

RESEARCH SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

NCORPORATED BY ACT OF PARLIAMENT ACT 1970, 20 OF 1986

# Survey of Mathematics in Primary Schools 2007

# Copyright © October 2008 by NIHERST

NIHERST 43 – 45 Woodford Street Newtown Port of Spain Trinidad

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system without the prior written permission of NIHERST.

# Foreword

In this publication, the National Institute of Higher Education, Research, Science and Technology (NIHERST) presents the results of the Survey of Mathematics in Primary Schools, 2007.

The Survey of Mathematics in Primary Schools, 2007 was a study of teachers in Standards 1 to 5 from a representative sample of public and private primary schools. The major objectives of this study were to compile data on the profile of primary school teachers, training needs, difficulties encountered in teaching mathematics and their perceptions of the subject. The adequacy and availability of school infrastructure and support systems available for the teaching of primary school mathematics were also addressed in the enquiry. This included access to mathematics education workshops, resource personnel, teaching and assessment methods, equipment and professional literature.

Primary education in mathematics is critical to the total development of the student in the formative years of learning. A supporting environment and adequately qualified and trained teaching personnel are essential indicators for students' participation and sustained interest in mathematics, science and technology. The results of this study are therefore intended to provide data on operationally relevant indicators necessary for improving the quality of mathematics education to the benefit of all stakeholders.

NIHERST wishes to thank the Ministry of Education for approving the conduct of this study in primary schools. We also acknowledge the co-operation of the teachers who willingly provided the data collated in this report.

Science and Technology Statistical Unit 43-45 Woodford Street Newtown Port of Spain 628-1154 e-mail: stresearch@niherst.gov.tt website: http://niherst.gov.tt Maureen Manchouck President

ii

# **Executive Summary**

- Of the total sample of 213 primary school teachers, 23% were males and 77% females, representing a 1:3 male to female ratio approximately. By standard, however, the male to female ratio was 1:7 in standard 1 compared to 1:2 in standard 5. The educational district of Port of Spain, which comprised of 9% males to 91% females or a 1:10 ratio, recorded the largest gender disparity while the lowest was observed in St Patrick with 35% males to 65% females or a 1:2 ratio.
- Females out-numbered their male counterparts in all types of school; in the government primary schools the male to female teacher ratio was 1:2 compared to 1:3 in the government-assisted primary schools. However, in the private primary schools the disparity in the male to female ratio of 1:8 reflected a more pronounced decline of the male teacher role model.
- The largest percentage (40%) of teachers was observed in the 30 39 age group, followed by approximately one-fifth (22%) in each of the 40-49 and 50-59 age cohorts. Approximately one-third (30%) of the teachers in the private schools was less than 30 years of age compared to 2% in government and 16% in government-assisted schools.
- Over a half (56%) of the sample of teachers reported service of 15 years and over while one-fifth (20%) indicated teaching experience in each case of 5-9 years and 10-14 years.
- The majority (71%) of primary school teachers reported Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate (CSEC)/O'level as their highest educational attainment in mathematics and a similar percentage (69%) had a Teacher's diploma as the highest professional qualification. Over 90% of the teachers in the public primary schools were professionally qualified while one-quarter (26%) in the private primary schools held no such qualification. In addition, only 8% of primary school teachers were in possession of the B.Ed. degree, the stated qualification goal for all teachers.
- Over ninety percent (94%) of the teachers used textbooks, mainly as a supplementary resource, to teach mathematics despite a substantial proportion (63%) who indicated that the texts were inadequate, especially in the lower standards, 1 and 2. Over a half (56%) of the teachers in private primary schools stated that the texts were adequate compared to approximately one-third in the government (35%) and government-assisted schools (30%).
- On the improvement of mathematics texts, a significant proportion (70%) of teachers stated that the prescribed texts should contain more activities/assessment exercises compared to the suggestions that texts should be in agreement with the syllabus (41%) and graded in terms of age-group/ability (36%).
- The majority of teachers devoted one to two hours weekly in each case to preparing or grading student tests or examinations (50%), planning lessons (45%) and professional reading and development (34%).
- The modal frequency with which teachers (46%) informed parents about student's achievement in mathematics was once a term; similar information was conveyed by one-third (32%) of the teachers monthly. Teachers in the private primary schools met more frequently with parents than their counterparts in the government and government-assisted schools.
- Approximately one-third (30%) of the sample of primary school mathematics teachers indicated that meetings were held once a term with other teachers in their subject area to discuss and plan curriculum or teaching approaches.
- The data reveal that while 46% of the mathematics teachers had a lot of influence on the subject matter to be taught, the response from the majority of teachers shows that they exerted considerably less influence on the acquisition of materials and supplies (29%) and specific textbooks (18%).
- Almost all the primary school teachers (91%), especially those in the private schools (100%), agreed that the Secondary Entrance Assessment (SEA) examination in mathematics prepared students in the subject for secondary school.
- The modal number of mathematics period was ten (28%) each week, followed by five periods (26%) weekly. On a weekly basis, mathematics was taught more often in standards 4 and 5 than in the lower standards.

- Approximately two-fifths of the sample of teachers identified fractions (22%), decimals (22%) and geometry (18%) as the most difficult areas of the mathematics syllabus for primary school students to conceptualise. The data, however, shows that the difficulty encountered with fractions in standard 1 declined as students progressed towards standard 5. A relatively large percentage of teachers of standards 3 to 5 reported difficulty with decimals amongst students.
- In general, the most frequently performed mathematical activity was the practice of computational skills at every lesson (41%) and most lessons (48%), followed by working in groups at every and most lessons as stated by 37% of the teachers accumulatively.
- Three-quarters (76%) of the teachers assigned mathematics homework everyday mainly of duration 15-30 minutes (Tables 26 and 28). As students moved up the primary school system from standard 1 to 5 homework assignment increased; three-fifths (57%) of the standard one teachers gave homework everyday compared to almost all (98%) in the case of the standard five.
- The most significant indicator used to determine students' progress in mathematics was teacher-made tests (100%), followed by responses of students in class (98%).
- A significant percentage (81%) of the sample of mathematics teachers agreed that primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields. There was also a substantial level of agreement (52%) that students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught. However, over a half disagreed that most teachers had an insufficient understanding of how children learn (63%), that they generally had an inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics (61%) and there was a lack of suitable mathematics literature in their schools (56%).
- A substantial percentage of teachers identified the lack of parental interest in children's learning and progress (62%), student absenteeism (55%), disruptive students (51%), students who came from a wide range of backgrounds (46%) and the shortage of instructional equipment (43%) as key issues affecting the teaching of mathematics.
- A significant proportion (85%) of the primary school teachers, especially in Tobago (94%), St. Patrick (92%), Caroni (90%) and Victoria (88%), had attended mathematics workshops, to which exposure at least once in the last five years was reported by 86%.
- Attendance at workshops on teaching methods (79%) was considerably higher when compared to assessment (47%) and curriculum (41%).
- By attending workshops in mathematics most primary school teachers (83%) benefited from exposure to new teaching techniques and over a half (59%) from alternative forms of assessment and the provision of content knowledge (55%).
- Generally, the problems teachers encountered when applying the content of workshops were lack of time (66%), mainly in the educational districts of South Eastern (94%), Victoria (82%), St. George (73%) and North Eastern (73%), and lack of materials (57%), especially in Caroni (77%).

