td>45mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>07/09/2008</td>
<td>1 1/2 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/09/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/09/2008</td>
<td>1hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07/17/2008</td>
<td>35mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Method of Data Collection

_Documents_

Document and historical analysis serve as the second method of data collection. Documents can be public minutes of meetings; newspapers; and private items, such as journals, diaries, or letters. Documents enable the researcher to obtain language and words of participants (Creswell, 1994, Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). Marshall and Rossman (2006) state, “Knowledge of the history and context surrounding a specific setting comes, in part, from reviewing documents” (p. 107). I also examined several articles from the archive of _The Jamaica Gleaner_, which is also available on line (Appendix E). This allowed me to continue collecting documents after I had left the field. According to
Creswell (1999), documents can be classified as thoughtful data because they represent the feelings of an informant. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) state that documents can enrich what you see and hear by “supporting, expanding and challenging your portrayals and perceptions” (p. 54). Thus, documents can substantiate interviews and observations and, therefore, can bring trustworthiness to the conclusion. Documents can also provide interviews and observations with both a historical and a contextual dimension that can greatly advance the researcher’s understanding of a phenomenon. According to Patton (2002), documents are valuable because the researcher can “learn first hand information as well as they may lead to other inquiries” (p.294).

**Historical Analysis**

Historical analysis uses records and accounts to provide a background that can substantiate interviews, which is useful in qualitative studies (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The sources can be primary, such as documents or relics, and secondary, such as history books. Marshall and Rossman (2006) also state, “Many research studies have a historical base or context, so systematic historical analysis enhances the trustworthiness and credibility of a study” (p. 119). Tanner and Tanner (1990) say that “The implication of such study is that there are lessons to be learned from history; that is, contemporary works can wrest lessons about what to do (or more frequently, what not to do) from the great record of past experiences.” (p. 10)

Since this research background relies heavily on Gilmour’s speeches in Parliament, historical analysis will be utilized. Cohen et al. (2000) point out that historical research “Is an act of reconstruction undertaken in a spirit of critical inquiry
designed to achieve a faithful representation of a previous age” (p. 158). Tanner and Tanner (1990) also indicate that teachers, ministries of education, and principals should view historical consequences as research findings. A sense of history in the case of Jamaica could lead to an understanding of factors that influence educational policy implementation. As Dewey (1966/1916) states: “There is danger of losing a sense of historic perspective and of yielding precipitately to short-time contemporary currents, abandoning in panic things of enduring priceless value” (p. 3).

Historical research in education can accomplish several tasks. It can show practice; recurrent trends can be identified; and, most importantly, it can provide an understanding of politics and education (Cohen et al, 2000). Hansot and Tyack (1982) support the use of history in policymaking in education when they write that history “represents a whole storehouse of old solutions that regularly and often unwittingly are recycled to meet familiar problems” (p. 16). The use of history can assist policymakers in Jamaica to understand how educators and policy implementers responded to policy challenges. Utilizing history in education policy research can also highlight patterns that can help policymakers to develop additional alternatives.

A significant number of the documents used in this research were accessed through the Ministry of Education and the Jamaican Parliament (Appendix F). I examined Gilmour’s speeches, as well as memos, letters and notes from other ministry personnel. Documents analyzed for this study include:

- Gilmour’s parliamentary speeches
- Final Report for Reform of the Jamaica School Feeding Programme
Validation, Credibility and Trustworthiness

In qualitative research, data validity must be addressed through scope, depth of data, respondents approached, and extent of triangulation (Cohen et al., 2000). This study utilizes two forms of validity—internal and external. Internal validity is concerned with accuracy. The findings must describe the topic being researched. In qualitative research, internal validity can be accomplished through data confidence, credibility, dependability, and confirmability (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Internal validity can also be guaranteed through prolonged engagement in the field and triangulation.

External validity, on the other hand, refers to the degree to which results can be generalized to a wider population or transferred to other settings. However, in qualitative
research, generalizability is interpreted as comparability and transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Thus, Lincoln and Guba (1985) note that assessing the research should provide some possibility for identifying some comparison group and cultures. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) also support the idea that qualitative research should provide some amount of comparability and transferability. This study refers to a theoretical framework as well as to the models and concepts used in the analysis so that those who design policy or studies can determine whether the research can be transferred to other settings (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Additionally, the research and interview questions were designed based on the theoretical assumptions; this was utilized to ensure credibility. Theories were systematically interwoven throughout this study.

In order to create credibility and trustworthiness, reflexivity is very important. I used a personal notebook, which assisted in bracketing my thoughts and experiences. Credibility and trustworthiness were also ensured through the coding of the data. After the categories and themes were identified, I color-coded the interviews to keep track of settings, names, places and dates. As the categories and themes were emerging, and interviews were color coded, I began to identify the story that was emerging as well as how it was answering the research questions. Using the themes and patterns from the story, I looked for alternative explanations that challenged my understanding of the data as they were unfolding.

Research and the Researcher

Evaluation can be a political exercise (Weiss, 1991). When social programs are examined, it can have political overtones. The questions that are asked, the methods used,
and the interpretation of the data, such as which findings to highlight and what recommendations to make, are all political decisions. Weiss states:

Just agreeing to do a study has political overtones. The message to the world at large is two-fold: (1) the program is problematic enough to need evaluating, and (2) the program is a serious enough effort to be worth the time and effort to evaluate. (p. 221)

As a Jamaican who has been through the socialization process, I am aware of my biases, limitations, and fallibility. Awareness of my positionality as a researcher is important. I am aware that Jamaica’s colonial history continues to shape education and education policy as well as that political parties have used education research to promote particular agendas. Since I have been living in the United States for 10 years, I must also be clear that I am not grafting a United States education framework onto Jamaica. I am also aware of the barriers posed by my class and educational status.

In his assessment of the researcher, Miller’s (1992) view is that

Subjective judgments are controversial. Education is an instrument used to achieve different ends: justify actions and judgments of all kinds; allocate jobs, status, and other symbols of achievement; estimate personal competence and worth; and in some cases even to grant civic rights. Lack of education, whether provision or participation, often indicts an individual, a family, a community, an ethnic group, a government, or a country. Assessing education is never neutral. The assessor’s perspectives, preferences, and prejudices are often very evident. (p. 137)
“Fly-on-the wall researcher” describes a researcher who should be objective and should only observe what is happening around him or her. If the researcher were to put himself or herself into the research, then the outcome of the research would be biased. Therefore, I kept a field journal in which I bracketed my thoughts, observations, and interpretations. However, my background and my knowledge of language, proverbs, idioms, and other rituals that are unique to Jamaica were of great advantage. Knowledge of this culture is crucial for credibility and trustworthiness of data.

Ethical Issues

It is important for researchers to be cognizant that there are ethical challenges in qualitative interviewing. According to Marshall and Rossman (2006), “Ethical considerations are generic—informed consent and protecting participants’ anonymity— as well as situation-specific” (p. 82). Interviews lay open thoughts and feelings, and the process may cause the interviewee to reflect on uncomfortable situations in his or her life. The more problematic the experience is for the individual the harder it may be for the interviewer to obtain this information. Douglas (1985) suggests that a sensitive moment during the interview demands creative interviewing. This concept of creative interviewing “involves the use of many strategies and tactics of interaction” (p. 25) and these tactics will involve some conflicts, trust, and cooperation. Another important tool that may assist an interviewer conducting an emotionally charged interview is superb listening skills. I am a Jamaican who possesses the language and cultural nuances that are unique to Jamaica. This knowledge equipped me with skills necessary to develop rapport and to build trust.
Other ethical issues that are associated with qualitative research relate to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Jamaican regulations. I provided consent forms to all participants. I also provided information about the research and its purpose. I am aware that respondents gave their time for these interviews; as a result, the interviews were scheduled according their availability and the place of their choosing. Pseudonyms were used to protect respondents’ identities.

Data Analysis

Data analysis involves coding and sorting. Miles and Huberman (1994) indicate that coding should resemble the original data. This enables the researcher to immediately “detect patterns and themes and begin to develop generalizations” (p. 284). According to Creswell (1998), “Data analysis involves the researcher being involved in a process of moving in analytic circles rather than using a fixed linear approach” (p. 142). Cohen et al. (2000) state that data analysis is “more of a reflexive, reactive interaction between the researcher and the decontextualized data that are already an interpretation of a social encounter” (p. 282).

While there are several recommendations for analyzing data, this research utilized Marshall and Rossman’s (2006) seven phases for analytic procedures: (a) organizing the data; (b) immersion in the data; (c) generating categories and themes; (d) coding the data; (e) offering interpretation through analytic memos; (f) searching for alternative understanding; and (g) writing the report or other format for presenting the study. (p.156)

A transcription service was used to transcribe interviews. Transcribing can be a challenging task. Participants do not speak with punctuation and the meanings of
sentences or phrases can be lost based on where punctuation marks are placed (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Since the words and their symbolism are paramount to qualitative research, I extensively documented the proceeding of interviews. All tapes were numbered and stored in a safety deposit box in Jamaica. When I returned to Ohio, the tapes were transcribed verbatim and stored in electronic format by interview number. These electronic files were stored on a private drive on my office computer.

Organizing the data began with data reduction, which involved the use of analytical notes. Analytical notes represent the researcher’s feelings, ideas, and impressions. They may also be a form of data analysis that may range from “problem identification to question development to understanding patterns and themes” (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p. 49). The transcribed interviews numbered 700 single-space pages.

Anderson describes this as “empirical data that will permit the demonstration of sound inference of cause and effect relationship” (p. 29). Hypothesis should be developed and tested on the best possible evidence. Socioeconomic issues, especially those relating to poverty and education in developing countries, are sometimes difficult to quantify. Behavior patterns of people may be influenced by many social, economic and political factors.

I began the data reduction process by grouping the data according my perception of a participant’s responses. Generating categories and themes is described by Marshall and Rossman (2006) as “tough intellectual work of analysis.” This portion of the analytic process demands an acute awareness of and focus on the data. Generating categories involves identifying patterns. Some patterns may be obvious, but others are more subtle.
After the data were grouped according to my perceptions, I immersed myself in the data. This immersion allowed for a thorough examination of each group. The groups were later broken down into general and particular themes. I sought to capture phrases that were connected to the literature or patterns relating to the relationship between policymakers and the Ministry of Education and policy implementers and the goals of policies, role of policy implementers. Patton (2002) warns researchers to be aware that sometimes themes and categories are generated based on the researcher’s perception and not the data. Therefore, I embarked on color-coding to ensure that the themes generated were not based on my perception. Each research question was assigned a color or colors, responses were highlighted based on these colors. The interviews were coded according to response, and similarities were identified.

According to Marshall and Rossman (2006), “Data collection and analysis typically go hand in hand to build a coherent interpretation” (p. 155). In qualitative research, the researcher may have to shift or modify data analysis procedures as the research progresses. Cohen et al. (2000) indicate that a researcher should be aware that educational research, politics, and policymaking research are designed to address complex social issues but that policymakers may be seeking simplistic answers. However, Loveless (1998) points out that findings in educational research are “inherently contingent;” that is, findings are suggestive. Loveless also notes that when schools are challenged, educational policy or research is blamed. On the other hand, when policies are adopted, researchers gain legitimacy that their theories or research have been translated into policy, and policymakers state that their policies are backed by research.
Researchers have to be aware that policy suggestions may be sidelined if they are perceived as promoting a particular ideological viewpoint.

Nevertheless, Loveless (1998) maintains, “Researchers must cultivate ways of influencing policy, particularly when policy-makers can simply ignore research findings, commission their own research or under fund research into social problems” (p. 43). Research will be used if it is politically acceptable. This increases the tension between researchers and policymakers, because there are conflicting interests and agendas (Cohen et al.).

Reflections on the Data Gathering Process

After obtaining Institutional Review Board (IRB) permission I immediately emailed Shirlee Morgan and Beulett Hunter at the Ministry of Education. I also emailed Dr. Hyacinth Evans at the University of West Indies. Dr. Evans provided some guidance with my research and contacted Dr. Gilmour on my behalf. Before I left for Jamaica, I had scheduled interviews with Dr. Gilmour and Minister of Education Andrew Holness. Although Ms. Hunter assured me that she knew teachers in St. Thomas I was apprehensive about finding all the participants I needed.

When I arrived in Jamaica, I was anxious to get started. I was on a time constraint and I needed to find 35 additional participants. Dr. Gilmour was the first interview that I conducted. She was pleasant and engaging. I was estatic to gain access to Gilmour, because she usually does not grant interviews. However, she noted that my research was of interest to her. Her recommendations were the beginning of the snowball sampling process in Kingston.
Ms. Hunter provided contacts for St. Thomas teachers. However, I was still apprehensive because I am not as familiar with St. Thomas as I am with Kingston. When I arrived in St. Thomas, I hired Dalton, a taxi driver to assist me with finding my first participant. At first, I was nervous about riding in a taxi with strange man. There have been numerous cases of females being raped by taxi drivers. After I arrived at the destination, I surreptitiously recorded Dalton’s license plate number, as well as a description of him and his car. I called my sister in Kingston and gave her all his information. My insider knowledge made me fearful as a safeguard. My first interview in St. Thomas, I was delighted with recommendations which led to the snowball sampling process there. All my participants in Kingston and St. Thomas were contacted by phone. Some welcomed me into their homes; others welcomed me into their offices. I followed up with participants by phone for clarification regarding various aspects of their responses. Dalton was extremely helpful throughout this entire process and I offered him an unspoken apology for my suspicion.

I left some of interviews delighted about I was learning; after others I left depressed. One participant stressed that nothing could be done about policy implementation until there is the political will to institute change. At that point I called Dr. Godwyll who assured me that researchers sometimes struggle with various emotional challenges depending on the nature of their topic.

There were times when I felt moved to reject some statements regarding the nutribun and milk. I was a recipient of the nutribun program. The bun was hard and sometimes tasty, depending on how hungry I was that day, however, the milk was usually
spoiled. I recalled that it was mostly students from the lower socioeconomic class who purchased it. Because I experienced the nutribun, I was tempted to conclude that the program was inadequate. Then I had to remind myself that though I had been a recipient of these policies, I was now a researcher, so my field journal was helpful to bracket my thoughts.

The interviews about the inner-city communities (garrisons) communities were also emotionally challenging for me. While it was important that I take a critical distance because I had family living in these areas, I know firsthand what happened in them. I would argue that this was a very negative environment in general for schools. These warring factions were institutionally sanctioned, defined and sustained through political parties. Many people in these communities felt that they were being empowered without realizing that they had not been given any constructive alternatives.

Most problematic, however, were the schools that were located in these areas. When opposing factions engaged in gun battles, they would sometimes occupy the school buildings. Teachers and students were forced to lock themselves inside classrooms for their safety’s sake. The home environment set limits on the education, achievement and experience of students living in these communities. I am not suggesting that everyone from there was involved in gun violence, because there have been successful students coming out of these communities. What I am indicating is that, in general, a high percentage of students from these communities were impacted because of this violence. Sometimes they were unable to get to school on time, other times, young girls were raped with impunity on their way to school.
I am Jamaican and this in part helps in defining the direction of my research. I am a product of the primary school system, as well as the primary school policies, of the 1980s. I believe that the researcher and his or her research are inseparable. I am also aware that I am both researcher and the instrument of analysis, and how this consciousness of my status affects the research process. To ensure credibility and trustworthiness I kept a field journal in which I bracketed my thoughts and observations.
CHAPTER 4: GILMOUR’S FIVE POLICY INITIATIVES

Introduction

This chapter presents findings from the research data relating to Research Question 1, which asks, “What are the views of selected stakeholders about the five tenets of the Primary Education policy in Jamaica during 1980-1985?” The major policies that were articulated to strengthen primary education were: nutribun and milk, teacher education/upgrade, compulsory primary attendance, classroom single sealers and physical units. They are also listed below in Figure 6 (Appendixes G-K, Gilmour promoting polices and projects the Ministry of Education 1980-1984).

![Figure 6: Gilmour’s Five Policy Initiatives for Improving Primary Education.](image)

Since this study focused on Mavis Gilmour’s policies, I will devote a section here to describe her background and leadership style. This will be followed by a discussion of
the five policies. The major themes from each policy are listed, followed by a discussion of each theme.

Gilmour’s Background and Leadership Style

Figure 7: Mavis Gilmour at home in Kingston, Jamaica.

According to Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), political leaders’ “attributes and attitudes are important to the policy process because they influence their conception of, and attitudes toward, implementation.” (p. 171)

Gilmour’s Background

Mavis Gilmour was born and raised in rural Jamaica. During the 1930s and 1940s, she attended a rural primary school, which was headed, at that time unusually, by a woman. Gilmour described her principal as a great disciplinarian who influenced her to be dedicated, precise, and committed. According to Gilmour,

She introduced us at that school, primary school, to the best of English grammar and English literature, and poetry. And to this day, poetry is one of my recreations. She gave me the impetus to do the best always with whatever I was doing. (M1)
During her early adulthood, Gilmour wanted to be a doctor of medicine. She graduated with a Bachelor of Science in 1947 and a doctor of medicine in 1951, she noted, “So I had done in six years what other people took 10 years to do.” She returned to Jamaica and then became a surgeon specialist. Gilmour was the first female surgeon specialist in the Caribbean.

Before entering politics, Gilmour worked as a consultant surgeon at the Kingston Public Hospital. She noted that her entrance into politics was driven by a desire to serve in a larger capacity,

Well I had got my specialty and I had got to top of the ladder, and I trained quite a few young doctors, and I looked at what I was doing on the operating table, I was looking after one person, and if I could sit down and make a decision, I could influence the whole society. Therefore, I changed and entered into politics. (M1)

Gilmour’s Policies

In 1980, Gilmour was appointed Minister of Education. She stressed that it was obvious that primary education had to be the emphasis because Jamaica had come out of a colonial period, in which very few primary schools were built. When Jamaica became independent in 1962, many underserved communities wanted free secondary education, because up to that point, secondary education had to be completely paid for by parents. The then minister acceded to the cry of the nation, and instituted what was called the 70/30 program, which meant that 70% of the students who went to secondary school had to come from government primary schools.
In order to recruit the teachers for the increased number of students at the secondary level, the best of the teachers at the primary level were taken into the secondary system, and the primary school system was therefore deprived of its best teachers. There was a crash training program of primary school teachers on a program called the 2 +1 where the teachers in training had only two years in classroom training and the third year they were in the classroom. Gilmour indicated that this resulted in a great deficiency in primary school teaching capacity. Consequently, she put emphasis on improved primary teacher training. She stressed,

It was my idea that the teacher college training should be three years, three full years in the classroom. That one of the teacher colleges should be upgraded and would take the people who had 2 +1 and bring them back for six to nine months and give them a diploma. That was to improve the quality of the training of the primary school teachers. And, secondly, one of the teacher’s colleges in their final year should do some specialization, for example, Bethlehem Teachers College, say, teach music training, and Mico Teachers College would concentrate on, sciences, and another one would concentrate on, say, agriculture. But they should have in their last year, a specialization so that the teachers would have this capacity when they go in so that if I was a student at Bethlehem and I wanted to teach mathematics, I would then come to Mico for the last six months of my training. (M1)

After a policy was articulated for teachers, Gilmour stated that other aspects of primary schools had to be addressed. She noted that too many primary school students
were in large rooms divided by chalk boards, and teaching and learning under those conditions was very difficult, especially for children who were sensitive to noise.

Gilmour stated,

We started a school building program, we were supposed to build 50 primary schools, with the basic of a classroom for each teacher, and with, similar things like sick bay for the children, and a library, and a staff room, and a principal’s office. And if you want to see one you can stop at the Halfway Tree primary school in Kingston and look at it. (M1)

After the physical structures were improved she turned her attention to designing a better way of seating. Gilmour noted,

The children were seated on benches that were often made for three and would have five children on the benches instead of three. And what we did was put a bench with a writing surface for each child. And these had to be built under the supervision of the Bureau of Standards, so that they were all to a particular standard. And in order to save finances, they were, the backs of the benches were adjustable so that the child could really use the same bench from the time the child was six or seven into 11 or 12 he would not need a new bench. And in that school I wanted them to begin independence of a personal identity, a personal development. They had a seat of their own, it was theirs, they could put their name on it, and it had a place for each of their books, and it had a place for their pencils, and they could eat their lunch at their desk. (M1)
She stated that this seat design was driven by her personal experiences as a child. “I use to write and I want to write very pretty, and the child beside me bounced my hand when I write, and I get very angry.” (M1)

In addition to providing adequate seating she indicated that the financial situation in most of the homes dictated that children might come to school sometimes not well fed. Therefore, she introduced a nutribun and milk program. Gilmour stated,

A nutri bun and milk feeding program, you can put in brackets to replace an old fashion thing of cooking meals outside with inadequate utensils, inadequate everything. Inadequate sanitation, they wash the dishes with the same water with flies in it, and all of that, so you can multiply that for yourself. But we copied this program from the Philippines. They have worked that program out, and you provide a bun that has a three-day shelf life, so the school only had to get transport to the school only twice a week, and the bun was made with, I don’t remember the exact calories, proteins and vitamins in it, plus half a pint of milk.

She stressed that it was a good program because in terms of emergencies like hurricane, this was a life saving program that could be easily prepared, and dropped by helicopter to people who were stranded.

**Relationship with Teachers and the Jamaica Teachers Association**

Gilmour noted, “I am perfectly convinced that primary education should be compulsory.” However, she stressed that teachers were not very cooperative and that she had very limited cooperation from the teachers and the teacher’s union on this matter. Gilmour insisted that the Jamaica Teachers Association (JTA) operates like a trade union,
rather than a professional development body. This had promoted a less than professional environment for teachers. Teachers did not adequately prepare for class and did not see themselves as respectable leaders in the community. Gilmour stressed,

   Now these teachers of today there are only teaching for 45 minutes because 15 minutes they are preparing for that class. Well, in my day that was not done. The work preparation was done outside of the classroom time. They do not see the profession in the same light as older teachers saw their profession. It was a calling, a profession, a commitment. There is a complete decrease in the professionalism of the teachers. I do not know whether it is cultural or not. I mean when I was a child, a teacher and a pastor were the most respected people in the village, and the children used to say, good morning teacher and stand, and now they change for greeting the teacher, ‘good morning teacher’ to ‘good morning Miss.’” And I think even that has made an obvious change in attitude. (M1)

Gilmour stated that she had a very difficult relationship with the JTA, “Was not a love fest at all.” She stated that at the beginning of her term the secretary of the JTA told her that job of the JTA is to fight the ministers of education. In her monthly meetings with the JTA she told them exactly what she wanted to do. Gilmour indicated that she made decisions, and this made her unpopular. Although she insisted, her decisions were all data driven, her personality added to her unpopularity. She stated,

   My personality does not go for buttering up people or saying things I do not believe just because I think it would please them. The JTA’s obstruction of my
policies were based on my personality, Let's put it in a sentence, I think they were fighting my personality rather than my wisdom or my work.