# **Table of Contents**

	Page No.
Foreword	i
Executive Summary	iii
Methodology	ix
Table No.	Page No.
1. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Standard and Gender	1
1a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Standard and Gender	1
<b>Chart 1: Percentage of Teachers by Educational District and Gender</b>	2
<b>Chart 2: Percentage of Teachers by Standard and Gender - All Districts</b>	2
2. Number of Teachers by Type of School, Standard and Gender	3
2a. Percentage of Teachers by Type of School, Standard and Gender	3
<b>Chart 3: Percentage of Teachers by Type of School and Gender</b>	3
3. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Age Group	4
3a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Age Group	5
<b>Chart 4: Percentage of Teachers by Type of School and Age Group</b>	6
4. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Years of Service	7
4a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Years of Service	8
<b>Chart 5: Percentage of Teachers by Type of School and Years of Service</b>	9
5. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Mathematics Education	10
5a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Mathematics Education	11
<b>Chart 6: Percentage of Teachers by Type of School and Highest Level of Education in Mathematics</b>	12
<b>Chart 7: Percentage of Teachers by Educational District and Highest Level of Education in Mathematics</b>	12
6. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Professional Training	13
6a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Professional Training	14
<b>Chart 8: Percentage of Teachers by Type of School and Highest Level of Professional Training</b>	15
<b>Chart 9: Percentage of Teachers by Educational District and Highest Level of Professional Training</b>	15
7. Number of Teachers by Years of Service and Highest Level of Professional Training	16
7a. Percentage of Teachers by Years of Service and Highest Level of Professional Training	16
<b>Chart 10: Percentage of Teachers by Years of Service and Highest Level of Professional Training</b>	16
8. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Highest Level of Mathematics Education and Professional Training	17
8a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Highest Level of Mathematics Education and Professional Training	18
<b>Chart 11: Percentage of Teachers by Highest Level of Mathematics Education and Professional Training</b>	19
9. Used Mathematics Textbook by Educational District and Standard	20
Chart 12: Used Mathematics Text book by Standard	22
Chart 13: Used Mathematics Text book by Educational District	22

10. Used Mathematics Textbook by Type of School and Standard	23
<b>Chart 14: Used Mathematics Textbook by Type of School</b>	23
11. Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Educational District and Standard	24
Chart 15: Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Standard	25
Chart 16: Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Educational District	26
12. Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Type of School and Standard	27
<b>Chart 17: Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Type of School</b>	27
13. How Mathematics Textbook Used by Educational District and Standard	28
Chart 18: How Mathematics Textbook Used by Standard - All Districts	30
Chart 19: How Mathematics Textbook Used by Educational District	30
14. How Mathematics Textbook Used by Type of School and Standard	31
<b>Chart 20: How Mathematics Textbook Used by Type of School</b>	31
15. Suggestions for the Improvement of Mathematics Texts by Educational District	32
Chart 21: Suggestions for the Improvement of Mathematics Texts - All Districts	32
16. Time Spent per Week on Teaching Activities Outside the Formal School Day by Educational District	33
<b>Chart 22: Time Spent per Week on Teaching Activities Outside the Formal School Day</b> - <b>All Districts</b>	34
17. Time Spent per Week on Teaching Activities Outside the Formal School Day by Type of School	35
18. Meetings with Parents About Student's Achievement in Mathematics by Educational District and Type of School	36
Chart 23: Meeting with Parents about Student's Achievement in Mathematics by Educational District	37
Chart 24: Meeting with Parents about Student's Achievement in Mathematics by Type of School	37
19. Meetings with other Teachers by Educational District and Type of School	38
Chart 25: Meetings with other Teachers by Educational District	39
Chart 26: Meetings with other Teachers by Type of School	39
20. Influence on Aspects of Teaching by Type of School	40
<b>Chart 27: Teachers' Influence on Aspects of Teaching - All Schools</b>	40
21. SEA Mathematics Prepared Students for Secondary School by Educational District and Type of School	41
Chart 28: SEA Mathematics Prepared Students for Secondary School by Educational District	42
Chart 29: SEA Mathematics Prepared Students for Secondary School by Type of School	42
22. No. of Mathematics Periods/Week by Type of School and Standard	43
<b>Chart 30: Percentage of Mathematics Periods each Week - All Standards</b>	44
23. Most Difficult Subject Area for Students to Conceptualise by Standard	45
Chart 31: Most Difficult Subject Area for Students to Conceptualise by Percentage of Teacher - All Standards	45
24. Performance of Mathematical Activities by Educational District	46
<b>Chart 32: Performance of Mathematical Activities</b>	47
25. Performance of Mathematical Activities by Type of School	48

26. Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Educational District and Standard <b>Chart 33: Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Educational District</b>	49 50
27. Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Type of School and Standard	51
Chart 34: Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Standard	51
Chart 35: Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Type of School	52
28. Frequency of Mathematics Homework Assignment by Educational District and Duration	53
<b>Chart 36: Frequency of Mathematics Homework Assignment by Duration - All Districts</b>	54
29. Frequency of Mathematics Homework Assignment by Type of School and Duration	55
30. Assessment of Students' Work by Educational District	56
Chart 37: Assessment of Students' Work - All Districts	57
31. Assessment of Students' Work by Type of School	58
32. Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education by Educational District	59
Chart 38: Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education - All Districts	61
33. Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education by Type of School	62
Chart 39a: Agreement with Statements on Mathematics by Type of School - Government Schools	63
Chart 39b: Agreement with Statements on Mathematics by Type of School - Government-assisted Schools	63
Chart 39c: Agreement with Statements on Mathematics by Type of School - Private Schools	63
34. Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Educational District	64
Chart 40: Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics - All Educational Districts	66
35. Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Type of School	67
Chart 41a: Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Type of School - Government Schools	68
Chart 41b: Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Type of School - Government - assisted Schools	68
Chart 41c: Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Type of School - Private Schools	68
36. Percentage of Teachers Attending Mathematics Workshops by Educational District and Type of School	69
<b>Chart 42: Attended Mathematics Workshops by Educational Districts</b>	70
37. Number of Mathematics Workshops Attended last Five Years by Educational District and Type of School	71
<b>Chart 43: No. of Workshops Attended last Five Years by Type of School</b>	72
38. Attendance at Mathematics Workshops in Curriculum, Assessment and Teaching Methods by Educational District and Type of School <b>Chart 44: Attendance at Mathematics Workshops in Curriculum, Assessment and Teaching Methods - All Districts</b>	73 74
39. Benefits Derived from Workshops by Educational District	75
Chart 45: Benefits Derived from Workshops - All Districts	76
40. Benefits Derived from Workshops by Type of School	77
41. Problems Teachers Encounter when Applying the Content of Workshop by Educational District	78
<b>Chart 46: Problems Encountered when Applying the Content of Workshops - All Districts</b>	79
42. Problems Teachers Encounter when Applying the Content of Workshop by Type of School	80

43. Update Sessions/Reports on Workshops held in Schools by Educational District and Type of School	81
Chart 47: Update Sessions/Reports on Mathematics Workshops by Educational District	82
Chart 48: Update Sessions/Report of Mathematics Workshops by Type of School	82
44. Frequency of Mathematics Workshops by Educational District and Type of School Chart 49: Frequency of Mathematics Workshops by Type of School - All Districts	83 84
45. Time Mathematics Workshops Should be Held by Educational District and Type of School <b>Chart 50: Time Mathematics Workshop should be Held by Type of School</b>	85 86

# Methodology

#### Introduction

The empirical results of this study on manpower, physical infrastructure and curriculum content are key indicators in the planning and evaluation of formal mathematics education. This publication should engage the attention of decision-makers, curriculum specialists, researchers, teaching personnel and, in general, stakeholders in mathematics education. This methodology describes the objectives, scope, coverage, data collection and processing of the results of the survey.

#### Objectives

The study focused on the quality and methods of teaching and the availability and adequacy of resources by monitoring:

- teachers' qualifications and training needs,
- adequacy of teaching materials, textbooks and equipment,
- areas of difficulty teaching and understanding,
- teaching and assessment methods, and
- access to mathematics education workshops and professional literature.

#### Scope

The scope of this study included information on the demographic and social characteristics of the teachers such as age, gender, educational attainment, professional qualifications and years of service. Teachers also provided information about instructional practices, emphasis on the topics in the mathematics curriculum, teaching resources and assessment strategies. Data on time spent on activities outside of the school day, workshops attended and issues which limited the teaching of mathematics were also collected.

#### Coverage

The frame for the study was obtained from the website of the Ministry of Education and a 40% sample or 225 public and private primary schools were selected to participate in this enquiry. Of the 225 primary schools surveyed, 213 or 95% responded. Tables A, B and C show the number of schools selected and response rate by type of school.

### Table A. Sample Selected by Educational District and Type of School

	Tatal		Type of school	
Educational district	ισται	Government	Government-assisted	Private
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
All districts	225	56	135	31
Port of Spain	39	10	19	10
St. George East	43	12	22	9
North Eastern	19	5	13	1
South Eastern	20	3	15	2
Caroni	29	8	20	1
Victoria	33	7	23	3
St. Patrick	26	7	16	3
Tobago	16	5	8	3

# Table B. Response by Educational District and Type of School

	<b>T</b> . 1	Type of school										
Educational district	Iotal	Government	Government-assisted	Private								
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)								
All districts	213	52	134	27								
Port of Spain	33	9	17	7								
St. George East	39	10	22	7								
North Eastern	18	4	13	1								
South Eastern	20	3	15	2								
Caroni	29	8	20	1								
Victoria	32	6	23	3								
St. Patrick	26	7	16	3								
Tobago	16	5	8	3								

Table C. Percentage Response by Educational District and Type of School

	A11 1 1		Type of school	
Educational district	All schools	Government	Government-assisted	Private
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
All districts	95	93	99	87
Port of Spain	85	90	89	70
St. George East	91	83	100	78
North Eastern	95	80	100	100
South Eastern	100	100	100	100
Caroni	100	100	100	100
Victoria	97	86	100	100
St. Patrick	100	100	100	100
Tobago	100	100	100	100

#### Sample Design

All schools were stratified by educational district and type of school as shown in Table A in the coverage. Three strata were obtained. The government-assisted schools were further streamed by their religious denominations. The following procedure was then adopted in selecting the standard as the sampling unit: commencing with stratum one, standard I was selected from the first listed school, standard 2 from the second school and similarly for standards 3, 4 and 5 from the next consecutive schools. This process was repeated until the schools in the stratum were exhausted. The procedure for selecting the standards from the subsequent strata was similar to that described for stratum one. The mathematics teachers of the selected standards were surveyed. Through this selection process, a representative sample of 213 teachers from public and private primary schools responded to the enquiry.

#### **Data Collection**

A questionnaire for teachers of the selected standards was designed to achieve the underlying objectives. The questionnaire was then delivered to each school and subsequently monitored by a group of experienced interviewers. Data collection commenced in May, 2007 and was completed by July, 2007.

#### Data Processing

As completed questionnaires were received, data were edited for consistency and omissions. Where discrepancies were identified, questionnaires were returned to the field for verification and correction as necessary. Edited data were then captured in the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 11.0 software which was used to produce the tabulations in this report.

#### Results

The results of the survey are presented in the various tabulations and graphics which follow

#### Table 1. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Standard and Gender

	A 11									( 1	Standa	ard						
Educational district	AII	stano	aros		1		2			3				4		5		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
All districts	213	50	163	46	6	40	44	5	39	44	11	33	38	14	24	41	14	27
Port of Spain	33	3	30	7	0	7	5	0	5	8	2	6	6	0	6	7	1	6
St. George East	39	9	30	9	0	9	10	3	7	7	2	5	6	4	2	7	0	7
North Eastern	18	5	13	4	0	4	4	2	2	4	1	3	3	0	3	3	2	1
South Eastern	20	5	15	3	1	2	4	0	4	4	0	4	5	1	4	4	3	1
Caroni	29	9	20	6	1	5	5	0	5	6	3	3	6	3	3	6	2	4
Victoria	32	6	26	7	2	5	8	0	8	7	1	6	4	1	3	6	2	4
St. Patrick	26	9	17	6	2	4	5	0	5	5	1	4	5	4	1	5	2	3
Tobago	16	4	12	4	0	4	3	0	3	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	2	1

#### Table 1a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Standard and Gender

	٨١١	atand	anda							( 1	Standa	ard						
Educational district	AII	stano	arus		1		2			3				4		5		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
All districts	100	23	77	100	13	87	100	11	89	100	25	75	100	37	63	100	34	66
Port of Spain	100	9	91	100	0	100	100	0	100	100	25	75	100	0	100	100	14	86
St. George East	100	23	77	100	0	100	100	30	70	100	29	71	100	67	33	100	0	100
North Eastern	100	28	72	100	0	100	100	50	50	100	25	75	100	0	100	100	67	33
South Eastern	100	25	75	100	33	67	100	0	100	100	0	100	100	20	80	100	75	25
Caroni	100	31	69	100	17	83	100	0	100	100	50	50	100	50	50	100	33	67
Victoria	100	19	81	100	29	71	100	0	100	100	14	86	100	25	75	100	33	67
St. Patrick	100	35	65	100	33	67	100	0	100	100	20	80	100	80	20	100	40	60
Tobago	100	25	75	100	0	100	100	0	100	100	33	67	100	33	67	100	67	33

Table 1 shows the distribution of mathematics teachers surveyed by educational distict, standard and gender. Of the total sample of 213 primary school teachers, 23% were males while 77% were females, representing a 1:3 male to female ratio approximately. By standard, however, the male to female ratio was 1:7 in standard 1 compared to 1:2 in standard 5. A further review of the data by educational district reveals that Port of Spain, which comprised of 9% males to 91% females or a 1:10 ratio, recorded the largest gender disparity while the lowest was observed in St. Patrick with 35% males to 65% females or a 1:2 ratio.





Source: Table 1a

	Male	Female
All standards	23	77
1	13	87
2	11	89
3	25	75
4	37	63
5	34	66

#### Table 2. Number of Teachers by Type of School, Standard and Gender

Tuna af	A 11		landa							( 1	Standa	ırd						
туре от	AII	stand	larus		1		2			3				4		5		
SCHUUI	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
All schools	213	50	163	46	6	40	44	5	39	44	11	33	38	14	24	41	14	27
Government	52	17	35	11	2	9	9	2	7	10	2	8	10	5	5	12	6	6
Government -	107	70	<b>П</b> (П (	00		οr	00	-	77	00	п	ín	00	п	ı.	٦.	р	10
assisted	134	۵U	104	29	4	20	۵۵	វ	Ζ1	۷Ď	9	19	Ľ۵	ŏ	כו	24	D	١۵
Private	27	3	24	6	0	6	5	0	5	6	0	6	5	1	4	5	2	3

#### Table 2a. Percentage of Teachers by Type of School, Standard and Gender

Tuno of	٨١١	atand	anda								Standa	ard						
туре от	All	Stand	arus		1		2			3				4		5		
SCHOOL	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)
All schools	100	23	77	100	13	87	100	11	89	100	25	75	100	37	63	100	34	66
Government	100	33	67	100	18	82	100	22	78	100	20	80	100	50	50	100	50	50
Government -	100	00	70	100	14	00	100		00	100			100	<u>лг</u>	DC.	100	05	75
assisted	100	ZZ	/४	100	14	ăр	100	IU	90	100	32	ЬŎ	100	35	63	100	25	/៦
Private	100	11	89	100	0	100	100	0	100	100	0	100	100	20	80	100	40	60

Females out-numbered their male counterparts in all types of school and standards. In the government primary schools the male to female teacher ratio was 1:2 compared to 1:3 in the government-assisted primary schools. However, in the private primary schools the disparity in the male to female ratio of 1:8 reflected a more pronounced decline of the male teacher as a role model.