However, she stated that she might sound very hard on teachers, but that she believed 70% of them are good, and maybe the 30% are the ones who do not want to take on their responsibilities as teachers. Cabinet members as well as two high-ranking officials from the JTA confirmed Gilmour’s assessment of her personality and her relationship with the JTA. C3 stated,

She stood for change and because she was an outspoken person. As I said that her words were never sugar-coated. I am not saying they were necessarily acrimonious but – the shifts and the changes that she wanted would definitely affect the status quo, and so that is why to me they lobbied against her. (C3)

On the other hand, a former JTA official stated that the relationship between the Ministry and the JTA as stormy. J2 insisted that it was a matter of personality because Gilmour was abrasive and she would have strong disagreements with people in their monthly meetings. J2 stated,

Because Dr. Gilmour wanted to do many things on her own without proper consultation, like for example, schools. It is very rare that JTA has gone out in the public to oppose a ministry relation like that. It was stormy. In fact, the meetings at the ministry were not very cordial at all. There were many quarrels between Dr. Gilmour and us. (J2)

Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) noted that the “personal component” (p.169) of leaders is critical to policy implementation. They further stated, “If leaders are rigid,
inflexible, and unimaginative in adjusting their preferred styles to the political challenges they face, they have very seriously limited their chances of implementing their policy options.”(p. 169) While is not entirely clear that Gilmour’s leadership influenced the implementation of her polices, it is evident, that she was a controversial figure and many participants indicated that she was not a team player. Cabinet member C3 stated that Gilmour was dynamic and dynamic people always fall to criticism, “Mavis was strong and wanted things to happen quickly.”(C2) Another cabinet member noted that the JTA is a very large and powerful, yet difficult, organization, which had to be carefully managed.

*Future of Education in Jamaica*

Gilmour noted that although the present minister is interested in pre-primary education, she is convinced that pre-primary education is important, but it is vital to take the primary school and make it efficient, as well as encourage private enterprise schools, churches, and private enterprise. Gilmour stated,

If a private sector, let’s say a big company, say, all right, I’m going to have a pre-primary thing for all my workers. We will provide a teacher and if you have, if you can get a minimum of 30 children, we will provide a teacher and the curriculum. That, I think, is as far as we can go with pre-primary. Only because of financial restraint. What I believe that, if we take all the children that’s age six and gave them a good education up to age 12, and improve or expand the different levels of training at secondary, where we are deficient at secondary, you weren’t going into that, so I didn’t want to go into that, where we are deficient at
secondary is that we have a good secondary academic, but not a good secondary trade.

Gilmour spoke passionately about the need for compulsory primary education. She stressed that the practice of parents taking children out of school to work at the market is detrimental to the society. She stated that those children who do not attend school are the ones who turn out to be the gunmen later. They cannot read, write or even sign their names. As a result, they steal to maintain their livelihood. She stated, “But colored children running around, nobody cares.” Gilmour noted that the society does not demand education. In Jamaica, politicians do not have the foresight to see that education is the basis of building a nation. The cultural deterioration in Jamaica is a big challenge for education. Gilmour concluded,

I have no problem with the people who said you did not do enough. Nobody would have done enough. In addition, I do not know any leader in any country whose people say they have done enough. Politics is a thing in which there is no fulfillment, there is no satisfaction. At the end of the day a person should be able to look back and say, well granting the circumstances under which I worked I the best that I could, and that is the only satisfaction you get.

Gilmour’s First Policy Initiative: Nutribun and Milk

Introduction

The first of Gilmour’s policy initiatives to be discussed is the nutribun and milk. The nutribun program copied from the Philippines, consisted of a half-pint of milk and a bun that had a three-day shelf life. They were transported to some primary schools twice
each week. According to Gilmour, the financial situation in most homes precipitated this introduction which was also meant to replace an “old fashioned” method of cooking meals outside with inadequate utensils in unsanitary surroundings. Gilmour also stressed that the program would increase attendance. She praised the program, and smiled as she stated that teachers were quite pleased with the nutribun and milk, “Oh they loved it. Oh yes. Well it was easy and, the smell of cooked food all over the place, only think of rats and roaches and rodents and all that was cut out.” (Gilmour, 2008) Clarke (1990) and Simeon (1989) stated that nutrition is vital to attendance and achievement.

Analysis of the interview data and documents about the nutribun and milk revealed four major findings: Food “Too much on teachers’ plate,” appetite for change, lack of consultation, and affordability, are presented in Figure 8 with Emerging Themes reflects the views of these participants towards the nutribun and milk as well as how the program was implemented.

Figure 8: Gilmour’s Policy on the Nutribun and Milk Initiative.
Theme 1: Food: “Too much on teachers’ plate”

Some teachers welcomed the nutribun and milk; on the other hand, others refused to sell the items because that took away from their core function as teachers and shortened their lunch hour was well. A member of the leadership team at the Jamaica Teachers Association (JTA) stated that the nutribun and milk distribution “put into process special responsibilities in some schools.” (J2) A teacher (T5) noted that teachers were asked to assist with the counting and distribution of buns and milk that were sent to each class. They also had to collect and count the money. T7 described the extra cleaning that was sometimes involved with the milk crates,

Naturally, it is more work and sometimes the crates that were sent to the classroom contained punctured milk containers. With these students would spill the milk all over the classroom floor. Teachers then had to clean up. Many teachers were unhappy with performing the custodial function that accompanied the distribution of the nutribun. (T7)

While T7, T8 and T9 teachers saw it as more work, they cooperated for the sake of the students. On the other hand, because of the additional responsibilities, other teachers refused to sell the items. If a teacher refused to sell the nutribun and milk in his or her class, then those students were allowed to purchase them from another teacher. About 19 (95%) teachers said the distribution infringed on their lunchtime. The director (C1) of the nutribun and milk program verified that the ministry received several complaints from teachers, which resulted in helpers being placed in some schools to assist with distribution. C1 noted that on one occasion during salary negotiations,
teachers mentioned the time constraint involved with the distribution of the nutribun as a justification for additional financial compensation.

In addition to infringing upon teachers’ lunch-time, teachers distributing the nutribun and milk had to be vigilant because as T20 states,

Some of the buns started vanishing out of the delivery truck. Sometimes the ministry documented that 24 bags were sent to the school, but you only received 20. Therefore, you have to be alert, because some other people saw it as a means of obtaining a little extra money.

Thus, teachers had to police the nutribun as well. Similarly, one teacher said the nutribun money was stolen from her drawer and she had to replace it from her personal funds. Many teachers emphasized that they resented being responsible for what they described as the “ministry’s money.” These added responsibilities “were too much on teachers’ plate,” and distracted from the core function of teaching and placed an additional emotional toll on teachers.

In addition to infringement upon lunch hour, distribution, cleaning, and acting as vigilantes, many teachers were also responsible for transporting the nutribun to their schools. One principal (T4) used his personal vehicle. According to T4, the ministry claimed that the remote location of his school made delivery impossible so he decided that since his students were asking for the nutribun he would use his personal vehicle to transport them. T4 argued, “The people at the ministry said to me, ‘If you can come and pick it up yourself, you’ll get it.’ Therefore, you see, I used my VW for years until it rotted out. I lost a car.”
Another teacher (T22) pointed out that her school was even more remote than T4’s and the nutribuns were dropped off at a small shop in the town closest to the school. As a result, several teachers were responsible for transporting them from this shop to the school. Teachers commuted to school via a taxi, a vehicle similar to a bus utilized mostly in remote areas where there is no bus service. The teachers would ask the driver to stop at the shop so they could retrieve the nutribuns and milk. If for any reason teachers were unable to reach the shop on their way to school, someone from the school would ride a donkey to collect the nutribuns and milk. The director of the nutribun and milk program confirmed this:

And a plan was worked out that the food could be left for some primary schools that were not accessible by the ministry’s vehicles. Now sometimes they would be left at a shop, and teachers would choose to go for it. We do not force them to go for it. In this case, one school even used a donkey to pick up the buns from a shop. Another school sometimes they used a bicycle to get the bun and milk. (C1)

The transportation issue was also a challenge for schools that were accessible to the delivery trucks. A cabinet member (C3) noted that there were problems in terms of delivery because the refrigerated trucks were expensive and they could not afford one truck per school. Figure 9 shows a nutribun and milk delivery truck.
As a result, C1 underscored, “Sometimes the trucks would break down on the road and they would not get to the schools on time.” Consequently, teachers were forced to adjust class schedules to accommodate late lunches. Additionally, the principal of one urban primary school stated that the school had not received milk for several months. Beverley Williams, from Franklin Town Primary, a teacher who was responsible for the school-feeding program, told the *Jamaica Gleaner* on May 3, 1985, that the school had not received a supply of milk since January of that year. The director of Nutrition Products Limited, which processed and distributed the milk, stated the delay was due to expansion at the factory (*The Daily Gleaner*, May 3, 1985).

The project manager’s report highlighted irregular distribution as a challenge for the school feeding program. Gilmour also acknowledged that there were problems with distribution in view of which the ministry would construct additional processing plants, (*Daily Gleaner*, March 16, 1985) In addition to problems with delivery, there were also challenges with storage. The powdered milk was reconstituted the evening before,
pasteurized, then stored at three to ten degrees Celsius (3-10 o C), the ideal storage temperature for milk. It was then shipped out the next day to schools. However, some schools did not have facilities to keep the milk at the correct temperature, while others did not even have electricity. The milk would be delivered to the classrooms and would sit on the floor in some cases for two hours before being distributed. Oftentimes it was spoiled. The hazards of contamination due to poor or no refrigeration resulted in stomach cramps and diarrhea. To my recollection, no one was held responsible.

Coomarsingh (1984) also found that two years after Gilmour’s pronouncement nutribun and milk were never delivered to the four schools in his study. These schools continued with the cooked lunch program.

**Theme 2: Appetite for Change**

Although the majority of teachers emphasized that the affordability of the nutribun and milk made it an attractive option for most students, they also stressed that it was monotonous and students resented it over time. One teacher (T16) noted that many schools continued the provision of a cooked lunch. T16 indicated that although the nutribun was inexpensive, “it still did not replace cooked lunch, because even though schools had the Nutribun, we still continued with the cooked lunch.”

About 20 (98%) teachers stressed that when the nutribun was introduced some schools stopped providing cooked lunches, which were later resumed after students began rejecting the bun and milk. The teachers emphasized that since many students came to school without a meal, they preferred to have a warm meal. Moreover, some teachers noted that sometimes the students, especially in schools where cooked lunch was present
did not see the nutribun and milk as a meal. In the words of T16, “they saw it more as
snack, but not as a lunch, since students looked forward to cooked lunch instead of bun
for lunch.”(T16)

A member of Gilmour’s cabinet supported the teachers’ claim that the nutribun
and milk were initially accepted, then became monotonous. The nutribun and milk
director stated that perhaps this was because the ministry called it a snack; on the other
hand, Gilmour (M1) rejected the teachers’ explanation that students viewed the bun as a
snack. She insisted that teachers and principals who were benefitting from the cooked
lunch created this perception. She declared that when the ingredients for the cooked lunch
were sent to schools “half of the ingredients were taken by the principals and the teachers
and staff.”

Additionally, Gilmour stated that teachers indoctrinated the students with the idea
that the provision of lunch should mean a warm meal. She asserted that she was engaged
in constant battles with teachers and principals in which she reminded them that nutrition
is not related to temperature, “So I had that fight with the teachers. Oh, it was terrible,
dreadful.”(M1) Gilmour concluded that the teachers lacked the sophistication to
administer this simple program “But you have to know that you are dealing with a
developing country, where the teachers themselves are ignorant of a lot of things.”(M1)
However, a cabinet member (C3) corroborated that more schools began requesting the
cooked lunch program instead of the nutribun.
Theme 3: Lack of Consultation

Only two (3%) teachers recalled being called to specific meetings regarding the introduction and implementation of the nutribun and milk program. T21 explained,

We were called to a meeting, and it was explained to us how the nutribun was made, and the components of it, so as to let us know that the meal was not just an ordinary bun, but it was a filling and nutritious bun. We went to a workshop and they explained to us the components, and that it should be sold to the children at a minimal cost. T5 also noted that she was called to a number of meetings where the nutribun and milk were discussed, and she was even invited to the production site for a tour.

On the other hand, nearly 20 (98%) of teachers stressed that before the nutribun was introduced they were never invited to a meeting to share their perspectives. Some heard from the media. T1 insisted that she heard about it on the news and read about it in the newspaper before it was even discussed at her staff meeting while others were informed by their principals at staff meetings. T6 described when he first heard about the bun and milk:

The principal informed us at a staff meeting. He said the ministry is coming on stream with the bun and milk, and each teacher is expected to take it to class and get the children’s contribution. The principal did not solicit our feedback, and I do not think the schools had a chance to say they did not want it.
On the other hand, T22 stated that she was not informed at her staff meeting; she realized that the ministry had stopped delivering the food for the cooked lunches. When she inquired, the principal told her that a bun would replace the cooked lunch. Other teachers stressed that there was no seminar or specific workshop regarding the implementation; though, several teachers noted that sometimes workshops are organized by the ministry to assist with the implementation of some policies. However, they also emphasized that these workshops were not helpful because teacher input is never solicited. T3 leaned over, stared into my eyes, and declared,

_No! No!_ nobody consults teachers. Usually a policy is sent from the ministry and teachers are told that it should be implemented. Rarely do teachers have an input. They may consult the education officers, and those people are not in the classrooms. They rarely come out and ask the classroom teacher your idea on this or that. When teachers are sent to a workshop, it is to implement whatever they have already decided upon._ (T3)

Nevertheless, the director (C1) of the nutribun program argued that teachers received adequate information and training regarding the implementation of the program, insisting, “We had seminars at the schools and we told teachers about the program and told them the program would be coming into the schools.” (C1) According to a ministry report to the World Food Programme on the School Feeding Programme (Project JAM 2727), seminars were held in various parishes to familiarize principals and teachers with the School Feeding Programme. Additionally, the report stated that most of the teachers
were fully aware of the aims and objectives of the program and they were all co-operating.

Yet, the majority of teachers declared that they were marginalized in the implementation process. T13 summarized the sentiment of those teachers regarding the implementation of the nutribun and milk;

We have never been comfortable. We are very, very concerned that the ministry does not consult us. If you do not have people’s opinion on issues, then you are not going to have the total buy-in, no matter what you are putting forward. (T13)

The difference of opinions is embedded in the issue of lack of consultation. Policies are formulated at the ministry. They are filtered down to teachers through various mechanisms—principals, JTA, education officers, and media. Through these filtering arteries the message becomes distorted. The nutribun program was funded by USAID. There were guidelines and specifications such as personnel training that were to be met to satisfy the criteria of this grant. Although the ministry report to USAID stated that seminars were planned there was no mention in that report of the number of parishes or teachers that were a part of these seminars. The contention is not whether seminars were held, but rather what was the size of the outreach. I believe this disparity conveys the importance of consultation on a wider scale.

**Theme 4: Affordability**

Even though the majority of teachers complained that the nutribun and milk were monotonous, and created additional responsibility, and they resented the fact that they were not involved in the conceptualization, they all lauded the affordability of the
program. About 20 (98%) of teachers in Kingston and St. Thomas stated that they all had canteens, started by individual schools, which provided cooked lunches. The ingredients were provided by the ministry, and included chicken, rice, and bulgur (wheat grain). Some schools did not receive these rations from the ministry, instead some ingredients were provided from school gardens. Other schools purchased their ingredients from local shops. In this case, the cooked lunch would be more expensive, compared to the nutribun and milk or the subsidized cooked lunches. According to T5, most schools had some form of school feeding program in place. However, some lacked proper preparation facilities, and for ensuring that the food had the required nutrients. As a result, the nutribun and milk were welcomed because they were inexpensive and nutritious.

All teachers spoke passionately about the affordability of the nutribun and milk. T1 stated:

When the nutribun came in as a feeding program to all the schools, it was well-supported, because you had children who – who were in need. It was a sort of staple diet for some of them; they looked forward to it, in other words. Children looked forward to the nutribun, and it was quite affordable, because they generally contributed a small cost, or it was provided free. (T1)

The majority of teachers emphasized that the nutribun and milk were the primary source of lunch for most students, filling and providing extra nutrition. They stated that they were so affordable that some students bought nutribuns and milk for their entire family. Although the ministry’s policy was that students should not purchase the nutribun and milk in bulk, some teachers sold them anyway to families in need. The nutribun was
in such demand that “sometimes we had to be careful the parents wouldn’t try to come in and get it themselves.” (T6) Additionally, a cabinet member (C3) stated, “There are times when some students were instructed by their parents to try and bring home one or two for any children who were not in school.” C1, who played a pivotal role in the conceptualization, implementation and oversight of the nutribun program, verified that at first teachers resisted, but later accepted the program after they realized that it was affordable and that it improved the learning environment for students.

Gilmour stated that the affordability of the program should have increased attendance. A ministry project managers’ report (Monitoring of Project JAM 2727) noted that a steady increase in attendance was observed in most schools. The report went on to say that teachers and principals praised the program as the sole contributor to the improvement in attendance. Yet, 19 (95%) teachers interviewed stated that the nutribun and milk did not improve attendance. According to an editorial in *The Daily Gleaner*, it was the consensus of teachers at Morant Bay Primary that the nutribun program did not help in improving attendance (*The Daily Gleaner*, October 16, 1985). In addition, Coomarsingh (1984) and Blair (1986) also agreed that there was no improvement in attendance as a result of the nutribun and milk.

There are several social and financial challenges that some parents had to overcome before there could be any significant improvement in attendance. This assertion will be discussed further, under compulsory attendance.
Second Policy Initiative: Teacher Education Upgrade

Introduction

This section presents the second of the five tenets of Gilmour’s policies—teacher education upgrade. During the 1970s, there was an exodus of trained teachers from primary to secondary schools. This resulted in a dearth of the best teachers as well as a shortage at the primary level. As a result, a crash-training program for primary school teachers, called the Two Plus One (2+1, two years in teachers college and one year in the classroom), was introduced in the 1970s. This program replaced the usual three years in college. Gilmour insisted that this system of training teachers was ineffective and that primary schools would benefit more if colleges reverted to the standard three years for training teachers, which meant that teachers who were trained under the 2+1 were required to go back to college for an additional year.

According to J1, who was in a leadership position at the Jamaica Teachers Association, (JTA) there were competing interests regarding the introduction and implementation of the teacher upgrade from 2+1 to three years in college. The ministry wanted something that was affordable. The university wanted common standards across all colleges and the JTA did not want a two-tiered system where there would forever be certificate teachers (those originally trained under 2+1) at one level and considered inferior and diploma teachers (those who trained under the three-year plan) who were at a higher level.

From analysis of the interview data and documents about the teacher education upgrade three major themes emerged: Polarized factions, support from three-year-trained teachers, and lack of consultation. These are listed in Figure 10. Each theme
reflects the views of these participants towards the teacher upgrade as well as how the program was implemented.

Figure 10: Gilmour’s Policy on Teacher Education Upgrade and Emerging Themes.

Theme 1: Polarized Factions

Gilmour (M1) smiled as she declared that the upgrade “was my idea; it was accepted by most people.” However, an education officer (E3) described the sentiments as twofold:

Well, at first, with any new change, of course, there was some ambivalence. Some teachers welcomed it, because they thought that, well, they would now have a higher qualification, a diploma instead of a certificate. On the other hand, some teachers thought that the change was somewhat sudden. Some teachers did not mind spending a full year in internship. Now, with the diploma program, the internship year was eliminated. As the teachers graduated, and if they were
successful in their exams, they were now graded as trained teacher and started to receive the emoluments of a trained teacher.” (E3)

Teachers were polarized along two lines: those who appreciated going back to college for the additional year, and those who resented going back. Fourteen teachers were 2+1- trained and eight were three-years trained. About four (25%) 2+1 trained teachers stressed that they benefitted from going back for an additional year. According to T21,

Well I was young at the time so I said that I have to go and get the diploma because I do not have a long time yet in the system. Therefore, since learning is something that I liked, so I would go and get the training and do it and I did. (T21)

Even teachers who had spent ten or 15 years in the classroom emphasized the fact that the additional year provided opportunities for learning new pedagogy which enabled them to respond to a new generation, as well as training in testing and measurements such as how to grade students. While these teachers noted that they all benefitted from the one-year internship, they also praised the knowledge that they acquired during the additional year in college. T15 underlined,

Teaching is an on-going process, and every set of children requires us to draw on new ideas. So the one-year internship cannot replace one year where you look at theories that have worked, that you could adjust or could add to improve your expertise. (T15)

On the other hand, 10 (75%) teachers who received the 2+1 training said that they resented going back because they felt they were already adequately prepared. They
stressed that the one year in the classroom was effective in preparing them with teaching and classroom management skills. In addition, they declared that teachers trained under the three-year program (in college, no internship) were not prepared for the classroom. T16 asserted,

Teachers coming out with three years, many of them were not ready for the practical part of teaching. They were not ready to teach. Certificate teachers who had to go back to do the diploma did not like it. I did not like the idea of going back after teaching for so many years. I did not see the sense in doing it.

Anyway, I reluctantly went and did it. (T16)

The majority of 2+1-trained teachers insisted that the three-years-trained teachers needed more time in the classroom because they could not apply book knowledge. Furthermore, they pronounced that even teachers with university degrees were not as good as the 2+1. According to T2, T8, and T12, during the internship year, teachers were required to do a study, and a skills assessment, which were checked every week throughout the one year. They were assigned classroom teachers who provided feedback. The Joint Board of Teacher Education, as well as a 1982 Ministry of Education Teaching Internship Report, also stated that the internship period was well-structured with clear guidelines for teachers and supervisors. According to T18, the teachers in the classroom for the third year made more sense as they were better able to function in the system. Likewise, T21 announced,

Let me first explain to you that I thought the Two-Plus-One was better because we got more practice teaching in the school, and it was a good experience for one
who had very little teaching experience before college to be in the school for that one year. It was a very rich experience – I learned a lot, and had benefitted from that. And after this three years idea was introduced, I heard principals complain that the teachers with the one year experience in the schools did a better job. (T12)

Additionally, T1 stated, the one year in the classroom is essential because a large number of persons entering the teaching profession are coming from professions where there was no formal academic requirement.