# Table 3. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Age Group

	Tfhl	T-+-I			Age grou	p - years	
Equcational district	type of school	Iotai	Under 20	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
All districts	All schools	213	1	29	87	46	47
	Government	52	0	1	23	17	11
	Government-assisted	134	0	21	54	26	33
	Private	27	1	7	10	3	3
Port of Spain	Total	33	0	7	13	5	7
	Government	9	0	0	5	1	3
	Government-assisted	17	0	5	5	3	4
	Private	7	0	2	3	1	
St. George East	Total	39	0	9	13	8	9
	Government	10	0	0	4	3	3
	Government-assisted	22	0	6	6	4	6
	Private	7	0	3	3	1	0
North Eastern	Total	18	0	3	9	4	2
	Government	4	0	0	3	1	0
	Government-assisted	13	0	3	6	2	2
	Private	1	0	0	0	1	0
South Eastern	Total	20	0	1	11	5	2
	Government	3	0	0	1	2	0
	Government-assisted	15	0	1	10	3	1
	Private	2	0	0	0	0	1
Caroni	Total	29	0	1	10	10	8
	Government	8	0	0	3	4	1
	Government-assisted	20	0	1	7	6	6
	Private	1	0	0	0	0	1
Victoria	Total	32	0	2	13	6	10
	Government	6	0	0	3	2	1
	Government-assisted	23	0	1	10	4	8
	Private	3	0	1	0	0	1
St. Patrick	Total	26	0	4	12	2	8
	Government	7	0	0	3	2	2
	Government-assisted	16	0	3	7	0	6
	Private	3	0	1	2	0	0
Tobago	Total	16	1	2	6	6	1
	Government	5	0	1	1	2	1
	Government-assisted	8	0	1	3	4	0
	Private	3	1	0	2	0	0

60 and over
(7)
3
0
0
3
1
0
Ū
1
U
U
U
U
U
U
I N
U
1
<u>п</u>
Π
Π
Π
1
П
0
1
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0

#### Table 3a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Age Group

	Tfhl	T_+_l			Age grou	p - years	
coucational district	Type of school	TOTAL	Under 20	20-29	30-39	40-49	50-59
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
All districts	All schools	100	1	14	40	22	22
	Government	100	0	2	44	33	21
	Government-assisted	100	0	16	40	19	25
	Private	100	4	26	37	11	11
Port of Spain	Total	100	0	21	39	15	21
	Government	100	0	0	56	11	33
	Government-assisted	100	0	29	29	18	24
	Private	100	0	29	43	14	0
St. George East	Total	100	0	23	33	21	23
	Government	100	0	0	40	30	30
	Government-assisted	100	0	27	27	18	27
	Private	100	0	43	43	14	0
North Eastern	Total	100	0	17	50	22	11
	Government	100	0	0	75	25	0
	Government-assisted	100	0	23	46	15	15
	Private	100	0	0	0	100	0
South Eastern	Total	100	0	5	55	25	10
	Government	100	0	0	33	67	0
	Government-assisted	100	0	7	67	20	7
	Private	100	0	0	0	0	50
Caroni	Total	100	0	3	34	34	28
	Government	100	0	0	38	50	13
	Government-assisted	100	0	5	35	30	30
	Private	100	0	0	0	0	100
Victoria	Total	100	0	6	41	19	31
	Government	100	0	0	50	33	17
	Government-assisted	100	0	4	43	17	35
	Private	100	0	33	0	0	33
St. Patrick	Total	100	0	15	46	8	31
	Government	100	0	0	43	29	29
	Government-assisted	100	0	19	44	0	38
	Private	100	0	33	67	0	0
Tobago	Total	100	6	13	38	38	6
	Government	100	0	20	20	40	20
	Government-assisted	100	0	13	38	50	0
	Private	100	33	0	67	0	0

In terms of age distribution the largest percentage (40%) of teachers was observed in the 30 - 39 age group, followed by approximately on in each of the 40-49 and 50-59 age cohorts (Table 3a). Approximately one-third (30%) of the teachers in the private schools was less the age compared to 2% in government and 16% in government-assisted schools.

bU and over
(7)
1
л П
n
11
3
n
n
14
0
0
-
0
0
0
5
0
0
50
0
0
0
0
3
0
0
33
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0

ne-fifth (22%) 3n 30 years of



Source: Table 3a

# Table 4. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Years of Service

				Years o	fservice	
Educational district	Type of school	Total	0-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15 years and over
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	All schools Government	213 52	8 0	44 11	42 12	119 29
	Government-assisted	134	3	24	26	81
	Private	27	5	9	4	9
Port of Spain	Total	33	1	11	9	12
	Government	9	0	2	4	3
	Government-assisted	17	0	5	4	8
	Private	7	1	4	1	1
St. George East	Total	39	2	9	6	22
	Government	10	0	2	1	7
	Government-assisted	22	0	5	4	13
	Private	7	2	2	1	2
North Eastern	Total	18	2	3	5	8
	Government	4	0	1	0	3
	Government-assisted	13	2	2	5	4
	Private	1	0	0	0	1
South Eastern	Total	20	1	4	2	13
	Government	3	0	2	0	1
	Government-assisted	15	1	2	2	10
	Private	2	0	0	0	2
Caroni	Total	29	0	1	6	22
	Government	8	0	0	2	6
	Government-assisted	20	0	1	4	15
	Private	1	0	0	0	1
Victoria	Total	32	1	4	4	23
	Government	6	0	1	2	3
	Government-assisted	23	0	3	2	18
	Private	3	1	0	0	2
St. Patrick	Total	26	0	7	5	14
	Government	7	0	1	1	5
	Government-assisted	16	0	4	3	9
	Private	3	0	2	1	0
Tobago	Total	16	1	5	5	5
-	Government	5	0	2	2	1
	Government-assisted	8	0	2	2	4
	Private	3	1	1	1	0

#### Table 4a. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Years of Service

				Years o	f service	
Educational district	Type of school	Total	0-4 years	5-9 years	10-14 years	15 years and over
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	All schools	100	4	20	20	56
	Government	100	0	21	23	56
	Government-assisted	100	2	18	20	60
	Private	100	19	33	15	33
Port of Spain	Total	100	3	33	27	36
	Government	100	0	22	44	33
	Government-assisted	100	0	29	24	47
	Private	100	14	57	14	14
St. George East	Total	100	5	23	15	56
	Government	100	D	20	10	70
	Government-assisted	100	0	23	18	59
	Private	100	29	29	14	29
North Eastern	Total	100	11	17	28	44
	Government	100	D	25	D	75
	Government-assisted	100	15	15	38	31
	Private	100	D	0	D	100
South Eastern	Total	100	5	20	10	65
	Government	100	0	67	D	33
	Government-assisted	100	7	13	13	67
	Private	100	0	D	D	100
Caroni	Total	100	0	3	21	76
	Government	100	0	0	25	75
	Government-assisted	100	0	5	20	75
	Private	100	0	0	D	100
Victoria	Total	100	3	13	13	72
	Government	100	0	17	33	50
	Government-assisted	100	0	13	9	78
	Private	100	33	0	D	67
St. Patrick	Total	100	0	27	19	54
	Government	100	0	14	14	71
	Government-assisted	100	0	25	19	56
	Private	100	0	67	33	D
Tobago	Total	100	6	31	31	31
	Government	100	D	40	40	20
	Government-assisted	100	D	25	25	50
	Private	100	33	33	33	0

Over a half (56%) of the sample of teachers reported service of 15 years and over while one-fifth (20%) indicated teaching experience in each case of 5-9 years and 10-14 years (Table 4a). A similar pattern of teaching experience was observed in the government and government-assisted schools. However, the majority (52%) of teachers in the private primary schools had less than ten years of



Source: Table 4a

# Table 5. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Mathematics Education

 Г.І	Tfll	T_+_1		Highest level of mat	thematics education	
Educational district	lype of school	Iotal	CSEC*/0'level	A'level	Associate degree	Bachelor's degree
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	All schools	213	150	49	9	5
	Government	52	29	19	2	2
	Government-assisted	134	108	23	1	2
	Private	27	13	7	6	1
Port of Spain	Total	33	21	8	3	1
	Government	9	6	2	0	1
	Government-assisted	17	13	3	1	0
	Private	7	2	3	2	0
St. George East	Total	39	31	6	1	1
	Government	10	6	3	0	1
	Government-assisted	22	20	2	0	0
	Private	7	5	1	1	0
North Eastern	Total	18	12	6	0	0
	Government	4	4		0	0
	Government-assisted	13	8	5	0	0
	Private	1	0	1	0	0
South Eastern	Total	20	15	4	0	1
	Government	3	0	3	0	0
	Government-assisted	15	14	1	0	0
	Private	2	1	0	0	1
Caroni	Total	29	18	9	1	1
	Government	8	4	3	1	0
	Government-assisted	20	13	6	0	1
	Private	1	1	0	0	0
Victoria	Total	32	22	8	2	0
	Government	6	1	4	1	0
	Government-assisted	23	20	3	0	0
	Private	3	1	1	1	0
St. Patrick	Total	26	19	5	1	1
	Government	7	5	2	0	0
	Government-assisted	16	13	2	0	1
	Private	3	1	1	1	0
Tobago	Total	16	12	3	1	0
J -	Government	5	3	2	D .	
	Government-assisted	8	7	1		0
	Private	3	2	Ū.	1	0

\* Caribbean Secondary Education Certificate

# 

- \_
- -\_

- \_

- -

- \_
- \_

	Percentage of Teachers by I	cuucational distric	а, туре от ъспоота	nd Algnest Level	of mathematics Eq	ucation
	<b>T C L L</b>	<b>.</b> .		Hiohest level of ma	thematics education	1
Educational district	lype of school	lotal	CSEC*/0'level	A'level	Associate deoree	Bachelor's deoree
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		100	71	77	4	7
All districts	All SCRUUIS	100	// EC	23	4	<u> </u>
		100	30	30 47	4	4
	bovernment-assisted	100	81			
		100	48	<b>26</b>		4
Port of Spain	lotal	100	64	24	9	<u>ሪ</u>
	Government	100	67	22	U	11
	Government-assisted	100	76	18	6	U
	Private	100	29	43	29	U
St. George East	lotal	100	80	15	3	3
	Government	100	60	30	0	10
	Government-assisted	100	91	9	0	0
	Private	100	71	14	14	0
North Eastern	Total	100	67	33	0	0
	Government	100	100	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	62	38	0	0
	Private	100	0	100	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	75	20	0	5
	Government	100	0	100	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	93	7	0	0
	Private	100	50	0	0	50
Caroni	Total	100	63	31	3	3
	Government	100	50	38	13	0
	Government-assisted	100	65	30	0	5
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
Victoria	Total	100	69	25	6	0
	Government	100	17	67	17	0
	Government-assisted	100	97	13	0	0
	Private	100	33	33	33	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	73	19	4	4
	Government	100	71	29	Ū.	0
	Government-assisted	100	81	13	Π	6
	Private	100	33	33		
Tobaoo	Total	100	75	19	<u> </u>	 
	Government	100 100	60 60	4N	n	n
	Government-assisted	100 100	88	13	П	n
	Private	100 100	67	П	33	Π

The majority (71%) of primary school teachers reported CSEC/O'Level as their highest educational attainment in mathematics (Table 5), and a similar percentage (69%) had a Teacher's diploma as the highest professional qualification (Table 6). A further review of the data by type of school shows that over one-third (36%) of the teachers in government primary schools held A'level qualification in mathematics; in the private schools 26% reported A'level and 22% had an Associate degree as their highest qualification in mathematics. Over 90% of the teachers in government and government-assisted primary schools were professionally qualified while one-quarter (26%) of the teachers in the private primary schools held no such qualification (Table 6a). The data also show that only 8% of primary school teachers held the B.Ed degree, mostly with teaching experience of 10 years and over (Table 7), and with CSEC or its equivalent as their highest qualification in mathematics (Table 8).





Source: Table 5a

Educational	Total	CSEC/O'level	A'level	Associate	Bachelor's
district	Teachers			degree	degree
All districts	100	71	23	4	2
Port of Spain	100	64	24	9	3
St. George Eas	100	80	15	3	3
North Eastern	100	67	33	0	0
South Eastern	100	75	20	0	5
Caroni	100	63	31	3	3
Victoria	100	69	25	6	0
St. Patrick	100	73	19	4	4
Tobago	100	75	19	6	0

# Table 6. Number of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Professional Training

				ŀ	lighest level a	of profession	al training	
Educational district	Type of school	Total	None	Teacher's diploma	Certificate in education	Diploma in education	B.Ed	M.Ed
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
AU 1	AU 1 1							
All districts	All schools	213	15	148	17	10	18	4
	Government	52	2	37	4	2	5	2
	Government-assisted	134	6	100	8	6	12	2
	Private	27	7	11	5	2	1	0
Port of Spain	lotal	33	4	24	3	1	1	U
	Government	9	1	7	U ,	U	1	U
	Government-assisted	17	U	15	1	1	U	U
	Private	7	3	2	2	U .	U	U
St. George East	lotal	39	5	23	5	1	3	1
	Government	10	1	6	1	Ū	1	1
	Government-assisted	22	2	15	2	1	2	0
	Private	7	2	2	2	0	0	0
North Eastern	Total	18	2	13	0	1	1	1
	Government	4	0	4	0	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	13	2	9	0	1	0	1
	Private	1	۵	۵	0	0	1	0
South Eastern	Total	20	1	14	2	0	3	0
	Government	3	0	2	0	0	1	0
	Government-assisted	15	1	10	2	0	2	0
	Private	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Caroni	Total	29	0	23	3	0	3	0
	Government	8	0	5	2	0	1	0
	Government-assisted	20	0	17	1	0	2	0
	Private	1	۵	1	0	0	0	0
Victoria	Total	32	1	24	2	2	1	2
	Government	6	0	4	1	0	0	1
	Government-assisted	23	0	19	1	1	1	1
	Private	3	1	1	0	1	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	26	2	21	0	1	2	0
	Government	7	0	7	0	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	16	1	12	0	1	2	0
	Private	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
Tobago	Total	16	۵	6	2	4	4	0
	Government	5	0	2	0	2	1	0
	Government-assisted	8	0	3	1	1	3	0
	Private	3	0	1	1	1	0	0

Not stated	
(8)	
1 0 0	
0	
0	
0	
1	
0	
U	
<u> </u>	
Π	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
U	
U	
Π	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
U	
<u> </u>	
Π	
0	
0	

# Table Ga. Percentage of Teachers by Educational District, Type of School and Highest Level of Professional Training

					Highest level	of profession	nal training	
Educational district	Type of school	Total	Nana	Teacher's	Certificate	Diploma in	R C4	MEA
			NUILE	diploma	in education	education	U.LU	M.LU
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
All districts	All schools	100	7	69	8	5	8	2
	Government	100	4	71	8	4	9	4
	Government-assisted	100	4	75	6	5	9	1
	Private	100	26	41	18	7	4	0
Port of Spain	Total	100	12	73	9	3	3	0
	Government	100	11	78	0	0	11	0
	Government-assisted	100	0	88	6	6	0	0
	Private	100	43	29	29	0	0	0
St. George East	Total	100	13	59	13	3	8	3
	Government	100	10	60	10	0	10	10
	Government-assisted	100	9	68	9	5	9	0
	Private	100	29	29	29	0	0	0
North Eastern	Total	100	11	72	0	6	6	6
	Government	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	15	69	0	8	0	8
	Private	100	0	0	0	0	100	0
South Eastern	Total	100	5	70	10	0	15	0
	Government	100	0	67	0	0	33	0
	Government-assisted	100	7	67	13	0	13	0
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
Caroni	Total	100	0	79	10	0	10	0
	Government	100	0	63	25	0	13	0
	Government-assisted	100	0	85	5	0	10	0
	Private	100	0	100	0	0		0
Victoria	Total	100	3	75	6	6	3	6
	Government	100	0	67	17	0	0	17
	Government-assisted	100	0	83	4	4	4	4
	Private	100	33	33	0	33	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	8	81	0	4	8	0
	Government	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	6	75	0	6	13	0
	Private	100	33	67	0	0	0	0
Tobago	Total	100	0	38	13	25	25	0
J-	Government	100	Ū	40		40	20	0
	Government-assisted	100		38	13	13	38	[]
	Private	100	0	33	33	33	0	0