Three years in college, and one year for internship, whether it is the first year, or the second year, or the third year, but one year should be designated that they’re in the classroom, because many people who took up teaching have never been in a classroom. Some were just gas station attendants, some were working in offices, and some were hairdressers so the experience in the classroom was vital. (T1)

According to J2, the JTA and Joint Board of Teacher Education (supervises and accredits teacher training) supported the three-year upgrade because it included a proper practicum; he noted, however, that there was no provision in the three-year program for practice teaching. The majority of teachers agreed that the one year in the classroom gave the teacher a lot of experience on the ground. And T4 noted that “even though the teacher might not have been so steeped in the content, it sort of paid off in terms of the teacher’s learning and understanding methodology, by trial and error, and having supervision over a one-year period.” White (1979) agreed that student-teacher classroom management was closely related to performance during their internship. Moreover,
teachers who supported the upgrade stressed that the three-year teachers lacked the necessary classroom management skills,

Well I don’t think it was a waste of time, because we were able to revise what you knew before, and you learned new – you got new information, new strategies, and that could help you to manipulate to serve better in the classroom. Nevertheless, some of the three-year teachers that I observed were not equipped in the practical sense that they are able to manage a class. (T1)

Furthermore, 10 (75%) teachers noted that the one year in the classroom was a springboard into a job. Once their internship period expired, many teachers were offered positions at their internship institutions.

**Theme 2: Support from Three-Year-Trained Teachers**

Franklin McKnight, a fierce critic of Gilmour’s policies, lauded the reintroduction of three-year teacher training program. According to McKnight there was a ratio of two pre-trained teacher to one trained teacher (*The Daily Gleaner*, July 9, 1981). Additionally, teachers who came into the system as three-year-trained teachers all supported Gilmour’s plan to upgrade all teachers. They insisted that the three years provided a more rounded education. One principal, who inherited a school where she supervised teachers who were trained under 2+1 stated

When they came to the classrooms, especially when you work in a depressed area like mine, where children did not have all of the training they need at home, we would benefit more from teachers who were rounded, especially in the social graces. Teachers must get more than the scientific art of teaching.
According to T19, three full years is desirable because sometimes interns copy the style of the supervising teacher, which may be not be the most effective in the classroom. T20 asserted that after spending three years in teachers college, they immediately recognized that teachers who were 2+1-trained were not fully prepared,

As a classroom teacher, senior teacher, marking lesson plans, I noticed that some of them were woefully short in terms of language. Mathematics was not too bad, but language was totally missing. Totally missing. (T20)

Evans (1983) substantiated that many interns found lesson planning tedious, and would not prepare them.

Theme 3: Lack of Consultation

Similar to the introduction of the nutribun and milk, 20 (98%) teachers emphasized that they were not called to a specific meeting about the teacher upgrade policy. T6 stressed,

We heard it over the news and I had a friend, we were in the same grade, and she told me she was doing this course, which is a diploma course. Another friend of mine called me and said the ministry is suggesting that teachers go back to college and do the diploma. At the time, it was free and she indicated that very soon teachers would have to pay so she encouraged me to go back at that time. (T6)

They all declared that if the ministry planned to introduce a far-reaching policy, such as teacher upgrade, then there should be a pilot study, and feedback should have been solicited from those who would be impacted. However, T4 insisted that he not did hear
about the teacher training until it was about to be implemented. T1 and T3 said the principal, or the education officer or “somebody” told them they needed to go back for a diploma. The teachers all affirmed that they were not called into a meeting and no study was done. T21 stated,

No, I was not consulted, no one asked for my suggestion or opinion. We heard over the radio and some of the association that this is a new thing. As of so-and-so, certificates will be phased out, and teachers would have to be diploma-trained.

That is how it was communicated to us. (T21)

They also highlighted that many teachers resisted at first, but after awhile they complied because others started going back.

Third Policy Initiative: Compulsory Primary Attendance

Introduction

This section presents the findings for compulsory primary education as the third of Gilmour’s policy initiatives. Compulsory attendance was introduced in September, 1982, as a measure to improve school attendance. Truant officers were hired to visit homes of delinquent students whose parents then had to go to court and incurred a fine. According to Gilmour, parents had no reason to keep students out of school. She said,

They got a full lunch at school and they got full uniforms to go to school. They didn’t get shoes, but they got pants and shirt for the boys and skirt and blouse for the girls. In addition, they got a full and nutritious meal. Therefore, there was no reason for the poorest person not to send their child to primary school. None, none. (M1)
All the Kingston teachers stated that compulsory education was not introduced at their schools. Likewise, the ministry had no data available for compulsory education in Kingston. As a result, this analysis concerns the views of St. Thomas teachers. The interview data revealed five major themes: No enforcement, too poor to pay, compulsory attendance “Fails?” no additional seats, and lack of consultation. They are also listed in Figure 11. Each theme reflects the views of participants towards compulsory primary education, as well as how the program was implemented.

![Figure 11: Gilmour’s Policy on Compulsory Attendance and Emerging Themes.](image)

**Theme 1: No Enforcement**

E3 stated that some teachers were in favor of compulsory attendance, because they were concerned about the low level of attendance. Among parents, on other hand,
the reaction was mixed. There were some parents, particularly middle-class parents, who supported it fully, because they understood the value of education. The parents in the lower socioeconomic strata, also understood the importance, but they did not have the means and resources to meet all the requirements. One teacher (T12) stressed that some parents also resented the visits from the truant officers because they viewed them as an infringement upon their parental rights. About seven (30%) teachers affirmed that they were not impacted because they already had great attendance at their schools. T13 stated

   At my school, parents were very, very aware of what education can do for them. So whereas you would find a problem in many schools in St. Thomas, as it related to attendance, we have had, I would say, a minor problem in comparison to some schools. In addition, my school was in a residential area, you had middle-class people who sent their children there, because the leadership at the time was somebody of note. (T13)

On the other hand, 15 (70%) teachers emphasized that their schools were not impacted because compulsory attendance was never enforced. T16 pronounced,

   Well, as a teacher I thought it was good; however, whatever policies were in place I do not think were really implemented. Parents were told that they would be visited if their children did not attend school as well as certain fines would be imposed as a deterrent. I do not think anything was done. Hence, the name was there, but nothing was carried through, so children just came to school as irregular. (T16)
A ministry memorandum (*Compulsory Education*, February, 27, 1975) noted that while compulsory education was desirable, there were several challenges that had to be addressed; the majority of parents were poor and utilized their children as a part of the economic support system in the home.

The ministry’s memorandum on compulsory education also recommended that compulsory attendance should be introduced on a phased basis with minimum government assistance for enforcement. The ministry’s memorandum noted that in areas where compulsory attendance was already introduced the ministry was not aware of the daily activities of the truant officers because there was no established procedure at the ministry for their supervision.

Five years later, J2 noted that the truant officers were properly appointed and monitored. The majority of teachers declared that they never saw a truant officer; E3 also agreed that there were never adequate truant officers. Mr. Wiggins, a principal at Morant Bay Primary, also stated that the majority of truant officers were not residents of the community; as a result this hampered their ability to locate students’ homes (*The Daily Gleaner*, October 16, 1985). Many principals and teachers told *The Daily Gleaner* that the whole program lacked teeth, and some spoke of the absence of truant officers who themselves should be checking on absent students. This was supported by T18, who was at a school where the program was introduced, and stressed that she never saw a truant officer.

T20 and T21 emphasized that the sanctions were never enforced, so the majority of parents ignored any verbal or written warning that they received. J2 shook his head in
disbelief and stated there was no follow-up, which resulted in a disaster for that policy. Miller (1997) concluded, “The major difficulties were the enforcement of the law and the consequential punishment of the parents, most of whom were poor.”(p.39). However, T16, summarized the sentiment of all teachers, “It was a waste of time.”

Theme 2: Too Poor to Pay

Coupled with the lack of enforcement, 20 (98%) teachers declared that the financial burden of sending students to school for five days was overwhelming for some families (Smith, 1961). According to T14, sometimes students do not have clean uniforms, tuition, or lunch money. Others have to travel or walk great distances (Dreher, 1984; Eyre, 1972). T12 stressed that the school uniform and nutribun program made a good start on the part of the ministry, but families had other problems. T20 declared,

Some children did get uniforms, and they are getting lunch as well. However, when you go to the homes you will see that there were other variables that had to be considered in order for the children to come to school every single day. Because I think if the parents were found to be delinquent, you would love for them to be prosecuted. Then when you visit their homes and the conditions under which they live, your heart just melted. I do not know, something went wrong and compulsory attendance just faded. (T20)

Likewise, a former JTA president (J1) stressed,

The people from poor rural and urban communities are in poverty. They are the ones who cannot send their children to school regularly. They cannot keep them fed. That is what defeated Mavis’ compulsory education policy. It is not that they
are not enrolled, they are just not attending. Moreover, if you are not addressing these issues, structural issues, your policy would be defeated. (J1))

Dreher (1984) also noted that in two rural communities even parents who had jobs could not afford books and uniforms. Coomarsingh (1984), Jones (1985) and Blair (1986) all argued that poverty was a major factor influencing the problem of poor attendance. Blair (1986) went on to advocate for a suspension of compulsory attendance until all facilities could accommodate all the expected students.

**Theme 3: Compulsory Attendance “Fails?”**

Inspector of schools Latrobe noted that elementary schools encountered problems with attendance (1838). Over a century later, the 1990 Jamaica Five Year Development Plan (JFDP) reported that compulsory attendance at the primary level had been low since 1983. The report calls attention to the fact that for the entire decade of the 1980s students attended between 4 and 4.3 years out of six.

Compulsory education was introduced in September 1982 (*The Daily Gleaner*, October 16, 1985). According to Gilmour, after compulsory attendance was introduced a survey conducted in a small district in St. Thomas showed that the attendance figures had increased dramatically. In addition, in March, 1985, Gilmour announced that the compulsory attendance program “had met with significant results” in St. Thomas and Trelawney, the two pilot parishes. Nevertheless, in October of the same year teachers and principals from both parishes stated that compulsory attendance had lost momentum and had even reverted to pre-compulsory attendance numbers. This was confirmed by *The Daily Gleaner* editorial “Food programme pulls out kids but compulsory attendance
fails,” where teachers at Morant Bay Primary school in St. Thomas asserted that students “have resorted to the usual attendance pattern.” (The Daily Gleaner, October 16, 1985).

Moreover, Jones (1985) also stated that there was no improvement in attendance at eight Trelawney schools during September 1982-March 1985.

Two years after Gilmour introduced compulsory attendance the 1985 Jamaica Economic and Social Survey (JESS) noted that many students who turned out initially had slipped back into poor attendance patterns. The report noted, “On the whole, the programme had not fully achieved its stated objective as daily attendance during 1984-1985 ranged from a high of 69 percent in St. Thomas…” (JESS, 1985, p.18.3). According to a The Daily Gleaner editorial, compulsory attendance was expanded to six additional parishes in 1983 without any empirical evidence from the program in the pilot parishes (The Daily Gleaner, October 21, 1985). Table 6 further illustrates that compulsory attendance did not result in any significant improvement in attendance in St. Thomas. There was no data available for Kingston.

Table 6: Average Daily Attendance Rates in Primary Schools after Compulsory Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>St. Thomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Section, Ministry of Education.
Theme 4: No Additional Seats Provided

The majority of teachers stated that before the introduction of compulsory primary attendance certain physical conditions were not met. Many schools did not have adequate spaces for students before compulsory attendance. T5 stated that schools were never assessed and “certainly if you do not have the accommodation you could not have Compulsory Education.” (T5).

According to William Wiggins, the principal of Morant Bay Primary, the school was constructed for 1,200 students with 435 benches. The population of school exploded under compulsory attendance to 1,705 and the school received no additional furniture. Another principal reported that on the first day of compulsory attendance the school was unable to accommodate all the students. As a result, “200 students were sitting on a wall outside the school...some students were sitting under trees...at that time the school was short of seats for over 350 students (The Daily Gleaner, October 15, 1985 p. 28).

Coomarsingh (1984) study showed that all but one school had classroom space to accommodate the increase in enrollment, and found no increase in attendance. Jones (1985) also noted that several schools in Trelawny, which was a pilot parish, were not given additional resources to facilitate implementation.

Theme 5: Lack of Consultation

Similar to the nutribun issue, concerning the teacher-training upgrade the majority of teachers stated that they were not invited to a meeting before the introduction or implementation of the compulsory primary education policy. J2 asserted that the JTA was in favor of compulsory education, as long as it was carefully introduced and monitored.
The ministry lost the JTA’s support when it was evident that it was introduced by word of mouth and not properly implemented. They indicated that the ministry did not consult the JTA, instead the minister made announcements on the radio, and in the newspaper. J2 stressed that if they had been consulted some of the pitfalls could have been averted.

Fourth Policy Initiative: Classroom Single-Seaters

*Introduction*

In this section, the findings for the policy on classroom single-seaters will be discussed. Gilmour stressed that students were seated on benches that were made for two, but at times were forced to hold up to five students. Figure 12, is an example of the two-seaters. Gilmour stated that the two-seater desks and chairs were not conducive to a good education, because they did not promote “emotional development.” Moreover, this design also favored the spreading of viruses.

![Figure 12: Students sitting in Two/Three Seaters.](image)

In order to improve primary education, single desks and chairs were introduced. Figure 13 is an example of the single-seaters.
The single-seater was to promote development, and independence, decrease irritation, decrease the spread of viruses and infections, create a sense of ownership and belonging, and this comfort would increase attention span. According to Gilmour, “The single classrooms seaters were well accepted.”(M1) The backs of the benches were adjustable so students could use the same bench from age six or seven through age 12 and above.

The interviews revealed three themes: Overcrowded classrooms, the invisible desks and chairs and lack of consultation. They are also listed in Figure 14. Each theme reflects the views of these participants towards the single-seaters, as well as how the program was implemented.
Theme 1: Overcrowded Classrooms

About two (3%) teachers said that they welcomed the single seaters. T17, stated, Yes, we had the three-seaters and then we received the single desks. I know some children really welcomed it. It was better for each child to be working on his/her own. You do not have any issue of touching, so it was welcomed.

Likewise T20 emphasized,

We really welcomed the single desks because they could be moved easily.

Students are not sitting before you, line-by-line, rather the desks could be moved around, depending on the subjects you are teaching or the activity was taking place.

On the other hand, 19 (95%) pronounced that they were not as sturdy as the two seaters were. They overwhelmed the classrooms. T4 affirmed,
The single-seaters took up more space, and generally, the infrastructure in the system is very deficient. When the single-seaters were introduced, it limited the number of students per classroom, and therefore some people continued to use two-seaters. (T4)

According to T9, the single-seaters were cumbersome and she had 71 students in a classroom separated by a chalkboard, which meant a space for 30 was crammed with 71 students. “They make all of the noise and the space – they take up a lot of space.” (T12)

Additionally, they declared the single-seaters were noisy, as children would shove them around. They even created problems, as students would fight for a desk and chair, which brought confusion and animosity. A cabinet member (C3) confirmed that teachers recognized the value of individual space, but complained to the ministry that the single-seaters were noisy and would take more physical space.

**Theme 2: The Invisible Desk and Chairs**

About 19 (95%) teachers could not recall changing to single seats, and the majority also stressed that they never got the amount of furniture that was needed. About 17 (80%) teachers stated that they purchased their own seats, from the Food for the Poor (International Relief and Development Charity). T1 pronounced, “We did not received any single-seaters. We were clustered, overcrowded, and still only had three in a seater. The single-seaters that we needed we got ourselves from Food for the Poor. We bought some, and we made some.” (T1) T5, T7, T8, T10, T11, and T12 also purchased furniture from Food for the Poor.
Some schools received single-seaters for one class, while other classes maintained the two-seaters. Similar to T1, other schools constructed their own benches, some with help from parents. T4 noted he received parental help, as well as the assistance of a part-time woodwork teacher. Furthermore, T22 stated she was not aware of the single-seaters until she started teaching in Kingston, “When I left St. Thomas in 1987 and I came to Kingston that is the year I first saw a one-seater.”

Theme 3: Lack of Consultation

Nearly 20 (98%) teachers stated that they were never called to a meeting to discuss the introduction or implementation of the single-seaters. T1 smiled as she said that the single-seaters might have been for the high schools because it is unfathomable that she would not have heard about such a major policy decision for primary schools. This was the fourth round of inquiry about consultation. The majority of teachers laughed at this point.

Fifth Policy Initiative: Physical Units

This section presents the findings for Gilmour’s fifth policy, physical units. As previously highlighted, many primary school buildings were old while others were in an advanced state of disrepair. In many schools, there are no walls between classrooms, only corridors formed by chalkboards. Gilmour states: “Fifty-five students are on one side of the chalk-board learning singing and the other fifty-five are on the other side of the chalkboard learning Mathematics” (Jamaica Hansard, 1983, p. 188).

Gilmour declared facilities and maintenance of school buildings inadequate, with leaking roofs, and some schools with no windows or doors. In addition, the majority of
the primary schools were overcrowded. As with other policies, Gilmour committed to improving the physical structures of primary schools. Two years later the opposition spokesman on education, D.K. Duncan, highlighted several structural challenges still facing primary schools: Two percent (2%) were without toilets, 62% were using pit toilets (outhouses), 44% were without electricity, 89% were without shower units, three percent 3%) had no water supply, 51% had no staff rooms for teachers, and 21% had no principal’s office (*The Daily Gleaner*, July 1, 1982).

Analysis of the interview data and document analysis revealed four themes: listed in Figure 15.

*Figure 15:* Policy on Physical Units and Emerging Themes.
Leaking roofs, classrooms separated only by chalkboards, vandalism/pilfering, and school/community tension. The themes reflect the views of these participants towards physical units as well as how the program was implemented.

**Theme 1: Leaking Roofs**

About four (8%) teachers from recently constructed schools noted that while the physical buildings were in good condition, they experienced problems with seating. T3 declared that a school, which was opened by Gilmour and constructed according to her specifications, “Did not have any seats for the entire grades five and six. Woodworms ate the benches. We had to pay transportation to get some used seats from the ministry.” (T3)

The missionary schools that were established in Jamaica in the 1700s had “poor building” (Whyte, 1977). Additionally, Brown (1979) stated that primary schools in the 1800s were challenged to maintain school buildings. Two hundred years later, 17 (85%) teachers emphasized that their buildings were in an advanced state of disrepair, “and they promised that they're coming to fix it but it's demoralizing and looking through the roof and the birds messing on you and that sort of thing.” (T11) complained. Figure 16 is an example of a leaking roof at a primary school.

*Figure 16: Leaking Roof of a Primary School.*
According to T8, the school building was old and all classrooms leaked. Moreover, T2 stressed that teachers had to fundraise in order to fumigate the school, and T5 emphasized that the classrooms got very hot in the afternoon. This was affirmed by Eyre (1972) who described the schools in Flankers, Montego Bay, as hot, dark and dirty. Figure 17, is a typical primary school window.

According to T7, teachers and older students were forced to perform janitorial duties.

**Theme 2: Overcrowded Classrooms Separated by Chalkboards**

Although Gilmour specifically identified the challenges of teaching in classrooms separated by chalkboards, all 22 teachers pointed out that these conditions still existed, and that their classrooms were still overcrowded. Figure 18 is an example of a two classrooms separated by a chalkboard.
T1 announced, “I still have classrooms separated by chalkboards. It was overcrowded then, and it is still overcrowded now.” Foner (1973) stated that one school in her study had over 250 students in a reading class. Furthermore, Dreher (1984) noted school facilities were dilapidated and classrooms were overcrowded. Moreover, Coomarsingh (1984) and Blair (1986), both of whose studies were in three rural parishes including St. Thomas, found that all the physical facilities needed major repairs. Likewise, Anyon (1995) emphasized that “low achievement and dilapidated schools” were common among the low socioeconomic class where even parents identified “maintenance” as the major problem facing the school. One teacher stressed that the school was built in the 1800s and the original windows were never replaced until 1990 (Anyon, 1995).

**Theme 3: Rampant Vandalism**

Nearly 20 (98%) teachers confirmed that their schools were vandalized at some point every year, which contributed to the dilapidation of schools. Vandalism occurred on a massive scale in every school. This study can only capture a small percentage of the
problem. Teachers spoke passionately about the types of vandalism that occurred in their schools. T1 stated that the residents destroyed the fence to gain access to the school grounds. Many teachers said that thieves took money, televisions, radios, food, refrigerators, pots, pans and other electrical items. Moreover, T4 pronounced,

They would break into the school, like every day. Vandalism became so uncontrollable the school had hired men from the community to sleep in trees on the school grounds. Yet, these men were never able to identify the vandals. (T4)

T5 emphasized,

Let us say that the security was not the best. They took all our electrical items and I remember losing my projector as well as radios from classrooms. They also stole the bathroom fixtures. (T5)

T16 laughed as she stated that the school had a pit toilet (outhouse) so the vandals had no toilet to steal; however, vandalism became so overwhelming they were forced to hire security guards. Even during natural disasters such as hurricanes and flooding people took desks and chairs for firewood. T6 remembered arriving at school one morning and was denied entry because vandals had cut the grills guarding the doors. They took the intercom system, the mic and even raw chicken from the canteen. On the other hand, T8 lamented, homeless people would take down charts inside the classrooms to make beds. In the mornings there would be urine and feces all over the classroom floor.

E3, as well as the Jamaica Five Year Development Plan (JFDP), confirmed that in 1985 the government introduced the Community Outreach Programme in Education (SCOPE) to improve school/community relations as well as to curb vandalism.
Theme 4: School/Community Tension

Miller (1997) identified school/community relationships as a context standard that is vital to the effectiveness of education policies. Rampant vandalism had resulted in a breakdown in the relationship between schools and the communities. What drives community members to steal from schools that are providing education for their children? Many teachers declared that community members vandalize schools because many of them do not value education. There was also an overwhelming belief among teachers that community members believed that they could take whatever the government provided, because the government would provide replacements. T5 noted,

It is a part of the education. It is a part of the mentality of people; it belongs to the government, because many people around do not believe that they are stealing when they take things that are provided by the government. (T5)

T13 suggested that the people in the community never had to work hard for schools because they are provided “free” by the government; as a result, there is no sense of pride attached to the school and its role in the community. There was no sense that community members understood that government is the people, and the ministry is put in place to serve the people, so when they vandalize or steal from schools they are stealing from themselves.