Not stated
(8)
1
П
0
4
0
0
0
0
3
0
0
14
U
U
Π
Π
л П
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
U
U
U N
Π
U





Source: Table Ga

Educational	None	Teacher's	Certificate in	Diploma in	B.Ed	M.Ed	Not stated
All districts	7	69	8	5	8	2	1
Port of Spain	12	73	9	3	3	0	0
St. George Ea:	13	59	13	3	8	3	3
North Eastern	11	72	0	6	6	6	0
South Eastern	5	70	10	0	15	0	0
Caroni	0	79	10	0	10	0	0
Victoria	3	75	6	6	3	6	0
St. Patrick	8	81	0	4	8	0	0
Tobago	0	38	13	25	25	0	D
# Table 7. Number of Teachers by Years of Service and Highest Level of Professional Training

		Highest level of professional training						
Years of service	Total	Nono	Teacher's	Certificate in	Diploma in	BEY	MEA	Not stated
		NUILE	diploma	education	education	U.LU	M.LU	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Total	213	15	148	17	10	18	4	1
0-4 years	8	5	2	0	1	0	0	0
5-9 years	44	3	29	3	5	2	1	1
10-14 years	42	3	31	2	0	5	1	0
15 years and over	119	4	86	12	4	11	2	0

## Table 7a. Percentage of Teachers by Years of Service and Highest Level of Professional Training

		Highest level of professional training						
Years of service	Total	None	Teacher's diploma	Certificate in education	Diploma in education	B.Ed	M.Ed	Not stated
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Total	100	7	69	8	5	8	2	0
0-4 years	100	63	25	0	13	0	0	0
5-9 years	100	7	66	7	11	5	2	2
10-14 years	100	7	74	5	0	12	2	0
15 years and over	100	3	72	10	3	9	2	0



	TADIE D. NUMBER DI TEACHERS BY CU	icational Disti N	sı, mynesi	LEVEI UI MALIIG	illatics cuucat		22101191 11 911	illiy
					Highest leve	l of profession:	al training	
Educational district	Highest level of mathematics education	Total	N	Teacher's	Certificate in	Diploma in	חנז	мгл
			None	diploma	education	education	B.Ed	M.Ed
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
	T-1-1	040	<u>ر</u>		477	10	-	,
All districts		213		148	1/		18	4
		150	8			Ď		2
	Alevel	49	5	31	5	1	5	Z
	Associate degree	9	1	4	2	1	U	U
	Bachelor's degree	5	U	2	U o	<u> </u>	3	U
Port of Spain		33	4	24	3	1	1	U
	USEC/Ullevel	21	2	17	U	1	1	U
	Allevel	8	1	5	2	U	U	U
	Associate degree	3	1	1	1	U	U	U
	Bachelor's degree	1	U r	1		U .	U	U
St. George East	lotal	39	5	23	5	1	3	1
	USEC/U'level	31	3	22	3	1	Z	U ,
	A'level	6	2	1	2	U	U	1
	Associate degree	1	U		U	U	U	U
	Bachelor's degree	1	U	L I	U	U .	1	U
North Eastern	lotal	18	2	13	U	1	1	1
	USEC/U'level	12	2	8 -	U	1	U	1
	A'level	6	U	5	U	U	1	U
	Associate degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	0	0		0	0	0	0
South Eastern	Total	20	1	14	2	0	3	0
	CSEC/O'level	15	1	11	2	0	1	0
	A'level	4	0	2	0	0	2	0
	Associate degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Caroni	Total	29	0	23	3	0	3	0
	CSEC/O'level	18	0	14	2	0	2	0
	A'level	9	0	8	1	0	0	0
	Associate degree	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Victoria	Total	32	1	24	2	2	1	2
	CSEC/O'level	22	0	18	1	1	1	1
	A'level	8	1	6	0	0	0	1
	Associate degree	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	26	2	21		1	2	0
	CSEC/O'level	19	1	17	0	0	1	0
	A'level	5	1	3	0	1	0	0
	Associate degree	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Tobago	Total	16	0	6	2	4	4	0
	CSEC/O'level	12	0	4	2	4	2	0
	A'level	3	0	1	0	0	2	0
	Associate degree	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's deoree	D		0	0	0	0	0

1 5 14

A 4 10 1

1.77

. ....

T-I-I- D N----I-

с **т** 

. . .

Not stated	
(8)	
1	
0	
0	
1	
<u>U</u>	
0	
0	
0	
0	
1	
U N	
u 1	
Ū	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
U	
Π	
Ū	
0	
0	
0	
U	
<u> </u>	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
U	
Π	
Π	

	able ba. Percentage of Teacher's by Euc	icational dis	unci, nigiles	SC LEVELUI MALI	iematics cuucat	IUIT AITU FI'UTES	sional n'an	IIIIY
					Highest level a	of professional ti	raining	
Educational district	Highest level of mathematics education	Total	M	Teacher's	Certificate in	Diploma in	חרו	мгі
			None	diploma	education	education	B.E0	M.Ed
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
All	T_+_1	100	-			-		
All districts		100		63 7/	ă 7	5 r	ă 7	Z
	L'ALL A IGAGI	100	6	/4	/	а п	/	
		100	10	64		2 4		4
	Associate degree	100		43	22	"	U	U
	Dachelor's degree		U 10	4U 70		U n	<b>6U</b>	U n
Port of Spain			1Z 10	/3 D1	9 0	ن د	ى د	U
			10	ום נים	U 90	а п	о П	U
	A IEVEI A a a a siste da una a		دا مى	دם مە	23 00	U	U	U
	Associate degree		<u>зэ</u> п	دد ۱۳۳	оо П	U n	U	U
St Coonce Fact	Dachelor's degree	100	U 12		U 17	U 7	U Q	U Ç
ar. Deorge cast			ы 10	33 71	ы 10	о Л	0 C	ъ п
	LULU/ U IEVEI A'loval		1U 77	/1	1U 77	ы П	D N	U 17
	A level Associate despes		оо П	и П	دد П	U N	U N	и П
	Associate degree Rachalor's degree		n n	Π	Π	υ	и 100	U N
North Fastern	Total		11	U 77	<u> </u>	6	6	о Б
		100	17	67	Π	D R	Π	g
		100	п	ם גם	Π	Π	17	п
	A isvei Associate degree	иш П	п	Π	Π	П	и П	п
	Rachelor's degree	Π	п	Π	Π	п	п	п
South Fastern	Total	100	5	70		о П	15	Π
		100	7	73	13	n N	7	n
		100	, n	50	n N	n	, 50	л П
	Associate deoree	лоо П	П	П	л П	n	П	n
	Rachelor's degree	100	n N	100	n N	n N	Π	n
Caroni	Total	100	0	79	10	0	10	0
	CSEC/O'level	100	0	78	11	0	11	0
	A'level	100	0	89	11	0	0	0
	Associate degree	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	100	۵	0	0	0	100	0
Victoria	Total	100	3	75	6	6	3	6
	CSEC/O'level	100	0	81	5	5	5	5
	A'level	100	13	75	0	0	0	13
	Associate degree	100	0	0	50	50	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	8	81	0	4	8	0
	CSEC/O'level	100	5	89	0	0	5	0
	A'level	100	20	60	0	20	0	0
	Associate degree	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	100	0	0	0	0	100	0
Tobago	Total	100	٥	38	13	25	25	0
	CSEC/O'level	100	0	33	17	33	17	0
	A'level	100	0	33	0	0	67	0
	Associate degree	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
	Bachelor's degree	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Nnt	
stated	
(8)	
(1)	
1	
0	
0	
11	
0	
0	
0	
Π	
Π	
Π	
Π	
Π	
100	
П	
Π	
U N	
U	
U	
<u> </u>	
U	
U	
U	
U	
U	
U	
U	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
0	
D	
0	



Source: Table 8a

	Table 5. U	ISEQ I	Mathematics Textbook by Couca	tional District and Standard
	C+		T=+=l	Use mathematics textbook
Equcational district	Standard		10131	Yes
	(1)		(2)	(3)
All districts	abrehneta IIA	ı	100	94
All ulati ibta	hrehnet?	1	100	91
	Standard	7	100	91
	Standard	3	100	96
	Standard	4	100	97
	Standard	5	100	95
Port of Spain	Total		100	91
·	Standard	1	100	86
	Standard	2	100	100
	Standard	3	100	100
	Standard	4	100	83
	Standard	5	100	86
St. George East	Total		100	92
	Standard	1	100	89
	Standard	2	100	90
	Standard	3	100	100
	Standard	4	100	100
	Standard	5	100	86
North Eastern	Total		100	94
	Standard	1	100	75
	Standard	2	100	100
	Standard	3	100	100
	Standard	4	100	100
	Standard	5	100	100
South Eastern	Total		100	90
	Standard	1	100	100
	Standard	2	100	75
	Standard	3	100	75
	Standard	4	100	100
	Standard	5	100	100
Caroni	Total		100	100
	Standard	1	100	100
	Standard	2	100	100
	Standard	3	100	100
	Standard	4	100	100
	Standard	5	100	100

: - percentage of teachers
No
(4)
r.
3
5
4
3
<u> </u>
9
14
U n
U U
1/
14
8
11
10
U
L
14
b or
25
U
U
IU a
25
25
0
0
0
0

ladie 5. used Mathematics Textodok by coucational District and Standard (continued)						
			lles mathematics textback - appendices of teachara			
Educational district	Standard	Total				
	(1)		1es	ND		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
Victoria	Total	100	97	3		
	Standard 1	100	100	0		
	Standard 2	100	88	13		
	Standard 3	100	100	0		
	Standard 4	100	100	0		
	Standard 5	100	100	0		
St. Patrick	Total	100	92	8		
	Standard 1	100	83	17		
	Standard 2	100	80	20		
	Standard 3	100	100	0		
	Standard 4	100	100	0		
	Standard 5	100	100	0		
Tobago	Total	100	94	6		
	Standard 1	100	100	0		
	Standard 2	100	100	0		
	Standard 3	100	67	33		
	Standard 4	100	100	0		
	Standard 5	100	100	0		

**T 11 0 11** 

Over ninety percent (94%) of the teachers used textbooks to teach mathematics (Table 9) despite a substantial proportion (63%) who indicated that the texts were inadequate, especially in the lower standards, 1 and 2, (Table 11). While a similar pattern of textbook usage was observed by type of school, over a half (56%) of the teachers in private primary schools stated that the texts were adequate compared to approximately one-third in the government (35%) and government-assisted schools (30%) (Table 12).





Source: Table 9

Educational district	Yes	No
All districts	94	6
Port of Spain	91	9
St. George East	92	8
North Eastern	94	6
South Eastern	90	10
Caroni	100	0
Victoria	97	3
St. Patrick	92	8
Tobago	94	6

	Table 10. Used Mathematics Textbook by Type of School and Standard						
Type of appeal	Ctandand	Tatal	Used textbook to teach mathematics - percentage of teachers				
		TULAT	Yes	No			
		(1)	(2)	(3)			
All schools	All standards	100	94	6			
	Standard 1	100	91	9			
	Standard 2	100	91	9			
	Standard 3	100	95	5			
	Standard 4	100	97	3			
	Standard 5	100	95	5			
Government	Total	100	90	10			
	Standard 1	100	82	18			
	Standard 2	100	89	11			
	Standard 3	100	100	0			
	Standard 4	100	100	0			
	Standard 5	100	83	17			
Government-assisted	Total	100	96	4			
	Standard 1	100	97	3			
	Standard 2	100	90	10			
	Standard 3	100	96	4			
	Standard 4	100	96	4			
	Standard 5	100	100	0			
Private	Total	100	93	7			
	Standard 1	100	83	17			
	Standard 2	100	100	0			
	Standard 3	100	83	17			
	Standard 4	100	100	0			
	Standard 5	100	100	0			



	Yes	No
All schools	94	6
Government	90	10
Government-a	96	4
Private	93	7

Table 11. Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Educational District and Standard						
Educational distaist	Standard	Tatal		Adequacy - perce	ntage of teachers	
	21911091.0	TULAT	Yes	No	Somewhat	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	All standards	100	35	63	1	1
	Standard 1	100	12	81	2	5
	Standard 2	100	18	80	3	0
	Standard 3	100	40	60	0	0
	Standard 4	100	51	49	0	0
	Standard 5	100	56	44	0	0
Port of Spain	Total	100	40	60	0	0
	Standard 1	100	33	67	0	0
	Standard 2	100	0	100	0	0
	Standard 3	100	38	63	0	0
	Standard 4	100	60	40	0	0
	Standard 5	100	67	33	0	0
St. George East	Total	100	31	67	3	0
	Standard 1	100	0	100	0	0
	Standard 2	100	11	78	11	0
	Standard 3	100	14	86	0	0
	Standard 4	100	67	33	0	0
	Standard 5	100	83	17	0	0
North Eastern	Total	100	29	.71	0	0
	Standard 1	100	0	100	0	0
	Standard 2	100	0	100	0	0
	Standard 3	100	75	25	0	0
	Standard 4	100	0	100	0	
	Standard 5	100	67	33		
South Eastern	lotal	100	33	67	U	
	Standard 1	100		100	U	
	Standard 2	100	100	U	U	U
	Standard 3	100	33	67	U	L L
	Standard 4	100	20	80	U	U
	Standard 5	100	25	75	U C	U C
Caroni	lotal	100	34	66	U	
	Standard 1	100	Ű	100	U	
	Standard Z	100	Ű	100	U C	
	Standard 3	100	67	33	U	
	Standard 4	100	33	67	U	
	Standard 5	100	67	33	U	L L

## Table 11. Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Educational District and Standard (continued)

	0, 1, 1	Til	Adequacy - percentage of teachers			
Educational district	Standard	Iotai	Yes	No	Somewhat	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Victoria	Total	100	35	58	3	3
	Standard 1	100	14	57	14	14
	Standard 2	100	29	71	0	0
	Standard 3	100	29	71	0	0
	Standard 4	100	75	25	0	0
	Standard 5	100	50	50	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	46	54	0	0
	Standard 1	100	20	80	0	0
	Standard 2	100	25	75	0	0
	Standard 3	100	40	60	0	0
	Standard 4	100	100	0	0	0
	Standard 5	100	40	60	0	0
	Total	100	27	67	0	7
Tobago	Standard 1	100	25	50	0	25
	Standard 2	100	0	100	0	0
	Standard 3	100	50	50	0	0
	Standard 4	100	33	67	0	0
	Standard 5	100	33	67	0	0





Source: Table 11

	Yes	No	Somewhat	Not stated
All districts	35	63	1	1
Port of Spain	40	60	0	0
St. George East	31	67	3	0
North Eastern	29	71	0	0
South Eastern	33	67	0	0
Caroni	34	66	0	0
Victoria	35	58	3	3
St. Patrick	46	54	0	0
Tobago	27	67	0	7