On the other hand, some teachers insisted that unemployment was a major factor that drove people to steal from primary schools. T6 highlighted, “I think because they are unemployed and because of the economic conditions, they go in there and steal everything. They later sell these items because they want money.” Others insisted that
many people steal from schools because they are lazy. E3 acknowledged that sometimes the economic situation drives people to engage in unlawful behavior; however, she insisted that the attitude about government was that anything that had the government’s name attached to it should be regarded as something not a part of the community, not for them, and that this is a driving force behind vandalism.

However, T1 stressed that schools should do a better job of developing positive relationships with the community so that the community can become security for the school.

Summary

Gilmour stated that the school feeding program was reaching almost 100,000 students, and spending amounted to over $2.6 million (The Daily Gleaner, June 4, 1985). Although the nutribun program had expanded, about 19 (95%) teachers, as well as the nutribun director, stated that selling the nutribun and milk created additional responsibility for teachers. Some teachers refused to sell the items, while others embraced the task. About 20 (98%) teachers also stated that they were never called to a meeting, a workshop, or a seminar regarding the introduction of the nutribun and milk. Their opinions were never solicited regarding the program’s implementation, and no evaluation of the program was done.

Although it was monotonous and created additional responsibilities, they all stated that its affordability was an attractive option for most students. The nutribun served a purpose in primary education in Jamaica. As discussed earlier, in some schools the milk was not properly stored and spoiled which resulted in stomach cramps and diarrhea. Only
the students from the low socio-economic class would consume the nutribun and milk and depending on the social circle, might be ridiculed for purchasing it. Some students did buy whole bags to take home, but they did so discreetly for fear of being ridiculed or laughed at.

The majority of teachers indicated that they were not consulted before the implementation of the training/upgrade program. Additionally, many schools could not afford to grant leave to more than ten percent of the staff. Another issue that arose was increased pay for teachers. According to J1,

When the first graduates come out, 1984, we are in the middle of the IMF problem and a substantial increase in pay was going to affect the budget. But this is where the Ministry part of the obligation comes in. This resulted in increased tension with the JTA because the association insisted that the teachers should be paid at their new qualification rate. (J1)

The Jamaica Teachers Association (JTA) was not about to give in on this point which resulted in increased tension between the JTA and the minister. Significantly, after the introduction of the teacher upgrade policy, primary schools accounted for 54% of pre-trained teachers in the system. Pre-trained teachers replaced the internship teachers. As illustrated by tables 7 and 8, the number of trained and pre-trained teachers in Kingston and St. Thomas fluctuated over the years.
Statistics published by the ministry revealed that island-wide the number of trained teachers declined by three percent (3%) from 16,970 to 16,473, while the number of pre-trained teachers continued to increase from 1,465 to 2,352. In a letter to the Ministry of Finance and Planning dated July 16, 1987, Cecil Turner, Permanent Secretary of the ministry, stated that the ministry’s current budget was insufficient to meet the cost of the teacher upgrade program. T13 summarized the views of most teachers,

We want everything that we see in the First World; we want performance to be optimum; yet we put in minimum resources. So we want all teachers to be upgraded to a first-degree level so that we can have fully trained persons in the schools, but at the same time we are not able to put in – we are not able to say that more than 10% of staff can go off at any time for training. (T13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trained</th>
<th>Pre-trained</th>
<th>Intern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Section, Ministry of Education 1981-1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trained</th>
<th>Pre-trained</th>
<th>Intern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Section, Ministry of Education 1981-1985
The Jamaica Five Year Development Plan (JFDP) noted that there was a three percent decline in classroom teachers over the period 1983/84-1987/1988.

In 1880, the Jamaican Assembly introduced the idea of compulsory education, and the Jamaican Assembly warned that the government could not afford it (Moore & Johnson, 2004). Two years after Gilmour’s pronouncements, the Jamaica Five Year Development Plan reported that Gilmour’s compulsory attendance did not result in improved attendance, “They introduced it in St. Thomas and Trelawney, and it was conclusive that it was needed; but they never reached any further.” (JFDP, 1990) In her address to parliament, Gilmour announced that St. Thomas and Trelawny would be the pilot parishes because they had the highest rates of absenteeism and lowest rates of literacy (Jamaica Hansard, December, 1981). However, Gilmour’s contention was that teachers resisted compulsory attendance because it created more work for them, and parents were illiterate so they could not see the benefit.

However, several challenges impeded the implementation of the compulsory attendance. Poverty was a factor. In the rural areas there were Farming Days during which students were taken out of schools to assist their parents in the fields. While in Kingston, I observed that students were taken out of school by their parents or guardians to sell merchandise at the market. Besides, the truant officers were not monitored; the nutribuns and uniforms, which were to offset financial commitment from parents, did not materialize. Many parents were from the low socioeconomic class and the additional expenses of books and bus fare prevented them from sending their children to school for five days.
As with the nutribun policy and the teacher-upgrade policy, the majority of teachers were not informed about the goals of the compulsory attendance program. They emphasized that they were marginalized from the process, which they were required to implement.

The majority of teachers could not recall any change-out of furniture. Many insisted that even when they retired in the late 1990s, years after the initiation of the policy, most of the classes still had the two-seaters. Many remarked that while there may have been a policy to replace the two-seaters they did not even know it was policy because they were never consulted or informed. Many noted that classes that consisted of 60 students were crammed into small spaces. The challenge for most teachers at this point is placement of teacher’s aides, or even moving around in the classroom.

C3 emphasized that financial resources prevented the ministry from providing all schools with single-seaters. Miller (1997) affirmed that although the ministry adopted new standards for classroom furniture, “implementation, however, was restricted to either new schools or where there was major refurbishing.” (p.14). Miller (1997) concluded that furniture and other equipment demand major resource allocation yet, “planning and policy-making in this area is without the benefit of empirical findings.” (p.15)

The data on facilities of public school obtained from the ministry covered the period 1975-76. The statistics showed that there were schools in St. Thomas without water supply, electricity, toilets; 30 schools with outhouses; and three schools used wood for cooking. In Kingston, only one school did not have electricity, and 22 schools had no cooking facilities (Ministry of Education, Statistics Facilities of Public Sector School,
1975-76). Tables 9 and 10 illustrate that all the schools in Kingston were over-enrolled, while the schools in St. Thomas were at capacity or under-enrolled.

Although Gilmour stated that 461 out of 738 primary schools were repaired (*The Daily Gleaner*, June 23, 1983), the majority of teachers stated that no repairs were ever carried out on their schools. In addition, *The Daily Gleaner* editorial reported that the 1985/86 school year opened with “problems of overcrowding, inadequate furniture, unsanitary or non-existent, and generally poor physical school plant.” (*The Daily Gleaner*, September 4, 1985).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>%Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>17950</td>
<td>19226</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>16754</td>
<td>17841</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>16754</td>
<td>18389</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>16754</td>
<td>19141</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Section, Ministry of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>%Excess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981-1982</td>
<td>6711</td>
<td>6864</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-1983</td>
<td>6711</td>
<td>6739</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-1984</td>
<td>7763</td>
<td>6817</td>
<td>-12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-1985</td>
<td>7763</td>
<td>6875</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-1986</td>
<td>7763</td>
<td>6711</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Section, Ministry of Education
The financial commitment to primary education never materialized. In the year 1981/82 the ministry allocated about one-third of the recurrent budget to primary education (Appendix A). In the year 1983/84, only 31 to 35% of the recurrent budget was allocated to primary schools. “The expenditure analysis does not confirm what is understood to be the Government’s priority, namely to devote special efforts to the amelioration of primary education.” (UNESCO, 1983, p.139). This was inadequate to provide quality primary education (JDFP). The share of general expenditure to primary education decreased 4.8% in 1981, and 6.5% in 1982. In Gilmour’s September 22, 1981 address to Parliament, she stated that expenditure was $171 per child in primary school and $649 per child in secondary school. The minister indicated that this ratio was unacceptable and “should be nearer to 1 to 2 if we are to obtain efficient primary education.” (Jamaica Hansard, September 1981, p.78)

The data revealed that there were no major improvements because of Gilmour’s polices. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that Gilmour’s policies aligned with Miller’s (1997) context and input standards that are necessary for improved primary education. Examination of input in this chapter covers buildings, furniture, teachers, and the context standards are attendance, nutrition, and school community relations. These inputs and context can affect “the effectiveness of policies.” (p. xiii). They are presented in Figure 19.
Figure 19: Gilmour’s Policy Initiatives Relating to Input and Context Standards.
CHAPTER 5: PROCESS OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION IN JAMAICA

Introduction

According to McLaughlin (1987), Pressman and Wildvasky (1973) “were the first in the generation of implementation analysts who showed that implementation dominates outcomes—that the consequences the best planned events, best supported, and most promising policy initiatives depend firmly on what happens as individuals throughout the policy system interpret and act on them” (p. 172).

This chapter presents the findings from the research data relating to Research Question 1, which asks, “What is the process of policy implementation in the Ministry of Education?”

Some of the participants that are involved in this section of the study were not active in Gilmour’s administration. However, they are critical to understanding the policy implementation process in Jamaica. E2 is the director of the Educational Services Division. This division is responsible for training related to policy implementation. R1 is a regional director. He supervises education officers as well as devises strategies for implementation. I2 is the director of the evaluation unit at the ministry. He oversees the evaluation of the ministry’s projects; additionally, the majority of participants believed that unit is responsible for evaluating the ministry’s polices.

Five themes emerged for policy implementation; diffusion of policy measures, lack of consultation, lack of resources, no evaluation, and mixed signals. The major themes are listed followed by a discussion. Each finding reflects the views of participants toward the implementation process. The views of stakeholders inside and outside the
classroom are examined and compared. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implementation of the Caribbean Center for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) program.

Diffusion of Policy Measures

Diffusion of policy measures refers to how policy goals and objectives are defined and communicated. When teachers clearly understand the goal of a policy, this increases the possibility of success (Hull & Hjern 1987, McLaughlin, 1987). Hughes and Keith (1980) in their study on implementing a new science curriculum also concluded that the degree of implementation was greater when teachers understood all goals, objectives and challenges that are involved with a policy. I1 announced that policies are communicated to teachers and during the training teachers are encouraged to see the benefit of a policy.

You have to excite them and they have to realize the same sort of excitement you pass on but we have to give them support. Now we are saying it is quality support, because we cannot take anything for granted. (I1)

I1 also noted that the ministry employed several means of dissemination of information, which included the media and letters or they send bulletins to schools.

The majority of teachers stated that they heard about these polices on the radio, television, or from other teachers, “on the news, and when the Education Officer called people together and tell you about it” (T17). According to T1, policies may be mentioned in the staff meeting, or staff development, and some teachers may be asked to attend certain seminars. Sometimes JTA may take on the responsibility to inform its members at
their JTA meetings. However, nearly 20 (98%) teachers stressed that there had not been any continuous dialogue in terms of people coming in to address the entire staff, sharing examples of what the ministry intends to do and the outcome, which they expect to see from these polices.

Trider and Leithwood (1988), in their assessment of principals’ implementation styles, stressed that values, beliefs and opinions about what is best for students dominated these patterns. Besides, McLaughlin (1987) noted that policy success depends on implementer’s motivation, and several mandated federal programs failed because teachers could not see the merit of these programs. As a result, teachers are sometimes described as “resistant to change.” T12 and T14 proclaimed that even if teachers disagree with some aspect of a policy or polices, there was no change in policy. T15 said, “No. No. You hear of the design and it comes to you. It comes ready for you to implement.”

On the other hand, one Education Officer insisted that policies goals and objectives are communicated, and outside of critical polices that are handed down from the top for immediate implementation, most polices are even piloted, “…nothing becomes policy until it has been tested. Okay.”(E1) This assertion is supported and expanded by E3, who stated,

Well, after the policy has been promulgated and everyone understands the intent or the goals of the policy, the implementation would start with schools being informed of what is to be done, and education officers would know they are responsible for visiting schools to see to the implementation of the particular policy initiated, or program. (E3)
However, T4 insisted “If you asked the question, they will tell you, we are doing a pilot. But most time there was no pilot done; some people at the ministry have ideas which are agreed upon and subsequently passed on to teachers.” (T4)

Nevertheless, E3 underscored that teachers were informed about polices and even had the opportunity to raise concerns, which were shared with the respective unit at the ministry. The officers would have a meeting of the staff, where concerns would be raised and teachers would get a chance to react, and if there were specific problems that teachers were encountering, they would cite those and the officers would take a note of it. The information would be taken to the ministry, where discussions were held, and then the planning unit of the ministry would start to look more closely at some of those policy implementation activities to assess the need for the adjustment. They would then make some recommendations to the Cabinet again for changes. (E3)

In addition to piloting, meetings and workshops, another element of communicating policy goals and objectives is made up of implementation plans. Although I1 insisted that all policies were accompanied by implementation plans, T15 stated, “You implemented polices like a madwoman or a madman because nobody provided guidance. There are no implementation guidelines.”

Nonetheless, T16, T20, and T22 insisted that sometimes there were guidelines; however, most of the time they were not conducive to situations on the ground (Hull & Hjern, 1987, McLaughlin, 1987; Trider & Leithwood, 1988). According to T19, he had the latitude to localize policy; however, T20 suggested that some principals were not supportive of localizing policies.
Some principals pushed whatever it is that they wanted to be done, among the other teachers. Some principals were so narrow-minded to that if a teacher came up with a suggestion they said you were trying to take over the school. (T20) This was also evident in Cummings’ (1986) assessment of the implementation of the (IMPACT) project, which was thwarted because the ministry personnel did not understand the specifics of the project, yet they were sent to train teachers to implement it. Additionally, Cummings’ (1986) analysis of the Ministry of Education indicates that teachers had no voice during the definition and formulation of the problems, and during the legitimizing of goals and programs. Issues of effective policy dissemination and implementation proved to be a significant challenge for the ministry.

Teachers’ perspectives are evident in Environment One of the political model theory (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980). Environment One is concerned with communication of policies. Elected officials and administrative appointees who formulate policies should set guidelines for implementation (diffusion of policy measures). Policy makers are often not involved in the implementation process “instead they rely on another set of actors” such as teachers and principals. Nakamura & Smallwood (1980) note that these officials can minimize challenges by communicating “clear and concise” instructions to implementers, “…being specific about what is to be achieved and how.” (p.33) Nakamura & Smallwood (1980), acknowledged that policymakers often do not provide clear guidelines. Younis and Davidson (1990) also note in their 10 preconditions for effective implementation that clear guidelines and communications are both
necessary, and essential to successful implementation. This theme also asserts that policy goals are not clearly articulated.

*Lack of Consultation*

In addition to a lack of communication, the majority of teachers also emphasized that they were never consulted before the implementation of a policy. Although I1 noted that training is conducted before implementation takes place, about 20 (98%) teachers stressed that they had never attended a workshop, training or seminar related to implementing any policy. LaRocque (1986), in her study on assessing the beliefs and assumptions of policy implementation by school boards, district administrators, principals, and teachers, found that there was a divisive relationship between the teachers and the ministry when they were not consulted on policies. This view is supported by arguments put forward by Hull & Hjern, (1987); McLaughlin, (1987); and Smit, (2003).

The majority of teachers insisted that the ministry never consulted them, and they had never gone to any form of training, seminar or workshop before the nutribun policy, teacher training, compulsory primary attendance or single-seater policies were introduced. T5 stated, “I think that is a criticism not only of Mrs. Gilmore, but of all policy makers, is that the teachers feel that they do not have enough input at the initial stage.” T6, T3, T4, T8, T9, T10, T15, T11, T12, T16, T21 and T22 emphasized that they were never called to meetings. Instead, they were directed by their principals to fall in line with the ministry’s demands.

One Jamaica Teachers Association (JTA) president also supported the teachers’ perspective, “I think that there needs to be much more, that they should rely much more
on teacher input rather than technical people input” (J2). I1, a director from the Educational Services Division who also conducts training, agreed with the teachers that they are not consulted: “Sometimes, too, sometimes the truth is we don’t go through all the steps for a directive” (I1). Yet, she stressed that while not everyone will be consulted, the officers of the Educational Services Division need to do a better job of involving more teachers in the consultation process. Stone (1980) also stated that interest groups were not consulted regarding policies affecting their interests. Robinson (2003) went further by stating that there was no formal consultation process in place at the Ministry of Education. McLaughlin (1982), Hull & Hjern (1987), and (Cooksey & Krieg, 1996) all agreed that policy delivered at the local level can be obstructed by lack of consultation and information. Smit (2003) also showed that teachers resented policies about which they were not consulted.

Nevertheless, about two (3%) teachers remarked that they had been invited to meetings, but they quickly realized that “everything was pretty much signed and sealed.” The teachers indicated that they were there to “save face,” because the administrators at the ministry had already made their decisions. Other times they were invited to meetings where teachers are asked for feedback or suggestions. When the feedback was provided teachers are accused of being adversarial or they were chastised for not cooperating. (T4) T2 asserted that in many instances, the ministry provided alternatives, but many teachers did not comprehend these suggestions. T21 was one of only two teachers who had attended any form of workshop; she claimed, “Since workshops were crammed into
single sessions, many teachers were inadequately trained to implement the original policies, furthermore to comprehend to alternatives.”

On the other hand, an Education Officer declared that the teachers were being less than honest in their assessment of the consultation process. E1 said,

That is not, that is not true. That is not true… We pull teachers, principals: naturally we are not pulling all teachers and all principals, but representatives of the various bodies, into situations where they are able to talk about what is happening on the ground and give suggestions as to how it can be related. (E1)

A Regional Director (R1) also noted that it is hard to believe that teachers are not involved in the process. Interestingly, teachers’ assertions were supported by another Education Officer (E2) who stated, “It is just really thrown on them and then they just have to implement it, that is true. That is true, too. That is not a lie.”(E2) E2 went on to state that sometimes the policies that are to be implemented arrived without notice. As a result, the Education Officers are not adequately prepared to train the teachers and principals. E2 even declared that sometimes polices are implemented without the knowledge of Education Officers, “Sometimes it goes into the school; we hear about a policy that had been implemented and we are the officers in charge.”(E2)

A small number of teachers noted that sometimes the JTA consulted teachers about various polices:

Sometimes the policies come in and not much consultation takes place. However, there are other times when they consulted through the union. Whatever affects the
teachers in the schools comes to the union, and when something comes to the union, and then the union will have to broach it with the Ministry. (T13)

However, T14 claimed the JTA sometimes made decisions without teachers consent. Additionally, T14 alluded to the fact that sometimes the teachers never provided feedback to the JTA because they are convinced their feedback would not be taken into consideration. One JTA president stated,

The ministry generally consulted with JTA in the implementation of some programs, some, not all. Some of them they sneak in through the back door, and when you hear about them, you have to jump at it to say, this cannot work. It will not work, and we will advise our teachers not to participate. (T13)

About 20 (98%) teachers stated that they have never overtly opposed a policy, even one they disagreed with. Even if they knew the policy would not work they implemented it anyway because they had no other options, “Well, the implementation of – it really depends on, of course, the teachers, so – We would try to implement what is given to us to implement.” (T12)

Lack of Resources

Environment 2 of the political model theory (Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980), stresses the importance of adequate resources “The allocation of—and potential constraints on— resources can have such an obvious and direct impact on the implementation process that it is hardly necessary to dwell upon this topic in detail.”(Nakamura & Smallwood, 1980, p. 55). There are several types of resources: money, time, qualified personnel and power. The majority of participants identified
money as the resource that is most lacking in policy implementation. Therefore, this study focuses on money (financial resource). According to I1, the implementation plan always outlined how a policy would be funded:

Financial support is important when you are developing a policy. Therefore, the implementation plan must outline how it will be funded. How are you going to fund it? Who will be responsible for funding? How is it going to be supported? Costing – that has to be done. (I1)

Gilmour proposed that resource constraint was a major factor: “We never had enough money.” (M1) A significant number of teachers claimed that they were constantly fundraising to supplement the less than adequate resources.

Nonetheless, 20 (98%) teachers lay emphasis on the lack of resources needed to implement policies. T5 noted that as a developing country Jamaica is constantly seeking external funding for policies and projects. She insisted that after the first phase of a policy, the government is usually unable to sustain it financially. T11 insisted that sometimes teachers are provided with the necessary resources, “Sometimes they give us some. They give us some things.” On the other hand, T8 declared that they were never given enough resources to implement policies. Sometimes teachers are compelled to purchase from their personal funds or fundraise. There were times when teachers were even forced to scavenge old cardboard boxes to make charts for the classroom because they were told to find their own resources. T12 stated that the ministry insisted that teachers acquire certain materials that were to be used in the classroom; however, the materials were not available. “There’s no resource. You are to teach x thing, but there is
no resource for you to use.” (T12) Other teachers drew attention to the lack of teaching materials. T15 stated,

When you want your children to engage in individual activities you run out of material, so you have to go beg for boxes at the supermarket and it puts a lot of pressure on you. If you really want to do something, yes, and you have to beg crayons and things like that for the children to be able to do things on their own. Paste – sometime we have to make paste out of flour and that is messy. (T15)

Moreover, E2 verified that teachers are not always provided with adequate resources:

While I agree with that, sometimes resources are not adequate, sometimes they do not get. Sometimes, it is not all the times. In addition, it comes from our perspective here, because as a ministry, as a country, our resources are not as much as we would have liked. That is the plain truth. (E2)

E2 continued that the ministry has very good policies that had to be significantly scaled down because of inadequate resources.

A significant number of teachers drew attention to the many polices that the Ministry of Education would like to see implemented in primary schools. Some they noted, started very well; there are others that had been partially implemented, some of them were terminated because of funding. According to R1, “I would support the idea that there is a lack of resources. Where there’s a slow or low level of implementation it could be relating to lack of resources.” (R1) Cabinet member C3 stressed, “The biggest problem to implementing policies would be a resource constraint.”
Yet the present Minister of Education insisted that the ministry would never send out a policy without adequate resources: “As I said, I do not see how the Ministry could send out a policy without providing support. I do not see that. It is not possible.” (M2)

The minister insisted that teachers would have to cite an example of a policy that was not adequately funded. At that point, I referenced a policy regarding supplies that teachers needed for their classrooms. There were several items on this list, one of which was a Jamaican flag. The teachers declared that they would have to purchase the flag from their personal funds, or ask a parent to donate the flag. The minister responded,

Now it is not the case, not the culture in Jamaica that education is totally, every single minute item is funded. Now if we say you have to flag in the classroom, all right, we are not saying you have to have a flag on a pole. You could very well use your creativity with a cardboard and put it up, this is the flag of Jamaica – a representation of the flag of Jamaica. (M2)

The minister continued that teachers who complained about lack of resources are evidence that the leadership at those schools is weak.

However, I1 states, “So it’s just like you are spread a little thinly. The provision is there but it is not adequate provision.” One Education Officer confirmed, “Well, there is always the perennial problem of the resources to implement. We are not short of policy and policy initiatives, but the issue is the resources to implement.” (E3) Younis and Davidson (1990) identified adequate resources as essential to policy implementation. Additionally, Cooksey and Krieg (1996) identified resource constraints as a barrier to
implementation. More importantly, they noted that only a small number of polices researched financial feasibility of programs before submitting polices for implementation.

No Evaluation

In the Ministry of Education there is a program monitoring and evaluation unit which is under the umbrella of the policy and research unit. Prior to 1992, there was no formal mechanism for evaluation. This unit was conceptualized to evaluate a major policy initiative and to date the unit continues to evaluate some projects. It noted that although the unit is not adequately staffed, the structure is in place. An Education Officer emphasized that the evaluation unit is located at the central ministry, “Because as with everything there has to be quality assurance, so the ministry does have that arm.” (E1)

According to E2, usually the directors, the heads of the units, and the Assistant chief education officers each plays a role in evaluating policies. “They are the ones who do it, and we look now at how that child was performing prior to the intervention of the nutrition and then after.” (E2) A regional director also confirmed the presence of an evaluation unit at the ministry: “Well, it is true. There is a unit, a policy evaluation unit at the ministry of education” (R1).

Yet, only one (2%) teacher indicated an awareness of an evaluation process; T2 stated, “Yes, like I said, they give the feedback, but most time it was vague.” On the other hand, T2 also all indicated that teachers were not in the loop, and sometimes when evaluations were done teachers never saw the written report. The majority of teachers declared that they have never seen anyone evaluating process in their schools or been a
part of an evaluation process. They indicated that there was no follow-up procedure. T3 stated,

I tell you right now there was no follow-up. There was no coming in to see what is going on. So, “Is this working? Is that working?” No. And no follow-up...No follow-up from Ministry. No follow-up.

Other teachers stressed that the education officers who are supposed to be the major part of the checks and balances arm of the ministry provided no guidance: “That was one of big problems we had: not much help from the education officers, who are supposed to come out to help us.”(T20) This was affirmed by T21, who stated that the education officers, “Came like inspectors, to see what was happening, but they never told you what was right or wrong.”

According to I1, when implementation challenges surfaced, the officers from the monitoring and evaluation unit alerted the Educational Services Division, which then initiated workshops to ensure that teachers and principals are reminded of polices and procedures. However, a director (I2) for the monitoring and evaluation unit confirmed that the unit does not evaluate most policies, and oftentimes the unit is not aware when implementation of polices is taking place:

A matter of fact, a lot of implementation takes place without us even knowing about it. A lot of implementation takes place even though we are supposed to monitor and evaluate. Keep in mind that structure normally follows function but often times in the ministry function follows structure. (I2)
I2 stressed that the evaluation unit offered to evaluate certain polices for various departments at the ministry. He said that none of the department heads or directors responded; “Nobody cares, nobody knows, people do not know what the evaluation is.” (I2).

I2 described the policy implementation process at the ministry as follows:

A circle of the people inside in the ministry put together forums and so on, and then they have seminars with all the regions’ officers – and may go for a half-day. They stand and lecture all day. From a half day of lecturing, you are then sent out to train other people how to implement these policies. There is no follow-up from anyone at the ministry. When problems arise out of the regions, the trainers from the ministry said people did not do what they were told. (12)

Kingdon (1995) noted that that sometimes people do not want their programs to be evaluated because sometimes directors might feel that they are going to be held responsible for shortfalls in the programs. This perspective is also evident in Environment Three of the political model theory, which notes that technical evaluation assesses policymakers’ and implementers’ capabilities. A negative assessment can influence resource allocation. Although technical evaluations strive to be objective, they are “ultimately political through their consequences” (Nakaruma & Smallwood, 1980, p.79) I2 agreed that some directors are of the view that evaluation means “something is wrong with my program.” He underscored that the unit is aware of this concern. As a result, they are cautious about the wording in their final report; that is, they identify the issue without personalizing the cause.
I2 concluded that the academic description of the implementation process that I described to him is not what happens at the ministry. Instead, certain prescriptions and regulations are combined. They are conveyed and the conveyance of them becomes implementation as opposed to a process in which policies are systematically developed, piloted, and evaluated. This conveyance process is compounded by the fact that decisions are made not on the basis of data but on the basis of notions and who has what authority which I2 further states, “So that is how people make decisions about technical matters in a non-technical way.” If decisions were made on the basis of data, then people would see the importance of evaluation. When pressed about the process of evaluation at the ministry, a regional director (R1) later validated the teachers’ claims, “There are quite a number of errors and evidence that policies are not being evaluated.”(R1)

*Mixed Signals*

The validity and impact of the teachers’ perspective can be further understood by the complexity of responses to the implementation process. This theme is a reflection of the range of responses about the implementation process. This process is compiled from the suggestions of a director of the Educational Services Division (I1) at the Ministry of Education. The policy formulation process is outlined in Chapter Two; therefore, only a brief overview is necessary here. According to I1, the minister makes policy statements or directions. For example, the minister could state no child should be allowed to advance unless he or she is numerate and literate. With that statement the ministry immediately puts mechanisms in place to work from grade one up to grade six. This, I1 stated, is not a policy but a statement of direction, which is developed into a concept paper.
A concept paper makes clear a directive of where the policy is intended to go. That concept paper is shared and seen at policy level. It is then transferred to a group of interested persons at a round table who examine what is being proposed. Out of that discussion, the concept is transformed to a policy, which is a draft policy. In constructing the draft, stakeholders are involved. The major stakeholders for education policies are always principals, teachers, and the Jamaica Teachers Association (JTA). Depending on the policy goals, there may be both internal and external interest groups. Once the policy is drafted and the stakeholder meetings have taken place, the policy is presented to the Executive Management Group headed by the Permanent Secretary. At this meeting there are discussions and recommendations. The policy is then moved from executive management to the senior policy unit that is headed by the Minister of Education. Once the policy is established, a presentation is made, after which the policy is submitted to the executive unit which prepares it for Cabinet submission.

Most importantly, however, all policies are accompanied by an implementation plan. I1 stressed that it cannot be a policy unless it is accompanied by an implementation plan. This plan includes the cost of the policy, how the policy will be implemented, what the principal implementation process will be and how the policy will be evaluated for effectiveness.

Education officers, principals and teachers are the major players in the implementation process. Everyone involved in the implementation process is trained. According to I1, cluster training is more effective than large group training, since clusters provide for more dialogue and exchange of ideas. From each cluster, a leader is appointed
to assist in the implementation process. Polices are implemented on a phased basis. II stated, “As a Third World country, financial constraints demand that some of the things we do will have to be phased in.”

On the other hand, Gilmour (M1) noted that during her administration implementation was dependent on the education officers. Each school was assigned an education officer whose duty was to oversee policy implementation. Gilmour stressed that the minister cannot physically go to every school to make sure that polices were implemented.

No, you cannot help to implement policies; you can only say what needs to be done. The ministry was well supplied with education officers. I think they had a very good number of what used to be called, a long time ago, inspectors of schools. I think that the ministry was well supplied with a reasonable proportion of education officers. The story you would get was excellent and every school under their supervision was doing well. (M1)

Likewise, C3 noted that all divisional heads participated in Senior Management Meetings with the minister and the other political figures. There would be discussions of new policy proposals, and the minister would determine which ones were sent to the Cabinet. Based upon Cabinet approval, “you have permission for implementation.”(C3) Similarly, C3 said, “The ministry had education officers who would supervise what was going on in the schools. Therefore, a lot of the feedback would come through them. Their activities were coordinated at the national level by a Chief Education Officer.”(C3)
In contrast to Gilmour and her Cabinet member, an education officer (E2) stated that policies are piloted. Then principals, vice principals, and anyone who has a critical role to play at the primary school level are trained. A regional director R1 stated that at his level they are privy to some of the policies before they are implemented.

We sent officers to each school and each officer was directed to speak with the principal, and after speaking with the principal, they are required to write in a logbook the provisions of that policy. Moreover, that guarantees that the persons who should know had been told – there is evidence that that information has reached where it should be operationalized. (R1)

The ministry’s website states that the minister is responsible for formulating and implementing policy. Yet, the present Minster of Education (M2), stressed that the minister’s role in implementation is minimal to non-existent. The minister develops very good policy. After the development stage, the minister is not active in the implementation stage. M2 declared,

So if you look at Jamaica’s education policy or rather legislation, it does not give the minister much power to do anything at all and therefore it is an eternal struggle to improve the quality of education because there is very little accountability. If the minister were to try to hold people accountable, it could be viewed as political interference. If tomorrow I were to decide a chairman of a board or remove a principal because they were not performing, it would be viewed as political interference or probably partisanship favoritism. So the minister is really restricted to the realm of policy – developing policy. (M2)
The general principle is that if the development of a policy fails, then the minister is responsible, but if implementation fails then the civil servant is responsible. This shows the complexity of the policy process, as very good strategies and policies may be formulated, yet they are not necessarily implemented with enthusiasm, because of the bureaucracy which primarily keeps political interference at bay. However, M2 claimed, “We pay an excessive price for slow implementation. It is a serious dilemma, as to how we get policy implemented without the drive of the minister, without the minister appearing to interfere in it.” (M2) Table 11 is an illustration of the a range of responses to the implementation process. These responses reflect the present process as well as the process during Gilmour’s administration.

Table 11: Various Implementers’ Responses to Policy Implementation Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Services</th>
<th>Minister Of Education (Present)</th>
<th>Gilmour Cabinet Members</th>
<th>Education Officers</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Policies Are Accompanied by an Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Not Involved in Implementation Seen as Political Interference</td>
<td>Education Officers</td>
<td>Chief Education Officer and Education Officers</td>
<td>Policies Are Piloted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan Includes Cost Of Polices As Well As Who Will Be Trained to Implement</td>
<td>Policies Are Given Ready for Implementation No Implementation Guidelines</td>
<td>Teachers, Principals And Education Officers Are Formally Trained to Implement Policies</td>
<td>Teachers’ Concerns Are Relayed to the Ministry</td>
<td>Workshops Crammed Into a Single Session Not Fully Trained to Implement Policies Concerns Are Never Addressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This theme indicates that there is evidence of confusion among the people responsible for policy implementation. The ministry’s website states that the minister is
responsible for implementation, yet, the minister noted that the appearance of political interference hinders him from getting involved. Gilmour left implementation solely in the hands of the education officers. However, the contradictions between the teachers and the education officers are even more astounding. The education officers are responsible for training teachers, nonetheless, teachers claimed that they were never trained.

Caribbean Center for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) Program

Although the CETT program was not implemented during Gilmour’s administration, it is utilized in this study because several participants referenced it as a program that followed an implementation pattern that has proven successful. I should also acknowledge that the CETT program had the necessary financial resources needed to implement the program. According to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the CETT program is a Presidential Initiative announced at the 2001 Summit of the Americas, dedicated to improving child literacy throughout the Americas. The Caribbean Center of Excellence for Teacher Training (CETT) inspires, empowers and equips teachers in the first three grades of primary schools to improve the teaching of reading.

The Caribbean CETT program currently works in Jamaica, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Belize, Trinidad and Tobago, Grenada and Guyana. The program includes training teachers in reading instruction to support improved educational achievement, including participatory educational methodologies, alternative instruments for measuring progress and strategies for engaging parents in the educational process. USAID highlighted that “Post-tests have demonstrated that student performance rose significantly in relation to
the increase in quality of instruction.” (USAID/JAMAICA) The CETT country director (S2) stated that Jamaica’s national exams, which test the literacy of students at grade four, confirmed that students were performing poorly.

The CETT program is presently operational in Jamaica, and will be discussed as a framework for understanding the nuances of policy implementation in Jamaica. One of the participants in the study, J1, was instrumental in the implementation of the CETT program in Jamaica. According to J1, the challenge was to convince teachers that the program would work as well as benefit students. He met with the teachers after they were trained in the CETT pedagogy. The teachers put forward a list of items that were necessary to implement the CETT curriculum. J1 agreed that implementation cannot be totally democratic, however, “when the people come up and say, ‘This is our wish list,’ if you start a fight with them, that does not make sense.” (J1) He emphasized that he took the list to professionals in the education field who affirmed that about 20% of the items on the list are indeed necessary, but not vital. Since the CETT operated on a budget, 80% of the items on the “wish list” were provided for the teachers.

J1 drew attention to the fact that teachers and principals were consulted, and their feedback was taken into consideration. He established what many principals and teachers affirmed, “This was the first time that anybody has ever come to us and asked us what we think.”(J1) They respected the fact that they were listened to as well as having items from their lists provided. Additionally, there was training, which incorporated several follow-up sessions. J1 strongly expressed that people expect those in charge to respond to their concerns, and that is what it takes: “That is how things get done, people who cared. You
see the hand that gives is the hand that must demand. If the hand only demands, it becomes tyrannical. If it only gives, it is lacks accountability.” (J1) Therefore, if the ministry disseminates a policy and the communication, consultation, training and resources are lacking, yet the ministry demands that all schools must demonstrate significant improvement because of this policy, this behavior J1 described as tyrannical. On the other hand, if resources, training, consultation and communication are all adequately provided, and no accountability is demanded then the ministry is also failing students. The CETT program gave as well as demanded.

I wanted to get a firsthand look at the CETT program in a school. J1 listed several schools, and then he said, “Take Calabar – I’m talking about in the heart of the inner-city (ghetto).” Although I was concerned for my safety because of the location of this school, I decided that my research could benefit from this visit. When I arrived at the school, which is located between two garrison communities (further discussion on garrisons will follow in Chapter 6) I found a school closed in by 10-foot concrete walls topped with barbwire. I later found out from the principal (S1) that frequent gun battles between the two communities that surround the school led to construction of the wall. He gave me a tour of school as well as an inspection of the computers and visual aids that accompany the CETT curriculum. The school was on summer break so the computer and visual aids were all wrapped in plastic. Figure 20 shows is the school wall and Figure 21 shows the CETT program computer lab. Calabar school also has satellite equipment used to maintain virtual contact with the teachers colleges administering the CETT program.
S1 stated that because of the location of Calabar, many of the students are not necessarily prepared for school: “We do not necessarily get the best children. Some of these children do not attend basic school, or kindergarten school at age four or five. They come here at age six, and many do not even know the alphabet.” Because of these dismal statistics, Calabar was selected as a CETT school. Since the inception of CETT at Calabar, S1 stated “We were one of the nonperforming schools. Historically, the school had a 40% or lower pass rate in the National Literacy Exams, and after CETT, we had 85% pass rate in literacy.”
S1 stated that one male student performed exceptionally well on the Grade Six Achievement Test (GSAT) and was awarded a national scholarship to attend one of the most prestigious high schools in Jamaica. The principal noted that he had been at Calabar for 29 years and never had a student pass an entrance examination for that high school.

Nevertheless, JI also emphasized that some teachers were resistant to CETT because of the additional work and the depth of methodologies; however, he stressed that he convinced teachers of the benefits, and provided them with support. Teachers continued because they were pleased with the training and support that they received.

Summary

The minister conceptualizes policies; works on them, with certain goals and visions of what the intended outcome should be, since implementation has a political as well as a managerial dimension (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). I asked M2 how it is that passion is communicated to the implementers, mainly the teachers who are actually going to realize its outcome? M2 insisted that there are times when the minister must play an activist role: “If my policy is going to be successful I must supervise its implementation.” However, he draws a line at operation. Once all the necessary behavior change and rules are implemented he retreats.

Gilmour, on the other hand, relied on the education officers to communicate her message to teachers, the ones who were the primary implementers (Beman, 1980; Hull & Hjern, 1987, LaRocque, 1986; McLaughlin, 1987; Smit, 2003). When asked about the role of teachers in implementation, Gilmour drew attention to the fact that
We had very little influence on those recalcitrant teachers. The ministry had very little influence on them. The Jamaica Union of Teachers and the ministry had a weekly meeting for complaints, to exchange complaints on either side. Whether the Jamaica Union of Teachers had complaints against the ministry officers, or the ministry officers had a compliant against a teacher. However, the Jamaican Union of Teachers operates mostly as a trade union rather than an agency for professional competence. (M1)

Gilmour affirmed that teachers have tenure and, as a result, they cannot be transferred. If teachers refuse to implement polices there is no accountability system in place. Gilmour told a story to illustrate her point.

There are students who travel through mud and overgrown grass in order to get to school. So when they arrived at school, their legs were covered with bits of soil and water. I had a shower constructed, and provided them with towels. I asked the teachers if they could assist some of the students with washing off all this mud. The teacher told me, they are there to teach, they are not there to clean children. In addition, I could do nothing about it as minister. I could not fire her. All I could do is asked her please. There was no method to secure compliance from teachers. I give you another example. I went to a school after a hurricane. When we got there the principal and others were there cleaning. The teachers’ did not go out and look after the school. They claimed that they were waiting for the minister to send in a cleaning team to clean the school. (M1)
Similarly, C3 pointed out that while education officers oversaw implementation, they had no power to enforce policy compliance with teachers.

About 20 (98%) teachers stressed that policies were never communicated to them before they got to most schools. They complained that policies are thrust upon them, policies which they had to carry out with scarce resources. Very often, they have to use their personal funds – and they were not pleased. Therefore, teachers declared that policy goals and objectives are almost never communicated with the passion with which the minister claimed they were conceptualized.

Gilmour stressed that education officers are responsible for overseeing policy implementation at the school level. One education officer verified Gilmour’s assertion: “The education officer is a part of the checks and balances, a part of the quality assurance,” (E1), yet Gilmour’s chief education officer (C2) remarked that he visited St. Thomas and teachers were positively impacted by his visit. He declared that the majority of teachers said they have never seen an education officer, let alone the chief education officer. According to the chief education officer, “The education officer overseeing implementation is more of a statement not a fact.” (C2)

The JTA at the level of president, the secretary general, and other officers meet with the minister (including Gilmour) and his or her team once per month. Whenever there is new policy, the JTA will have it disseminated at its Central Executive Meeting, its General Council, and its Conference. All polices would come through the secretary general where delegates can vote on various policies and resolutions. According to T5,
“If it is coming from the ministry, we get the response from the teachers about it, and the Ministry of Education has its team there at a formal conference where we can give teachers their response, the record to the minister and his or her team. Once a policy decision is made, the policy is disseminated through the JTA’s district associations, and the parish associations.”

The ministry lacks the kind of mechanism to ensure that policies are being monitored and evaluated. The minister acknowledged that evaluation is a challenge for the ministry: “That is definitely a complaint. Therefore, we have to get that implemented to address the feedback problem. Nevertheless, a good policy is one that people comply with rather than enforce. That’s the essence of it.” (M2). Yet evaluation is not about enforcement. Evaluation is a subset of the implementation process. Implementation occurs on a continuum; it is a cyclical, ongoing process that can ensure a policy’s success or failure. Consequently, evaluation becomes a vital part of the implementation process.

At the beginning of this chapter, I showed that polices are not communicated with the passion with which they were conceptualized. Evaluation is essential to the diffusion of policy measures because it allows policymakers to reflect on the motivation for a policy, what was it intended to achieve and again question how it has been implemented and whether the implementation really achieved its goals? Some ministry personnel’s involvement in the implementation process lacked an understanding of the evaluation and implementation process. They associated a workshop with implementation. Certain people are trained; then they were left on their own to implement
the policy. When it failed, the trainers assigned the blame to the people on the ground, even though there was no follow-up after the initial training.

This chapter presented a framework for understanding some of the challenges involved in the policy implementation process in Jamaica. “Implementation dominates outcomes” (Anderson, 2006). The Jamaica Five-year Development Plan (JFDP, 1990) as well as a UNESCO report (1983) underscored the fact that, after the policies were articulated and implemented, the primary school system continued to fail in many ways. Gilmour noted that compulsory education failed because of lack of financial resources: “The second reason was financially it would be a more expensive system because you had to put in truant officers.” (M1). Even teacher training, Gilmour stressed, was impacted because of financial resource constraints. Gilmour stated that the ministry could not afford to upgrade all the teachers: “We were hoping, you know, they would come little by little because that is how the money goes.” (M1)

The majority of teachers affirmed that the ministry’s projects are always underfunded. Teachers complained that they lacked the resources to implement a policy, and so they placed it at the bottom of their priorities. Other times they asked parents, or they had a fundraiser. As a result, some of them are disgruntled which influences the passion that is needed to make a policy work. Some teachers even indicated that a large bulk of the money is used for other activities before policies are actually implemented.

You cannot apply a program if you do not have the resources. Just as if you are going to bake a cake, you cannot have the baking tin, the oven, the recipe, and no ingredients. That is how things work here. (T1)
CHAPTER 6: FACTORS INFLUENCING PRIMARY EDUCATION

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from research data relating to Research Question Three, which asks, “In what ways were the implementation of primary education policies during 1980-1985 influenced by: Historical factors, political factors, economic factors, and social factors?” The major findings from each factor are listed followed by a discussion of each finding.

According to Gilmour, a fundamental challenge to primary education is improving the ingrained social conditions of both parents and teachers. Moreover, Gilmour announced:

You are coming out of a system in which education was not a chief value of the parents of the children you are trying to educate. Therefore, you had to fight that in many different ways. I met a man drinking a bottle of beer and his child was at home and not at school. I asked him why his child was absent from school. He said he did not have the money to give the child. I said “But you are drinking a bottle of beer at 11:00 in the morning. How can you afford to drink a bottle of Red Stripe beer at 11:00 in the morning and your child needs something to go to school?” (M1)

Goggin (1986) states that economic and political variables must be examined to assess implementation outcome. He also states that researchers should move beyond the success/failure model to understand the factors that influence implementation. This aligns with Miller’s (1997) context standards that factors, which originate outside the education
system also influence the effectiveness of education policies. Table 12 lists the factors and emerging themes.

Table 12: Factors Influencing Primary Education Policy Implementation as well as the Major Themes That Emerged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Factor</th>
<th>Political Factor</th>
<th>Economic Factor</th>
<th>Social Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slavery/Colonialism</td>
<td>Limited Policy Crossover</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Lack of Parental Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased Value for Education</td>
<td>Political Appointments of School Boards/Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty/Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Strongholds/Violence (Garrisons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical Factors Influencing Primary Education

Background

Jamaica gained independence from Britain in 1962. Many scholars have highlighted the negative impacts of colonialism on most post-colonial societies. Rodney (1972) demonstrated that throughout the Caribbean, Kenya, Ghana, Uganda, Sierra Leone, and Nigeria the colonial government did not play a central role in the provision of formal education; instead, education was relegated to the church. Similar to the colonial schools throughout Africa, the colonial schools in Jamaica had no formal curricula and were operated by churches (Whyte, 1977). Reverend John Sterling noted that these schools had “poor buildings, large classes, poor and untrained teachers, and senseless methods of rote learning” (Whyte, 1977, p. 19). Moore and Johnson (2004) also established that colonial education was meant to provide only basic literacy and
numeracy skills. Brown (1979) noted that colonial schools were not properly maintained and were staffed with untrained teachers. Two themes emerged for historical factors: Slavery/colonialism and decreased value for education.

**Theme 1: Slavery/Colonialism**

Gilmour insisted that primary education during colonialism was excellent. The only drawback she noted was that the number of schools was inadequate:

The children, who went to primary school in colonial days, got a quality primary education. What the colonial government failed to do was to make primary education universal, throughout the whole society. They did not cover the whole society. All the people who went to primary school in my day and before me, are very well-educated people. (M1)

Gilmour underscored that the colonial system produced better-trained, better-disciplined civil servants who were all primary school teachers. Many scholars critized colonialism as elevating certain people in society while disenfranchising others; for example, after slavery ended the colonial masters’ perception of the freed Black population had not changed. Blacks were still viewed as lazy and uninterested in education. Moore and Johnson (2004) emphasized that the British never carried out a comprehensive analysis of the school system; instead, they blamed truancy and tardiness for the failure of the education system. They also stated that the Quakers even described some of the children as “stupid” and their parents as “utterly illiterate.” (Moore & Johnson, 2004, p.214)

Moreover, Governor Musgrave of Jamaica referred to colonial Blacks as “half educated
vagabonds” (Moore & Johnson, 2004, p.217) who did not need formal education, but rather moral training.

After two hours of discussion, Gilmour acknowledged that there were negatives to colonialism, but she quickly clarified that she had no personal experiences:

Oh yes, there are some negatives to colonialism, but certainly I did not grow up with any negatives. I grew up under the colonial system, you know. I am 82 years old, so I grew up in the colonial day, and I do not have any negativity about it. What negativity did I have of it? None at all! (M1)

On the other hand, C3 validated that slavery continued to play a role in the Jamaican society, “I believe that our history in terms of slavery has some effect on behavior and outlook.” Summarily, C2 noted that although you never quite see the legacy of slavery it is playing a sociological role. The legacy of slavery remains evident in Jamaica’s education system to which, even M2, agreed,

Well, number one, Jamaica’s education started with the church, coming out of a slave situation where the house slaves were the ones who were considered the elite slaves who were taken on by the church and given an education. Education is an elite endeavor in Jamaica. That is how it started. So there is a concept that education is not for everyone. (M2)

Some parents coming of the colonial education did not value education because they never acquired the skills to move into the educated class. These parents could potentially indoctrinate their children about the value of education, so they were not
“effectively demanding” education because they did not value it. They were of the view that education was only for the elites.

In addition, about 18 (90%) teachers supported the view that slavery continued to play a role in Jamaican society as well as in the education system. T3, T5, and T7 emphasized that since slavery and colonialism ended successive governments have not provided adequate resources for primary education. Furthermore, many Jamaicans have not passed the place where they realize the importance of education. Surprisingly, 15 (70%) teachers insisted that skin color continued to play a role in the education system. T20 pointed out:

We came through slavery and we got it that Black people were stupid. If you were fair-skinned, your parents would encourage you to get an education over your dark-skinned sibling. Because your sibling is Black (dark-skinned) he or she, it was believed, would not get a “good” job.

On the other hand, T13 believed that although slavery has influenced many aspects of Jamaican life and Jamaican schools, “We must move forward and let it go; let go of the bitterness and hatred. Some people have opportunities and they never ever use them.” T13’s sentiments were supported by T4 who pronounced that while Jamaicans have been victims of history, “We need to stop blaming the White man” and create a new consciousness, which is not false, but a consciousness that moves people from a position of inferiority to a position of strength.
Theme 2: Decreased Value of Primary Education

Primary education was considered less important compared to secondary education (Cogan, 1983; Foner, 1973; Smith, 1961). Many people who completed primary schools went on to low-paying jobs or remained on their parents’ farms, compared to those who completed secondary education and were able to secure teaching or administrative positions. Because primary school education was not providing the social elevation that was evident with secondary education, many parents did not see it as a priority “In some households attending school is not a priority, students would be kept home on Fridays to take care of younger children or help in the fields.”(T18)

Additionally, T22 and T12 argued that some parents could not read or write and as a result they did not put enough effort into their children’s education, which left primary schools in the hands of teachers. The lack of interest was also reflected in parents’ reaction to compulsory education. T1 and T6 asserted that while the government should be taking steps to ensure that students attend school, Jamaica’s history with primary education is marked with a lack of accountability.

E3 also substantiated that the value for primary education is reflected in numerous incidents of vandalism, “Because there was much vandalism at primary schools, compared to high schools.”(E3)

On the other hand, about four (15%) teachers proposed that the decreased value for primary education is rooted in a flawed democracy and people’s lack of interest in their personal development. A teacher from St. Thomas (T15) highlighted, “Although they seem to think that Paul Bogle (National Hero from St. Thomas) had paved the way
for development– they themselves do not follow through their individual developments.”(T15) T4 described the Jamaican democracy as “diseased.” According to T4, this disease is reflected in an overreliance on the politicians, and politics, and a growing culture of begging. T4 strongly vocalized,

This is what is happening in Jamaica. There are literate, smart people, but they have been ghettoized in high-rise buildings, in a society where there is no law, and so, democracy is dead. How many children are making upward movement in this system? How many are progressive? Maybe 10%. How many going to university are coming out with a career, they have so many degrees, and they are not functional. (T4)

He declared that there is a decreased value for primary education because people themselves do not feel valued. Poverty and politics promote exploitation and ignorance and the educational system is not relieving mental hopelessness.

Political Factors Influencing Primary Education

Background

There are two active political parties in Jamaica--the Jamaica Labour Party (JLP) and the People National Party (PNP). According to Stone (1980), the JLP began as followers of Alexander Bustamante, Manley’s cousin, in 1944, emerging out of the Bustamante Industrial Trade Union. The union members converted themselves into a party to compete in Jamaica’s first election in 1944. According to Stone (1980), “The JLP set the pace in the transition towards pork-barrel, machine politics. It de-emphasized the formal organizational structure, relying mainly on
clientelistic networks of personal support for its political bosses and particularly on the demagogic crowd appeal of the flamboyant Bustamante.” (p.112). Bustamante championed the rights of the poor, while criticizing the excesses of the middle class.

The Peoples National Party (PNP) was founded in 1938 by Norman Manley an Oxford-trained lawyer (Stone, 1980). It stressed socialist values and promoted political education. The PNP appealed to the middle class. Manley tried to create a structure conducive to policy and ideology debates within the party. The PNP established local conferences as well as party branches. Similar to the JLP, the democratic procedures were eventually eroded and allegiance to the party leader became more important than policy or ideology (Stone, 1980).

In the early 1970s, allegiance to party was translated into various communities. Parties began doling out houses, cars, food and even guns. The favors later secured these communities as voting blocks for a certain party and over the years they came to be called garrisons. Some garrison residents are responsible for most of the crimes committed in Jamaica. Jamaica is also among the most violent countries in the world (World Bank, 2003) which is attributed to such social problems as growing urbanization, high levels of unemployment, and increased gang activities, slums, and drug trafficking. According to Harriott (2003), crime in Jamaica has reached unprecedented levels and is a fundamental issue that prevents children from the lower socioeconomic class from gaining access to educational institutions. Political factors revealed three themes: Political appointment of school boards/principals, limited policy crossover, and political stronghold (garrisons)/ violence.
Theme 1: Political Appointment of School Boards/Principals

Education policy formulation and implementation are influenced by politics (Walker, 2002). Political appointment of school boards, the influence of the Jamaica Teachers Association (JTA) and the political affiliation of the community in which schools are located all point to political influence. Gilmour announced that she would never refuse to confirm an appointment to a board or a principal’s position because of the political affiliation of the appointee,

I would not even know who was going to be appointed principal. A board selects the principal and I only have to approve. Moreover, when I look at it all I am interested in the person’s qualifications. (M1)

Under Jamaican law, the school board has the power to nominate. The minister appoints. The minister has no nominating power. The board has no appointing power. Gilmour pronounced that she is not political, as she had served in both political parties (JLP and PNP). However, she did recall that there was tension regarding her refusal to appoint a male principal to a high school in western Jamaica. This male principal was a known activist of the opposition party (PNP) at the time. Gilmour claimed she refused to appoint him because he could not “even speak the English language.” (M1)

On the other hand, J1 suggested that Gilmour came into office and decided that there was a certain group called Communists, to which this principal belonged. Gilmour vetoed the nomination of said principal. The board nominated the principal again; Gilmour then dismissed the entire board. The board took Gilmour to court and won because the minister has no power to dismiss the whole board. According to J1, Gilmour
vetoed the nomination of another principal who was also a known activist of the opposition, which created a lot of tension between her and the JTA “I think that was happening in some cases.” J2 seconded that “She vetoed purely out of political consideration.” (J2)

Additionally, T8 and T21 spoke passionately about the political appointments of boards, and the negative impacts on schools. In certain communities, some board members would coerce the principals to find employment for families and friends at schools. Even if there were no positions available, they were told to create one. Moreover, T19, who served as a principal during Gilmour’s administration initially refused to grant me an interview because he stated publicly that Gilmour almost ruined his career after she found out that he was an activist for the opposition party.

**Theme 2: Limited Policy Crossover**

Despite political turmoil in the 1980s Gilmour underscored,

Well, I think, of all the programs in this society, I think education is least affected by political change. I think that changes of governments have not drastically reverted a program done by the previous government, I think that is true. (M1) Gilmour stated that politicians should have the integrity not to discard effective policies from previous administrations; rather, they should build upon those policies. As a student of Jamaican politics, I pressed Gilmour on the point of policy continuity. She succumbed and said “Well, I think that one group tends to want to undo what the group before that did, instead of building on what was doing well and advancing it, let's try and do
something else to prove that we are brighter or we're - the competitiveness, political competitiveness is a deterrent to our progress.” (M2)

Additionally, 20 (98%) teachers lay emphasis on the fact that there is limited policy crossover between administrations. According to T1,

Well political factors – the only thing I observe is whatever government is in power, and they have a policy in place, when the other government came that policy is changed. Therefore, there is no continuity on what has been put forward. You do not have enough time to see those policies come to fruition. So policies are undermined, deleted, partially used, and then something new was introduced. Each political person wanted to say that ‘they do it.’ (T1)

The majority of teachers highlighted that when a new government came in it abruptly canceled polices without any form of evaluation, or refused to continue funding certain policies without informing the teachers. T3 and T4 noted the ministry of education has many programs, and after awhile they phase out, and are replaced by other programs, “They are allowed to get away with these things because of politicians and politics and because of poor political management.” (T4).

**Theme 3: Political Strongholds (Garrisons)/Violence**

According to the July 1997 Report of the National Committee on Political Tribalism, garrison communities are created by:

- the development of large-scale housing schemes by the state and the location of the houses therein to supporters of the party in power;
- homogenization by the dominant party activists pushing out the minority from within and guarding against invasion from outside; and
- the expelled setting up a squatter community.
The hard-core garrison communities exhibit an element of autonomy, in that they are states within a state. The Jamaican State has no authority or power except in so far as its forces are able to invade in the form of police and military raids. In the core garrison, disputes have been settled, matters tried, offenders sentenced and punished, all without reference to the institutions of the Jamaican State.

The border wars between garrison communities of different persuasions result in:

- increased difficulty in maintaining law and order;
- an inability to maintain social infrastructure (roads, water, sewage, garbage disposal, electricity, shops, supermarkets, markets), which border or pass through disparate communities
- a restriction of movement through these areas which affects human rights, transportation, and job attendance and opportunities;
- a restriction of business opportunities to the localized area as customers from other communities are denied access by blocked roads and real or perceived threats of violence.

According to M2, “It is not necessarily that they are fighting over politics but the nature of their evolution. They have developed a garrison which kind of cuts them off from law enforcement to the rest of the society.” These communities are politically affiliated and politicians refuse to hold unlawful residents accountable because they are influential in votes. T7 underscored that some parents in garrison communities refused to take advantage of what was offered by the ministry if their party was not in power.

Schools located in these communities are sometimes crippled by crime, “So it is really the crime in these communities that affects many of the schools.”(M2) About 20 (98%) teachers were resolute that political violence, especially in these garrison communities, played a significant role in keeping students away from schools. In a Ministry of Education memorandum dated April 30, 1980, several schools in Kingston were closed because of violence. A meeting on May 26, 1980, with principals followed up this memorandum. According to notes from that meeting, principals confirmed that
community members who were engaged in gun warfare prevented students and teachers from entering and leaving affected schools. The principals at the meeting were told that at Cockburne Gardens teachers were spending more time looking out for students’ safety than on teaching. At Dupont Primary, the school lost the back wall of the school due to floodwaters, which subsequently left the school with minimal protection. As a result, men with guns used the school as a thoroughfare. At Penwood School, nine teachers were held at gunpoint, consequently, many qualified teachers resigned and the ones who remained refused to work unless the ministry guaranteed their protection. Furthermore, at Greenwich School, older girls were beaten when they resisted advances from gang members outside the school. The gangs wanted unlimited access so they cut the school’s fence.

There were strong pleas from churches for peace. The *Daily Gleaner* (October 16, 1980) reported that six people were shot in downtown Kingston when gunmen with high-powered rifles went on a rampage. Because of the shooting, businesses and schools closed. In a *Daily Gleaner* editorial, the Jamaica Teachers Association expressed alarm at the escalation of violence in Kingston schools. According to the JTA, attendance had significantly decreased, while community members were seeking refuge on school property (*The Daily Gleaner*, May 17, 1980).

Many teachers maintained that students are zoned in. According to T7, her school was located in a district of the party in power; however, the principal was a known activist for the opposition and, as a result, the school received no funding from the ministry. She also noted that the parents did not protest this treatment of the school. T18
also insisted that parents would not accept policies from the opposition party. According to T21, sometimes councilors or members of parliament wanted to own a school if it was built during their party’s administration. T20 and T5 asserted that if the principal has a close relationship with a member of a party who was known as a party favorite, then more money would be allotted to that school.

Many teachers emphasized that something needed to done to address the lawlessness. Some community members did not believe in obeying law, in fact, they have their own laws. All of that is negatively affecting education and the children learn it in the elementary schools. One principal was held at gunpoint by a parent because the school was overcrowded and principal refused to enroll the child. As a result, the school installed cameras and employed a local security company as protection for staff and students. T4 substantiated this claim when he declared that a man entered the school grounds and demanded certain items. When the principal refused, the man brandished a gun and declared that he should receive whatever he requested because the Minister of Education was his cousin. T4 pronounced,

Lawlessness, fear of the government, whether it be PNP or JLP. That in itself paralyzes the system, one of the big things: law must have claws and teeth – it must be operational, and it must be respected. This is not happening in Jamaica.

Right now we are lame ducks in the schools. (T4)

This severity of the political situation perpetuates poverty and unemployment. Moreover, M1 agreed that political rivalry is one of the biggest setbacks in Jamaica.
Economic Factors Influencing Primary Education

Background

According to Gilmour, for 1981-1982 the government’s allocation to education was 19.6% of the nation’s total recurrent budget (Jamaica Hansard, 1981). Because of high external debt servicing and stipulations from the International Monetary Fund’s Structural Adjustment Programs, allocation to social services in Jamaica have suffered severe cuts. According to Gallagher (1993), when the education budget is reduced, primary education tends to lose its share of the education budget. Two themes emerged for economic factors: Lack of financial resources and unemployment.

Theme 1: Lack of Financial Resource

Gilmour noted that she was never provided with the adequate financial resource that the education system demanded, “The biggest thing is lack of enough financial support from the government. They just do not have the money.” (M1). However, Gilmour also asserted that if the government had invested more in education, the education system and the country would be more advanced,

I think that because we have not put the right priorities and the limited economic situation that we are in, the imbalance is showing up now. Because we should have put 60% of our GDP on education, from 1962 and we would have been out of the woods. (M1)

I asked Gilmour about support from Jamaica’s Prime Minister (Edward Seaga) for her education agenda. She indicated that the prime minister saw education as vital to national development. However, the IMF’s structural adjustment programs forced him to focus on
areas which could grow the economy, “Because he’s (Seaga) an economist, and he was worried about growing the economy.” (M1)

M2 stressed that providing adequate resources can be challenging in a country that has many other economic demands that were pulling the country in different directions with the limited resources. E3 also agreed that the 1980s posed severe economic challenges for the Jamaican government,

Well, certainly, the economic situation had a very significant negative impact on the education system. There were just the cutbacks in the resources to the schools. Monetary assistance from the ministry was always never received on time, or they came short. In fact, the ’80s, it was a very turbulent time, particularly the mid-80s, because of the international economic situation. (E3)

As a result of the economic situation at the time, it is not surprising that 20 (98%) teachers affirmed that they were never provided with the necessary resources to operate an effective classroom. According to T1,

The infrastructure itself is not suitable to schools. Materials and equipment are inadequate. The pupil-teacher ratio is not what it is supposed to be. Nevertheless, I think, financially, we are not able to afford it. We do not have the space. When I have 1,550 children in a school that is supposed to accommodate 1,200 children, it is evident that the financial situation is very grave. (T1)

Many teachers insisted that primary education policies lacked the focus and the resources to overcome cramped classrooms and achieve an acceptable teacher-pupil ratio. T20 agreed that,
One was the fact that so many children were put in one class. Moreover, that one teacher had to contend with so many students, from varying backgrounds in every way, was due to lack of resources, teaching materials, et cetera, because most times you had just nothing. (T20)

T2, T3, and T6 were adamant that primary schools lacked the infrastructure and there was an overreliance on parents to supplement the ministry’s shortfall. T12 noted, however, that most parents could not afford to contribute to schools because of poverty. It is evident that the ministry contribution is insufficient to operate schools. Grants for schools are insufficient, teachers had to improvise to provide teaching aids, particularly at some institutions, such as one school that had six classes with four teachers, and the principal had to teach.

**Theme 2: Unemployment**

About 20 (98%) teachers were resolute that unemployment was a major economic factor influencing primary education. Many also noted that after thousands of parents lost jobs in the 1980s there was also an increase in crime and fear, “So unemployment is a factor. Crime is a factor, violence is a factor, and fear is a factor.”(T13) Unemployment was evident in both rural and urban areas. The socioeconomic status of different areas—rural farming, commercial, inner cities and the slums—were all impacted by the loss of many industries. Rural areas where parents did not have jobs and students had to travel great distances to school, saw a significant reduction in attendance. In one area where the majority of residents had been employed in two major industries, T20 lamented the closure of these two factories,
Well some parents just did not have any jobs. Some did not care to have any job.
But some genuinely did not have jobs. The Goodyear factory eventually closed,
so when Goodyear closed, and the banana factory closed up, what is there for
them? Nothing. There was nothing. (T20).

T8, T9, T10, and T11 agreed with the teachers listed above who stated that
unemployment and poverty resulted in too much fundraising on the part of teachers.
Another downside of unemployment is that when parents cannot provide for students it is
reflected in their performance in the classroom.

Social Factors Influencing Primary Education

Background

According to Grant (1980), in the West Indies, “Poverty, hunger and poor health
are acknowledged as national problems, which are in need early amelioration. Poor
children are exposed to poor food, poor sanitation, poor housing, and sub-standard
medical care.” (p.3). Throughout these islands, Grant (1980) observed that living
conditions are influenced by the climate, tradition and poverty. Materials such as
cardboard, straw, bamboo, and coconut palm were utilized in the construction of houses.
Almost half these households had only one room and in Jamaica, there were about 4.2
children per household. As a result, three to five children of varying ages and gender
slept in the same bed, while the parents would sleep with the smallest child.

In rural Jamaica, some people travel up to a mile for drinking water and clothes
are washed in a river. In 1980, the unemployment rate in Jamaica was 33-40%.
Coomarsingh (1984), Blair (1986) and Jones (1985) all concluded that social factors such
as poverty alleviation are critical to the improvement of primary education. Analysis of the interview and documents revealed two major themes: Lack of parental involvement and poverty/unemployment.

**Theme 1: Lack of Parental Involvement**

The majority of administrators and teachers agreed that parents should play a more active role in students’ lives. Gilmour emphasized that schools that had an effective Parent Teachers Association (PTA) functioned better than the ones, which did not. She also stressed that many parents do not value, and are not active in, the educational lives of their children. Moreover, M2 also asserted that parents do not value education itself, and that contributes to their lack of involvement. M2 stated,

> The problem with education is that it is not effectively demanded. The concept of effective demand is that people not only want it, they are going to pay for it. They are not willing to sacrifice the consumption of other goods and services in order to have education.

There is a persistent notion that anyone with a good education can succeed in Jamaica. Yet, students are seeing successful people without an education. Especially in inner-city communities, where major dancehall artists (rappers) emerge, these artists move away and purchase expensive homes in affluent areas. In contrast, they also see people who received college degrees yet, remain in the community because it is too expensive to live elsewhere. Therefore, some parents and students may not value education because they are not seeing the immediate financial benefits. M2 buttressed that, “The value placed on
education is not related to overall good; rather, ‘Will it make me a richer person?’ And education does not necessarily deliver wealth in the Jamaican economy.” (M2)

The majority of teachers underscored that most parents do not take steps to dispel stereotypes or promote the value of education. This is further reflected in attitudes of many parents that the government is responsible for all costs relating to schooling. (E3) In fact, about 20 (98%) teachers also identified the lack of parental involvement as a major social factor influencing primary education. T2 clearly articulated this, “So I think that we have younger parents, and they do not have a sense of their social responsibilities. Furthermore, they do not attend meetings regarding their children’s progress in school.”

The majority of teachers established that parents were unemployed, unskilled and as some described them, lazy, “They’re unskilled, so you find parents not working, some of them are lazy.” (T2) Teachers accentuated that parents’ values do not align with school values. According to T5, T12, T13, parents’ low educational backgrounds presented a challenge for many primary schools, this T16 attributed to slavery,

I think this is a social issue coming right back from slavery, coming right back from slavery. During the time of slavery, only a certain class of persons received an education. Many parents do not really see the need for their children to acquire any form of education. (T16)

Consequently, the majority of teachers indicated that grandparents took on the responsibility of raising their grandchildren. Cabinet member C2 corroborated the sentiments of the teachers. She added that
The family unit and the disintegration of family life in Jamaica, I think, are severely affecting primary schools. Additionally, a large percentage of them have no family life and the statistics I hear quoted very often is that 85% of all children born in Jamaica are born to a single family, a single woman. (C3)

However, alarming 85% may seem, it is substantiated (Chang, 2007). Although children from single-parent homes lead successful lives, it is also extensively documented that these children in Jamaica are also the most vulnerable (Dreher, 1984; Evans, 2001; Smith, 1961).

An examination of social factors influencing primary education revealed that many students come from unstable homes, parents are migrating overseas, women head 43% of households, and one-fifth of students do not live with either parent. Fathers are infrequently at home and often have multiple mates. The economic, social and policy magnitude of an inadequate primary education cannot be borne by Jamaica (World Bank, 2003). C3 also alluded to several factors highlighted by the World Bank. In particular, she referenced absentee parents,

A critical member of the family, the mother in most instances, would go abroad to work and send money back home, but the nurturing of the child would suffer as a result. It is not so in every instance. In many cases, you have caring grandmothers, but some them are very young and they have jobs and other responsibilities. (C3)

Many parents travel to foreign countries in search of employment. Children are left in Jamaica with relatives or close friends. These children are called “barrel children”
because their parents send barrels of clothing and gifts. Some scholars argue that this is to compensate for their absence. In addition, they have to appease whoever is taking care of their children. There are several disadvantages to this living situation for children; mainly their caretakers physically and sexually abuse them, plus many caretakers do not participate in their educational programs.

Theme 2: Poverty/Unemployment

The 2003 World Bank Study *Country Assistance Strategy of the World Bank Group for Jamaica* stated that poverty in Jamaica is strongly correlated with social factors including teenage pregnancy; single parenting; drug and child abuse; and domestic violence. In addition, in a *Daily Gleaner* editorial, Assistant Chief Education Officer Dr. Neville Ying noted that the poverty level of many parents has forced several schools to implement welfare programs for some students (*The Daily Gleaner*, May 24, 1979). As Grant (1980) noted, in the Caribbean poverty influences living conditions. Many homes are constructed from straw or metal sheets. Four point two (4.2) children per one-room house in Jamaica compounded this reality.

About 20 (98%) teachers emphasized that poverty is a significant deterrent which severely influences families’ ability to send children to school. According to T3, poverty and unemployment operate in tandem and force some parents to make unwise decisions about school attendance. “I know the ins and outs, I know the suffering, I know their remoteness, I know what that remoteness does to those people – it pushes them further into the cul-de-sac of the mind.”(T3)
T7, T6, T14, and T17 also supported the claim that unemployment, poverty and single mothers influenced students’ attendance and performance. This was further complicated if students had to travel far distances to school, which was evident mostly in St. Thomas. As a result, many parents are unable to meet demands for uniforms, books and travel expenses.

On the other hand, T5 (principal for an inner-city school) questioned the notion of poverty among some parents who were considered in the low socioeconomic class. She echoed the point of a minister (M2) that many parents are not willing to sacrifice financially for education. T5 agreed with the minister when she said,

You know what I saw, the lovely earrings, gold chains, and lovely clothes.

Poverty was more spoken than seen in this inner-city community where parents seemingly are allotting more resource to personal appearance over school amenities. (T5)

There are many instances of extravagance in some of the low socioeconomic areas. Many people are convinced that they may be poor, but they had to “look nice.” Some scholars attribute this to the fact that many mothers were single and young and this was a means to attract potential mates. Grant (1980) substantiated T5’s claim, “The average low-or no-income bracket family likes ‘nice things’—meaning they like to wear good clothes, sometimes expensive ones, and to possess the household furniture one would least expect to find in such shabby-looking houses.” (p.5) These items, Grant went on to state, were secured through installment plans and most times were repossessed for lack of payment. Eyre (1972), on the other hand, found that shantytown (innercity) dwellers possessed
several positive characteristics: They were good money savers and they were industrious. These residents longed for security, and for jobs, electricity, education, water, and transportation. Eyre (1972) saw shantytown dwellers as hardworking members of society; however, their low social status prevented them from realizing the benefits of education.

Summary

Lack of parental involvement, poverty and unemployment significantly influence the consciousness of the value of education. C3 is convinced that a serious breakdown happened in the 1970s, and subsequently deteriorated. ‘I would say it started more in the ‘70s, but became significant in the ‘80s.’ (C3) The breakdown could be attributed to rural urban drift as well as to a change in thinking among Jamaicans that there was an easier way to make money other than farming. These challenges are compounded by teenage mothers, absentee fathers, uneducated parents, and a low educational level as well as a low literacy level in communities, all of which influence primary education.

Many teachers confirmed that most people from the rural areas lived in one-room houses with an average of four children. The parents were farmers who kept the children out of school on some days to help on the farm, or to sell things at the market. Some inner-city community families were living under similar conditions. The only difference was that those parents were maybe employed in factories, a wholesale or in a domestic capacity. Families living under these conditions did not have health insurance, and coupled with violence, guns and death, many cannot see beyond the immediate. These stories capture the essence of poverty in many communities where the majority of
primary schools are located. Poverty, in this case, is just not limited financial power but also limits peoples’ ability to participate fully in school and community events, because they are forced into communities where the social and educational interactions are minute.

Although the number of schools that were constructed during colonialization was inadequate, Gilmour praised primary education, calling it “Excellent, better than they get today.”(M1) She noted that the teachers were colonial-trained and displayed the discipline required of primary school teachers. According to Gilmour, all the poor cultivators and farmers sent their children to school, and the children did well. When I challenged Gilmour on some of the legacy of colonialization, she remarked,

    Thank God the British came. I do not see any of the big disadvantages that they are talking about. The inspector of schools in my days was an Englishman, but we did not hate him, and he did not give me any inferiority complex. When he came there, he asked me a question, “Oh you are a bright girl.” Was that negative?

(M1)

Gilmour emphasized that the people should be blamed for their lack of discipline to attend and excel in school, and that they used the legacy of slavery to divert attention from their otherwise unwillingness to work “Maybe I should put the other one first. How do I say, unacceptable recognition of the value of education by parents who are themselves, uneducated.”(M1)

According to J1, the period 1955 to 1978 recorded unprecedented educational development in Jamaica. The country was making money through exports and bauxite,
and the demand for social change became evident, especially in education. However, 1978 also marked the first significant devaluation of the Jamaican dollar. It was called the “crawling-peg” devaluation, with the Jamaican dollar worth two United States dollars. Therefore, while one section of the population was calling for more schools, the other was vocal about fixing the economy. The economy emerged victorious and a number of educational and social developments were frozen. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) began putting in place measures to correct the economy. As a result, wages were frozen, and many public sector jobs were eliminated. When Gilmour took office in 1980 she came into a period of economic downturn where the focus was to address the economic decline before the social sector. According to the Jamaica Five-Year Development Plan (JFDP), the Ministry of Education’s share of public expenditure declined from 13.4% in 1979/80 to 10.8% in 1986/87.

What is clear, however, is that lack of resources and unemployment cannot be understated. These themes emerged in all aspect of this study, as indicators that primary schools were facing challenges that would not be overcome without an injection of capital into the system. The 1970s, in retrospect, can be said to have seen a stiffening of society from the loose one of the 1960s. In Jamaica, the OPEC oil crisis resulted in devaluation of the Jamaican dollar. Many people lost jobs and the price of food soared. Nevertheless, a variety of reasons contributed to the increase in violence: Shortage of goods, scarcity of foreign exchange, clash of ideologies, and arming of certain people in garrison communities.
The conflicting ideologies of both the PNP and the JLP were now being fought in the streets of Kingston. Hundreds of people were driven from their homes. The over 800 murders which are said to have been committed around the 1980 election pale compared to what we see now, but then it was enormous. By 1980, the scarcity of foreign exchange and the shortage of goods of all kinds put the country in a downward spiral. In the ghettos, allegedly armed with guns by their respective members of Parliaments, a terror of violence was unleashed.

Although politics plays a major role in primary education, Gilmour claimed politicians still do not comprehend the concept that education is vital to the development of any nation. It is clear that they are led by greed and personal aggrandizement. According to the Secretary-General of the JTA, Fay Saunders, “Education does not win votes.” Saunders added that education has not been able to evoke passion in society when compared to other trivial issues. Anyon (1995) also noted that when she asked the assistant superintendent about choosing reforms that would be beneficial to students the superintendent stressed “…Education is as much about politics as it is about kids.” (p.77) An awareness of the bureaucracy is important to achieve reforms in education. However, Tanner and Tanner (1990) stated “… proposals are often politically motivated rather than educationally driven” (p.14) while Cooksey and Kreig (1996) noted that political infighting hampered the implementation of several recommendations.
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

According Gilmour her administration inherited a school system where teachers were inadequately trained. Services, such as uniforms, books, and the school feeding program, were also insufficient. Facilities and maintenance of school buildings were inadequate, with leaking roofs, and some schools without windows or doors. In addition, the majority of primary schools were overcrowded. As a result, Gilmour promised primary education would be the top priority of educational reform over a five-year period.

This was a qualitative study, which utilized the case study design in order to gain indepth insight into the policy implementation process. Interviews and documents were used as data-gathering tools. The data yielded significant themes, which were analyzed according to research questions. This chapter outlines the summary of the findings, theoretical and policy implications and recommendations for future research.

Summary of Findings

This section is an overall examination of the themes that emerged from this research. It is organized according to the research questions.

Research Question 1

It appears that the majority of teachers were never consulted about the introduction and implementation of the nutribun and milk, about 20 (98%) of them lauded the program for its affordability. They all indicated that it was welcomed and served its purpose at the time. Even those who opposed the additional responsibility still
supported the affordability aspect. Some teachers even volunteered to sell to students who were not members of their classes. All the same, the majority of teachers, as well as a cabinet member, stated that it was monotonous. Eventually, some students even started spilling milk on each other and throwing the buns.

A small number of 2+1-trained teachers indicated that the additional year in the classroom was beneficial because they learned new strategies for grading as well as new pedagogies. They stressed that teaching is an on-going process, which requires periodic professional development. However, the majority of 2+1-trained teachers insisted that they did not benefit from the additional year, because it should have been spent in the classroom acquiring practical skills. In addition, 13 (98%) of the 2+1 trained teachers noted that they were not consulted before the policy was implemented. On the other hand, all the teachers with three years of training emphasized that the 2+1-trained teachers did not possess the necessary skills required of a well-rounded teacher. As a result, they all agreed that the additional year in college was necessary.

The majority of teachers from St. Thomas agreed that compulsory primary attendance lacked accountability. Moreover, truant officers had no structured supervision and sanctions were never enforced. Many schools did not have seats for the influx of students who turned out initially. In addition, some parents lacked the financial stability that was needed to ensure full attendance. Consequently, the 1985 Jamaica Economic and Social Survey stated there was no improvement in attendance. As with the other initiatives, they noted there was no consultation before the policy was implemented.
The single-seaters were introduced to promote development, independence and
decrease irritation. A very small number of teachers indicated that they welcomed the
single-seaters because they encouraged individual work and students could easily move
them around. Nevertheless, the majority of teachers noted that the single-seaters were
noisy, and brought confusion because students began fighting over them. The major
issue, however, was that they overcrowded the classroom, and teachers did not have room
to move about. Some teachers claimed they never received the single-seaters, and the
majority emphasized that they were not consulted before the introduction.

Maintenance of school buildings remained inadequate throughout Gilmour’s
administration. Many schools had leaking roofs, and lacked windows or doors. Although
Gilmour highlighted that the practice using chalkboards to separate classes was not
conducive to good learning, this practice was maintained. Even the school that was
constructed under her new model for primary schools opened with inadequate furniture,
and with classrooms separated by chalkboards. These physical challenges were made
worse by rampant vandalism and pilfering, which aggravated the tension between the
schools and their communities.

Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) stated it is next to impossible to overstate the
importance of adequate resources in policy implementation. The assertion in the literature
(Anyon, 1995; Cooksey & Krieg, 1996) is that it is absolutely essential for policies to
function and for policy goals to be achieved. All indications were that there were never
adequate resources. The economic situation in Jamaica and the funding of the external
debt is an indicator that policies will never be funded 100%. However, it is unthinkable
that teachers had to provide the level of financial resources that they indicated. This further complicates the issue of implementation for teachers who feel compelled to invest personal funds to implement the same policies by which they were marginalized.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 examined the policy implementation process in Jamaica. Many ministry education officers stated that policies were communicated, while the majority of teachers insisted that they received no information about policies from the ministry or education officers. Instead, they heard about them on television or radio or read about them in the newspaper. The education officers, as well as ministry personnel, indicated that policies were piloted and there were workshops and training, but the teachers all maintained that they were never called to a meeting and they never attended any training, or workshops dealing with any of these policies. They also insisted that they were never provided with guidelines and policy goals were never communicated to them.

Participants further identified a lack of resources as a significant challenge for the ministry, which was supported by Gilmour and M2. Lack of consultation was a recurring theme throughout this study. The majority of teachers stressed that they were never consulted about any of these policies before they came down to the schools for implementation.

The assertion in the literature is that consulting with the implementers on the ground is essential for the effective implementation of any policy (Hughes and Keith, 1980; McLaughlin, 1982; LaRocque, 1986; Anyon, 1995; Smit, 2003). Teachers indicated that they were never consulted. Nevertheless, education officers, a regional director, and
ministry personnel all indicated that teachers were consulted and their feedback was taken into consideration. This contention is one indicator of the fragmented structure of the policy implementation process at the ministry.

Only one (2%) teacher indicated awareness of the evaluation process; although the education officers and the ministry personnel all indicated that there was an evaluation process in place. The director of the evaluation unit declared that what that unit actually did was evaluate specific programs. He also stressed that the ministry does not favor evaluation. The literature illustrated that since evaluation may sometimes highlight negatives in certain programs or other shortcomings people sometimes refuse to have their programs evaluated.

The intriguing aspect of implementation, however, is the mixed messages that participants were provided regarding the process. It is clear that there was a high level of confusion among the implementation team. The ministry's website states that the minister is in charge of implementation, but then the minister emphasized that he was not involved because of the appearance of political interference, while Gilmour left implementation completely up to the education officers. This turmoil clearly has broad implications for primary education policy in Jamaica.

The major implication is that though policy implementation is a complex process it is clear that there needs to be a more effective strategy for it and that strategy should include articulating of guidelines. These guidelines should be flexible, as asserted in the literature (Van Meter and Van Horn, 1975; Elmore, 1977; Hull & Hjern, 1987; McDonnell & McLaughlin, 1982; McLaughlin, 1987), so that polices can be adjusted to
issues on the ground and can be localized if necessary. Nevertheless, there also needs to be a clear, comprehensive and well-communicated system in place to implement policies. It is obvious when there is no structure there are no rules and no guidelines for policy implementation. This harkens back to the notion of communication in concert with consultation. If there are no guidelines or steps for implementation then what processes are implementers following? This problem is abundant throughout this research, which I believe conveys the importance of consulting teachers.

The ministry should have a framework for implementation that enhances the relationship between implementers on the ground and the people of the ministry. This guideline is central to deconstructing tension between the teachers and the ministry. This process cannot be one-dimensional or ideological, but must provide space for teachers and the ministry personnel to come together and design a policy. This would help in debunking the grand narratives that have been articulated by teachers throughout this research, that the ministry constantly ignores their concerns.

The Center for Excellence in Teacher Training (CETT) program has proven to be a success in Jamaica so far and aspects of its implementation could be applied to a general implementation framework for the Ministry.

Research Question 3

Gilmour insisted that colonialism was great for Jamaica and primary education excelled under the colonialists. Nevertheless, the majority of teachers underscored that some legacies of colonialism were still evident and problematic in the school system. The literature asserts (Brown, 1979, Moore & Brown, 2004) that the schools that were built
during the colonial period were dark and dirty. Adequate resources were never provided for them and the education that was provided was not enough to move students into mainstream society. As a result, many teachers stressed that some people never valued education or bought into the notion that education would be to their benefit. Similarly, primary education was never valued by many who completed it and went on to low-paying jobs while those who completed secondary education were able to get management and administrative positions.

This lack of education, many primary school graduates could only find menial jobs and some were unemployed. This economic challenge forced many of them into substandard living conditions. Economic pressures resulted in an economic downturn. Crime and poverty increased. Poverty resulted in the marginalization of the poor who were relegated to inner-city communities or garrisons. The two active political parties, the PNP and the JLP, infiltrated these communities and traded guns for homes and food. The communities became further insulated from mainstream Jamaica and developed their own subculture in which crime played a significant role.

The literature (Anyon, 1995; Manley, 1974; Stone, 1980) is clear on the pervasiveness of poverty in these communities because of economic and political marginalization. It is also interesting that this was a paradigm shift from a history of domination to a history of conflict. The many unanswered questions allow ample room for speculation. This study may not be able to capture the different values and multiple ideologies that surrounded the evolution of the garrisons. There are three basic premises underlying education in garrison communities: there is no protection for teachers and
students, many schools are in disrepair and many parents are unemployed. This is a recipe for school failure.

**Policy Implications**

There are several findings that require policy attention. The implications of these findings are that policy prescriptions alone cannot solve the crisis. It is evident the definition of what constituted policy was complicated by these various factors and must be understood. The findings also indicate that there was a top down (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975; Mazmanian & Sabatier 1983) approach to policy making and implementation at the ministry.

This study provides an understanding of the factors that influenced policy implementation and the challenges surrounding them. This study provides the ministry with a framework for understanding these combined challenges and the effects that they can have on schools. The advantage is that this study brought together many elements inside and outside the classroom and demonstrated how they overlapped, as well as how the intersection influenced policy and policy implementation. For example, the CETT program could be used a model for best practices. CETT program model is

- Adequate resource
- Created buy from teachers through direct consultation
- Provided additional training
- Consistent evaluation and feedback

CETT’s new pedagogy as well as the consultation process could provide new insights for policy implementation.
The literature asserts (Miller, 1997) that policymakers tend to ignore issues that they consider are not immediately relevant to schools, such as home environment and community poverty, but this research has demonstrated that it is not only important but necessary to address these issues.

This study also adds to the literature on factors that influenced primary policy implementation in general and in Jamaica and the Caribbean in particular. This study serves as a platform for the Ministry of Education to understand the importance of having clear policy implementation guidelines as is demonstrated by evidence. These officials need to continue to increase funding as well as advocate policies that are designed to improve the qualitative aspects of Jamaica’s education system. These problems are complex, but most scholars agree that they are by-products of poverty, inequality and the historical evolution of the school system in Jamaica. The above indicators are also warnings of the limitations and fallibility of education policies that do not account for social economic influences.

There are about 794 primary schools in Jamaica. Conceptualization of policies for the entire system is futile. According to J1,

Our primary education system is beyond the immunization phase. No single small injection of capital is going to have a massive effect. It is a mature system suffering from all the maladies of maturity. Some parts of the system have cancer, some have high blood pressure, and some have diabetes. Some have heart disease, some have kidney failure. (J1)

Jamaica does not have the resources to provide all primary schools with 100 percent
of their needs, because some schools actually do not need assistance. The educational system will not destroy all children. Some will survive no matter what, but there are others who will not survive if they do not have certain things, so the response must be targeted (Miller, 1992). The policies of Gilmour were very altruistic but many never got off the ground.

Policymaking should be system-wide as well as region or group specific (Miller, 1992). This will ensure that scarce resources are allocated where needed, “System-wide implementation of all policies and programs is both unnecessary and wasteful and does not take the strengths of the system into consideration.” (Miller, 1992, p. 220).

Implications for Theory

This study sought to understand the factors that influenced policy implementation in Jamaica from 1980 to 1985 through the theoretical lens of political model theory and in postcolonial theory.

Political Model

The political model is utilized to explain the multifaceted environments that operate in the implementation process. According to Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), the policy process is cyclical and is connected by systems of linkages and elements. They also state that the policy process occurs in three interconnected environments, and within these environments several processes take place: Actors are always changing and interacting; the environments are always in flux; and, most importantly, the environments suggest that implementation is not a one-directional process. Participants in this study
demonstrated elements that all three environments of the political model were evident in the implementation of educational policy in Jamaica.

*Political Model Environment I*

Many teachers heard about policies from the newspapers or television. They maintained that they never attended workshops. They did not have clear guidelines to implement policy so they are unable to localize policy although the JTA president placed emphasis on that very issue. J1, a past JTA president, put emphasis on localizing policy (Hull & Hjern, 1987, LaRocque, 1986; McLaughlin, 1987; Smit, 2003). He established that working closely with principals (Trider & Leithwood, 1988) can achieve significant results. In working with a group of principals to accept an implementation plan, J1 stressed,

> If I had taken a one-size-fits-all decree from the ministry to do it, everybody would begin to resist it because they would have no ownership of it, they would have no input into it, they would – and I have used this matter of getting implemented – the reason I have done other things is precisely of this understanding of the system…“it’s a whole business of collaboration.”(J1)

The narrative of the participants also confirmed that they were not consulted and the Minister of Education and the Educational Services Director, as well as the former Jamaica Teachers Association president agreed with the teachers. There needs to be significant improvement in communicating policies as well as in involving teachers in the consultation process. Anyon (1995) wrote that lack of communication and knowledge of
implementers can “hamper the implementation of educational improvement projects.”
(p.76)

McLaughlin (1982) underscored the fact that understanding variability in implementation can be helpful to teachers in the training process, which is necessary in the implementation and change processes. Another essential element in the implementation process is to prepare people to manage change,

You have to prepare your principals and your teachers and the parents, so the Parent Teachers Association. Therefore, when you are going to have that change in implementation it is a strategy that you use that more often than not – besides the resource constraint that would make or break the acceptance. (C3)

Political Model Environment II

Actors in Environment II include administrators, agencies and in this case teachers, principals and education officers according to Nakamura and Smallwood (1980) “…these individuals carry the burden of the implementation process…” (p.47). Implementation depended a great deal upon who was the chief education officer (C2). According to C2, Gilmour’s chief education officer was a key figure in preventing implementation from taking a political angle. This was especially important during the 1980s because the country was polarized along political lines. C2 noted that the majority of young people at the ministry lacked the technical background for jobs where there were no predecessors. He stated, “We were developing, when we went in we had no policies. We had to create policies ourselves with people who had little or no experience.” (C2)
The narratives of participants indicated that there needed to be an assessment of the internal workings of the ministry. It was evident that there was a breakdown of communication or a lack of understanding of the processes that needed to take place. R1 offered the illustration that

The ministry is everybody. When the ministry works well then everybody would have the opportunity of having an input into – into the collective wisdom and the collective procedures. That’s when it works well. When it doesn’t work well then you have a few people making that input but what certainly it is the – certainly somewhere between planning – people who are responsible for planning and the people who are responsible for implementation from which – which these philosophies would come, but if there is no consultation somebody thinks that because they have – they have the position to enunciate some kind of – what they say on policy and philosophy.

**Political Model Environment III**

According to Nakamura and Smallwood (1980), evaluation holds both implementers and policymakers accountable. Evaluation can be conducted by political or technical standards. They note that policymakers solicit feedback from their constituency and “success or failure of a program can be measured in terms of its acceptance or rejection by those constituents and/or groups who contact policy makers” (p. 68). Technical evaluation conducts formal evaluation, which focuses on measurable goals of a policy. The effectiveness of evaluation is limited if program data are limited or
nonexistent. It is evident that policies are not being evaluated and that there is an awareness of the evaluation unit but there is a lack of understanding of its function.

The narratives confirmed that both policymakers and implementers held a “defensive perspective toward evaluation.” (p. 71) They did not want their programs to be criticized. In Gilmour’s follow-up interview, she emphasized, “A 10-year period is a very short period to really make a dent into a structure like education. I mean, you make one or two things and that's about all you can achieve in that time.” (M1). Gilmour was responding to my comment that the Jamaica Five Year Development Plan (JFDP), as well as teachers and, administrators, reported that there were no significant improvements in primary education after her tenure expired. Gilmour insisted that she did her best with the financial resources that she was given.

Regarding the fact that most schools did not receive single desks and chairs she noted that, “You could not get around to every school...Oh no, you never - you never will.” (M1) Furthermore, she pronounced, “everything is a fight.” That is, she had to fight with the principals of schools who said the local carpenter in the village should construct the desks and chairs for schools, rather than a factory in Kingston. Concerning teacher upgrade, Gilmour also insisted that this did not produce the results she hoped for because It just happened at an unfortunate time when we had the - well, not the World Bank, what is the thing that lends you money, I forget what it's called. And the IMF came down on the government and then we had to cut down - the budget had to be cut. (M1)
She also proposed that compulsory education failed because teachers were against it and politicians lacked the will to enforce its implementation. Gilmour concluded that, “In any developing country when you go in there are 60 things that need to be improved and if you improve three you are lucky.”(M1)

The responses of participants confirmed that all three environments of the political model are evident in this research. The analysis also indicates that the experiences of participants were clearly reflected in the theory of the political model.

Theory Application

Postcolonial theory is also concerned with the voices of people telling their stories. In this study, the voices of teachers, education officers, ministers of education and ministry personnel were made to name their own realities and concerns regarding the implementation of educational policies in a postcolonial society. Education should be a unifier, the route to upward mobility. The disparity that existed during the colonial period is still evident in the historical, economic, political and social factors that influence primary education. Many participants spoke about this as a pattern coming out of slavery where only certain classes of people were given an education. The M2 noted

Well number one, Jamaica’s education started with the church, coming out of a slave situation where the house slaves were the ones who were considered the elite slaves who were taken on by the church and given an education. Education is an elite endeavor in Jamaica. That is how it started. Therefore, there is a concept that education is not for everyone. (M2)
The contention lies with those who received a colonial education that prepared them for upward mobility and those who did not. For example, Gilmour stated,

Thank God the British came. I do not see any of the disadvantage of that you are talking about. The inspector of schools in my day was an Englishman and we did not hate him, he did not give me any inferiority complex. (M1)

According to Gilmour, anyone could excel if he or she was willing to work hard.

Many of those who felt marginalized and placed in classes with 250 students (Foner, 1973) did not see the value of education, and this mindset was passed on to subsequent generations. Postcolonial theory, which speaks about stratification by race and class, is also evident in the provision of education. Cogan (1983) stressed that stratification was maintained by control over secondary education; as a result, the majority of teachers proposed that many parents did not value primary education because it did not provide social elevation, although a strong primary education background was a prerequisite to attending secondary school.

Those who were marginalized “kept students home on Fridays to take care of younger children or help in the fields.” (T18) Many of these parents were illiterate although some of them had completed primary school. Similarly, the majority of teachers contended that slavery and colonialism continue to play a significant role. Several teachers even emphasized that skin color (Austin, 1979; Fanon, 1967; Smith, 1961) continued to play a role in the education system. Fair-skinned students were given more opportunities in schools and were perceived as smarter. “The inferiority of skin color, light skin versus dark skin,” T20 stated,
We came through slavery and we got it that Black people were stupid. If you are fair-skinned, your parents would encouraged you get an education over your dark-skinned sibling. Because your sibling is Black (dark-skinned) he or she it was believed would not get a “good” job. (T20)

Teachers also highlighted the challenges of students from low socioeconomic communities. These challenges were evidenced in lack of parental involvement in students’ lives, which was noted by many teachers, ministry personnel and even Gilmour. Many parents were young, unskilled and of low educational background. One teacher identified poverty and unemployment as factors forcing many schools to implement welfare programs. Poverty impacts attendance which also impairs learning. Poverty limits the ability to fully participate in school and community.

Postcolonial theory and the construction of the “other” (Said, 1978; Young, 2003) was evident in the narratives a result of the evolution of the economic and political structure of the education system. Although the Jamaican government announced that education was aligned with national development, primary education has never received the injection of capital needed to adequately reform the system.

According to T1,

The infrastructure itself is not suitable to schools. Materials and equipments are inadequate. The pupil-teacher ratio is not what it is supposed to be. Nevertheless, I think financially we are not able to afford it. We do not have the space. When I have 1,550 children in a school that is supposed to accommodate 1,200 children, it is evident that the financial situation is very grave. (T1)
Postcolonial theory and class relations and identity also played out in the political strongholds (garrison communities). From the standpoint of the dominant class, these communities reflected the “other.” Politicians exerted power in these communities through the distribution of guns and political favors in exchange for votes. Primary schools were severely impacted by the high level of violence, which further marginalized students from these communities. These communities are evidence of Fanon’s (1963) geographical layout of a postcolonial world and Young’s (2003) concept of those who were “walled in.” These communities are also what Eagleton, Jameson and Said (1990) refer to “as an act of geographical violence through which space in the world is brought under control.” (p.77) The majority of teachers agreed that the violence in these communities kept many students away from school. Especially during election time, schools were constantly bombarded with gunfire from rival factions living near the school. Sometimes the enormity of these gunshots prevented students as well as teachers from entering or leaving affected schools. At one school, nine teachers were held at gunpoint. At another school, girls were beaten when they resisted advances from gang members and there were times when gang members even destroyed the fences leading into schools so that they could have unfettered access to the school compounds. T-3 announced that a parent held a principal at gunpoint because she refused to admit his child to the school that was already overcrowded.

T4 pronounced,

Lawlessness, fear of the government, whether it be PNP or JLP. That in itself paralyzes the system, one of the big things: law must have claws and teeth – it
must be operational, and it must be respected. This is not happening in Jamaica.

Right now we are lame ducks in the schools. (T4)

Primary schools have encountered problems with overcrowding, untrained staff, and inadequate buildings since the 1800s. Some of these schools now located in “other” communities were vandalized—the very schools that were supposed to be their vehicle to upward mobility. Many schools were in an advanced state of disrepair while community members continually vandalized others.

Evans (2001) noted that the primary school system was established to maintain Jamaica’s stratified social structure and “still reflects this history.” (p.2) Evans stressed that despite the expansion of Jamaica’s education system there remains a huge disparity between the quality of education that people at the bottom receive compared to those at the top of the socioeconomic ladder. In addition, Evans (2001) stated that only ten years ago 94.3% of the wealthiest students were enrolled in secondary schools compared to 65.2% of poor students. At the upper levels of secondary education, Evans (2001) underscored that there are places “for only 46% of the age cohort” and poor students account for only 17.8% of this group. Moreover, Evans emphasized, “Children of poor parents are overrepresented in schools that are considered of lesser quality…these schools terminate at Grade 9 with few or no opportunities for further education.” (p.4)

Miller (1992) concluded, “There can be doubt that the resolution of this problematic situation does not lie in teacher/pupil ratios, repetition rates, formal teacher preparation, physical accommodations, or the management of logistical arrangements of the school.” (p. 206). The resolution, Miller (1992) purports, lies in the quality of
education provided, and the motivation of teachers and students that education will provide upward mobility. According to Miller (1992), Native Americans, Blacks, guest workers and women in traditional societies all have one common feature: They are alienated from the mainstream.

In most developing countries, education is the determinant of ones’ social status (Beckford, 1972; Forojalla, 1993). Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, and Henry (1997) state that, “Education has both individual and social purposes--it seeks both to instill those capacities and qualities in students that help them to lead creative and fulfilling lives and to create conditions necessary for the development of a caring and equitable society.” (p.19). In Jamaica, primary education (mass schooling) became popular because it was attached to the survival of the colony (Brown, 1979). Morality in early Jamaican education was co-opted by the church. The voices of the participants revealed that remnants of postcolonial realities are evident in Jamaican primary schools.

Suggestions for Further Research

The factors influencing the implementation of primary education policy in Jamaica have never been researched. This study adds to the literature in addition to opening the door for debate and research of various findings and related issues. Ideas for further study include:

- A longitudinal study from 1980-2008 could identify patterns in implementation
- A leadership study of Mavis Gilmour could answer how style influences implementation.
• An implementation analysis of the Center for Excellence in Teacher Education (CETT) program could provide further insight into its implementation.

• The ministry is implementing a new compulsory education policy. A comparative analysis of Gilmour’ policy and the 2009 policy could provide deeper insights into evolution or stagnation of policy implementation.

• The ministry is implementing the new teacher-upgrade policy. All teachers will be required to obtain a bachelors degree. A comparative analysis of Gilmour’s policy and the 2009 policy could provide deeper insights into implementation.

• The ministry introduced the Program of Advancement through Health and Education (PATH). This provides financial incentives for parents to send children to school. A study of social services provisions and economic and social factors may yield new results.

• The ministry is embarking on a major policy initiative, the “transformation process.” There were several complaints from teachers about its implementation. A study of this policy could also add to the literature on implementation.

• Despite systematic failures, a study could examine what polices worked.

Conclusion

Everybody wants a better home, a better car, but they do not see the value of education. They see their physical comfort over and above the value of education in the development of a nation. Jamaica attained universal primary education before most developing countries (World Bank, 2003). Yet, in 2007, sociologist Peter Espeut stated that both political parties in Jamaica had failed the students at the primary level (Jamaica
Gleaner, June 27, 2008). In addition, results of the 2007 Grade Four Literacy Test show that 40% of the students who took the test were reading below the required level (Jamaica Gleaner, June 8, 2007). Therefore, it is unimaginable that 29 years after primary education was placed at the top of the education policy agenda, the system continues to decline.

Most of the educational reforms implemented after independence have not addressed the major problem of unequal access to education in Jamaica. As Fanon (1963) noted “the proof of success lies in a whole social structure being changes from the bottom up.” (p. 35) Despite these challenges, the education system has a responsibility to every Jamaican child, and I will co-opt the words of Michael Manley to conclude this study. He reflects that:

In Jamaica, as elsewhere, the mood of dissatisfaction amongst the young tends towards an unprecedented intensity. This tempts repressive reaction on the part of the establishment...Youth is best understood taking into consideration two factors. First, there is the effect upon young minds of the values, which they find in the society, which surrounds them. Second, there is the effect upon a young person of the educational system during the preparation for adult life…All this takes place in the context of homes that are either broken or fractured or are the scenes of chronic discord which does little to engender respect for the adult ways. The most important area in which the young claim the right of participation is education itself. The moment any class or group can buy themselves a better start in education for their offspring they have laid the foundations of a class system by
conferring advantage upon a child through efforts other than its own. There can be no compromise about this if one is serious about egalitarianism. (Manley, 1974, pp. 158-160).
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## APPENDIX A: MINISTRY EXPENDITURES 1981/82 AND 1982/83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1981/82 (Revised Estimates)</th>
<th>1982/83 (Estimates)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Tertiary and Continuing Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Supervision</td>
<td>123,807</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Basic School Teachers</td>
<td>753,122</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Teacher Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers' Colleges</td>
<td>17,026,580</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Service Teacher Education</td>
<td>937,942</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools Teacher Up-grading</td>
<td>679,919</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(In-service Diploma Courses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Related Expenses</td>
<td>281,773</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural College</td>
<td>2,677,688</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>4,173,013</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for CAST and Agric. Col.</td>
<td>1,000,100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>2,597,050</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMAI</td>
<td>8,566,135</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total F</strong></td>
<td>38,728,091</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G. Higher Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to UWI</td>
<td>97,326,150</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. Maintenance, Project Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration, Supervision</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1,525,101</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total H</strong></td>
<td>3,025,101</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Student Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Feeding</td>
<td>5,855,180</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniforms (Primary, All-Age)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total I</strong></td>
<td>5,855,180</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total Ministry of Education</strong></td>
<td>336,594,270</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** I. Including $1,351,480 for Public Libraries in 1981/82 and $1,700,000 in 1982/83.
APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED (INFORMAL CONVERSATION) GUIDE FOR TEACHERS

1. Tell me about yourself

2. Tell me about your experience as a teacher?

3. What was your role in education during 1980 and 1985?

4. Were you involved in primary school education policy implementation in St. Thomas or Kingston?

5. When Dr. Gilmour introduced buns in primary schools, how did you feel?

6. When Dr. Gilmour replaced the two three-seater desks with the single seater, how did you feel?

7. What was your reaction when Dr. Gilmour introduced the teacher-training program?

8. Were you consulted before these policies were introduced?

9. Was there any improvement in the education system because of these policies?

10. What did you see as the broader social, political issues, historical, and economic factors that influenced primary education policy implementation during 1980-1985?

11. What are some of challenges that you faced when you tried to implement policies?
APPENDIX C: SEMI-STRUCTURED (INFORMAL CONVERSATION) GUIDE FOR MINISTER/MINISTRY OF EDUCATION PERSONNEL

1. Tell me about yourself
2. Tell me about experience as a Minister/Ministry of Education personnel.
3. What was your role in education during 1980 and 1985?
4. Were you involved in primary school education policy implementation in St. Thomas or Kingston?
5. What was your role in policy implementation during the 1980-1985?
6. When Dr. Gilmour introduced buns in primary schools, what was the feedback that ministry received from teachers?
7. When Dr. Gilmour replaced the two three-seater desk with the single seater, what was the feedback that the ministry received from teachers?
8. What was the reaction from teachers when Dr. Gilmour introduced the teacher-training program?
9. Was there any improvement in the education system because of these policies?
10. What did you see as the broader social, political issues, historical, and economic factors that influenced primary education policy implementation during 1980-1985?
11. What are some of challenges that you face when trying to implement policies?
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APPENDIX F: REQUEST FOR ACCESS FOR MINISTRY ARCHIVE

Ministry of Education and Youth
2 National Heroes Circle
Kingson 4, Jamaica, West Indies
Tel: 876-922-1400-9
www.moevc.gov.im

December 19, 2007

Miss Winsome Chinnu
5 Dawn Avenue
Kingston 20

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Access to Information Act - Application

Thank you for your application dated December 19, 2007, and received by us on December 19, 2007. We will undertake the necessary research in order to respond to your request within the prescribed period of thirty (30) days.

You may contact Marlene Hines at 502-5974 or at Marlene.Hines@moey.gov.jm for any further information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marlene Hines (Ms.)
Director Documentation, Information & Access
For Permanent Secretary

---

Every Child Can Learn ...Every Child Must Learn

Hon. Maxine Henry-Wilson, Minister • Hon. Noel Monteith, Minister of State •
• Mrs. Mariia Jones, Permanent Secretary
APPENDIX G: GILMOUR ANNOUNCING POLICY INITIATIVES

Hon. Minister of Education addressing Rotarians (St. Andrew Club) re Ministry of Education Policies and Programmes
APPENDIX H: NUTRIBUN AND MILK

Improved and Expanded School-Feeding Programme

Before 1980, there existed two types of school-feeding programmes. The first type was the supply of sugar, flour, milk solids, etc., directly to the individual schools to be cooked at the school to provide hot meals for the children. This involved bulk storage both at a central store and at the school, unfortunately providing opportunity for pilferage, deterioration and general deterioration because adequate storage facilities were lacking. The preparation and serving of the meal in the schools was also open to unsanitary conditions.

The schools do not have the appropriate facilities, and the capital and recurrent costs would make it prohibitive to provide them. The second type was a snack which was prepared in a central plant by Nutrition Products Ltd., set up for that purpose. A half-pint canister of reconstituted milk and fried-vegetable patty were provided. Although this snack was an improvement on the previous in terms of cleanliness and taste issues, there were two main problems:

- Distribution was confined to the Corporate Area.
- The shelf-life of the product was limited, which was a factor confining distribution to the Corporate Area.

The canisters were fired and were not palatable when cold. A new programme has been designed to overcome these problems as well as provide better value for the investment. Instead of the patty, a nutri-bun with a shelf-life of one week, and a better capacity for distribution has been introduced.

Each bun can supply a student with 33-40% of daily nutritional needs.

The half-pint canister of milk has been retained, but a new system for delivery has been evolved.
The schools with electricity will be provided with a dispenser which will provide half pint of milk per child.

In other schools, sealed half pint pouches stored in a cool place, will be provided.

In order to ensure that all Primary and All-Age Schools can receive this daily snack, four new plants are being constructed to start functioning early in 1985 as follows:

- Shrewsbury (Westmoreland)
- Falmouth (Trelawny)
- Porus (Manchester)
- Annotto Bay (St. Mary)

The World Food Programme has supported this programme with a grant of US$8m. worth of food supplies over the next three years.
APPENDIX I: COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE POLICY INITIATIVES

Compulsory Attendance — Introduced 1882

Local research had shown that the most important factor affecting progress in learning is regular attendance at school. Our educators were in unanimous agreement that the children of this country of ages 6-12 should be in school. Up to 1880 however, no decision had been taken to ensure that these children did attend school. The Education Act of 1866 made provision to enforce attendance in school, but the regulations were not implemented on the grounds that the conditions in the schools were not perfect.

The problem was not enrolment, but attendance. Some 95% of the age group 6-12 were enrolled in school, but average attendance was as low as 66% in rural areas and a high of 80% in towns and cities.

The gravity of the situation was that a quarter of the students were receiving not more than 2 years of the 6 years of Primary Education.

The researchers made it perfectly clear that compulsory education could be implemented in St. Thomas and Trelawny and therefore, after careful preparation, this was done.

As a consequence, attendance Monday — Thursday increased by 13% generally reaching 90% on Friday, traditionally the worst day of the school week, it increased by 23% reaching 97%.

School Enrolment 95%

60% Rural

30% Towns and Cities

The following parishes were included in 1987:
- St. James
- Hanover
- Westmoreland
- St. Elizabeth
- Manchester
- Clarendon

The results have not been as spectacular, however, largely because the mass media promotion was not repeated due to limitations of funds.

With the various improvements now being put into the system this programme of universal Primary Education will be pursued.
APPENDIX J: SINGLE SEATER DESIGN

Design and Introduction of a New Desk and Chair for Primary Schools

One of the unsatisfactory features of the Primary Schools was the furniture provided for the students. The standard was a two-seater bench and attached table unit, which was cumbersome and space consuming. Frequently, 5 or 6 children were seated on the bench, thus inhibiting the learning process, and making it easier to spread contagious disease — a fact which specially concerned the Minister of Education, who spearheaded the search for a new design which would provide each child with an individual sitting and writing area.

The new desk and chair unit is constructed to be:

- Durable;
- Functional — it can be adjusted to meet variations in the height vertically and horizontally so that it can be used by any age group;
- Flexible — it can permit re-arrangement of classrooms;
- Inappropriate for other use — discouraging theft;

Starting with new schools, this furniture will be gradually phased into all Primary and All-Age Schools. 28,948 units have already been supplied to schools.
APPENDIX K: NEW TOILET TO PREVENT VANDALISM

New Toilet System Designed to Prevent Vandalism and to Improve Sanitation.

In removing pit toilets from school buildings, the sanitary conveniences introduced have been essentially those designed for private home use.

The consequences of using such fragile equipment for hundreds and even thousands of school children, has been disastrous for the maintenance of proper sanitary standards and the excessively high budgetary costs both for installation and repeated replacement.

An additional problem was the attractiveness of this expensive equipment and its easy removal by vandals and thieves.

At the request of the Minister a new system has been devised by the Architects of the Ministry based on the following criteria:

- Maximum durability
- Easy maintenance
- Excellent sanitary standards

The new toilet facility is a period — flushed, single-system lavatory which consists of pre-cast concrete seats with lids over a channel which is flushed manually and automatically with 100% cleaning capability.

The system achieves high standards of sanitation; can withstand the use of hundreds of students; reduces vandalism and theft; and conserves water — a vital point in rural areas where water supply is not always dependable.