# Table 12. Adequacy of Mathematics Textbook by Type of School and Standard

Type of school	Standard		Total					
//				Yes	No	Somewhat	Not stated	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
All schools	All standard	S	100	35	63	1	1	
	Standard	1	100	12	81	2	5	
	Standard	2	100	18	80	3	0	
	Standard	3	100	40	60	0	0	
	Standard	4	100	51	49	0	0	
	Standard	5	100	56	44	0	0	
Government	Total		100	36	62	0	2	
	Standard	1	100	22	67	0	11	
	Standard	2	100	13	88	0	D	
	Standard	3	100	30	70	0	D	
	Standard	4	100	40	60	0	0	
	Standard	5	100	70	30	0	D	
Government-assisted	Total		100	30	67	2	1	
	Standard	1	100	4	89	4	4	
	Standard	2	100	15	81	4	D	
	Standard	3	100	44	56	0	D	
	Standard	4	100	55	45	0	D	
	Standard	5	100	42	58	0	D	
Private	Total		100	56	44	0	0	
	Standard	1	100	40	60	0	0	
	Standard	2	100	40	60	0	D	
	Standard	3	100	40	60	0	0	
	Standard	4	100	60	40	0	0	
	Standard	5	100	100	0	0	П	



	Yes	No	Somewhat	Not stated	
All schools	35	63	1	1	
Government	36	62	0	2	
Government-a	30	67	2	1	
Private	56	44	0	0	

Table 13. How Mathematics Textbook Used by Educational District and Standard						
				How textbook used - p	ercentage of teachers	
Educational district	All standards		Total	As the primary basis	As a supplementary resource	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	
All districts	All standards		100	14	87	
	Standard 1	1	100	12	88	
	Standard 2	2	100	5	95	
	Standard 3	3	100	17	83	
	Standard 4	4	100	14	86	
	Standard S	5	100	21	79	
Port of Spain	Total		100	13	87	
	Standard 1		100	33	67	
	Standard Z	2	100	D	100	
	Standard 3	3	100	13	88	
	Standard 4	4	100	D	100	
	Standard S	5	100	17	83	
St. George East	Total		100	25	75	
	Standard 1		100	13	88	
	Standard 2	2	100	11	89	
	Standard 3	3	100	14	86	
	Standard 4	4	100	50	50	
	Standard S	5	100	50	50	
North Eastern	Total		100	24	76	
	Standard 1		100	33	67	
	Standard 2	Z	100	0	100	
	Standard 3	3	100	50	50	
	Standard 4	4	100	0	100	
	Standard S	5	100	33	67	
South Eastern	Total		100	17	83	
	Standard 1		100	0	100	
	Standard 2	Z	100	33	67	
	Standard 3	3	100	33	67	
	Standard 4	4	100	0	100	
	Standard S	5	100	25	75	
Caroni	Total		100	7	93	
	Standard 1		100	0	100	
	Standard 2	2	100	0	100	
	Standard 3	3	100	17	83	
	Standard 4	4	100	0	100	
	Standard S	5	100	17	83	

Table 13.	Table 13. How Mathematics Textbook Used by Educational District and Standard (continued)						
			How textbook used - p	ercentage of teachers			
Educational district	All standards	Total		As a supplementary			
			As the primary basis	resource			
		(1)	(2)	(3)			
Victoria	Total	100	3	97			
	Standard 1	100	0	100			
	Standard 2	100	0	100			
	Standard 3	100	0	100			
	Standard 4	100	25	75			
	Standard 5	100	0	100			
St. Patrick	Total	100	8	92			
	Standard 1	100	20	80			
	Standard 2	100	0	100			
	Standard 3	100	20	80			
	Standard 4	100	0	100			
	Standard 5	100	0	100			
Tobago	Total	100	13	87			
	Standard 1	100	0	100			
	Standard 2	100	0	100			
	Standard 3	100	0	100			
	Standard 4	100	33	67			
	Standard 5	100	33	67			

The majority of teachers (87%) used mathematics textbooks as a supplementary resource (Table 13). By educational districts, onequarter of the teachers in St. George East (25%) and North Eastern (24%), and similarly in the private primary schools (24%) (Table 14), used texts as the primary basis for teaching mathematics.





Source: Table 13

As the primary basis	As a supplementary resource
14	87
13	87
25	75
24	76
17	83
7	93
3	97
8	92
13	87
	As the primary basis 14 13 25 24 17 7 3 8 8 13

	Table 14. How M	ather	matics Textbook Used t	iy Type of School and Standard
			Til	How textbook used - pr
lype of school	All standard	S	lotal	As the primary basis
			(1)	(2)
All schools	All standards		100	14
	Standard	1	100	12
	Standard	2	100	5
	Standard	3	100	17
	Standard	4	100	14
	Standard	5	100	21
Government	Total		100	6
	Standard	1	100	0
	Standard	2	100	0
	Standard	3	100	20
	Standard	4	100	10
	Standard	5	100	0
Government-assisted	Total		100	14
	Standard	1	100	7
	Standard	2	100	4
	Standard	3	100	19
	Standard	4	100	14
	Standard	5	100	29
Private	Total		100	24
	Standard	1	100	60
	Standard	2	100	20
	Standard	3	100	0
	Standard	4	100	20
	Standard	5	100	20



ercentage of teachers
As a supplementary resource
(3)
87
88
95
82
86
70
/3
54
100
100
80
90
100
86
93
96
81
86
71
76
40
80
100
80
80



	As the primary basis	As a supplementary
		resource
All schools	14	87
Government	6	94
Government-assiste	14	86
Private	24	76

#### Table 15. Suggestions for the Improvement of Mathematics Texts by Educational District

	Improvement of mathematics texts - percentage of teachers							
Educational district	Better quality	More activities/assessment	Graded approach in terms	I				
	illustrations/print	exercises	of age-group/ability	in agreement with syllabus				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)				
All districts	24	70	36	41				
Port of Spain	30	80	27	27				
St. George East	19	81	28	44				
North Eastern	24	82	24	18				
South Eastern	39	72	28	61				
Caroni	10	59	52	48				
Victoria	23	58	45	48				
St. Patrick	17	71	46	29				
Tobago	40	53	33	47				

On the improvement of mathematics texts, a significant proportion (70%) of teachers stated that the prescribed texts should contain more activities/assessment exercises. Two-fifths (41%) of the teachers suggested that texts should be in agreement with the syllabus while over one-third (36%) indicated that they should be graded in terms of age-group/ability.



#### Time spent - percentage of teachers Educational district Total Activity 1-2 hours 2-4 hours None <1 hour >4 hours (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) All districts Preparing or grading students tests or exams Meeting with students outside of classroom time Planning lessons by yourself Professional reading and development activity Administrative tasks including staff meetings Meeting with parents Port of Spain Preparing or grading students tests or exams Meeting with students outside of classroom time Planning lessons by yourself 1NN Professional reading and development activity Administrative tasks including staff meetings 1NN 1NN Π Π Meeting with parents Preparing or grading students tests or exams St. George East Ο Meeting with students outside of classroom time Planning lessons by yourself Professional reading and development activity Π Administrative tasks including staff meetings 1NN Meeting with parents Preparing or grading students tests or exams Б North Eastern Б Meeting with students outside of classroom time Planning lessons by yourself 1NN Б Professional reading and development activity Administrative tasks including staff meetings Meeting with parents Preparing or grading students tests or exams Π South Eastern Meeting with students outside of classroom time Planning lessons by yourself Professional reading and development activity ſN Π Administrative tasks including staff meetings INN Meeting with parents Preparing or grading students tests or exams Caroni Meeting with students outside of classroom time Planning lessons by yourself Professional reading and development activity Administrative tasks including staff meetings Meeting with parents

#### Table 16. Time Spent per Week on Teaching Activities Outside the Formal School Day by Educational District

Not <u>stated</u> (7) <b>3</b> <b>3</b> <b>1</b> <b>3</b> <b>7</b> <b>4</b> <b>3</b> <b>9</b> <b>0</b> <b>6</b> <b>12</b> <b>3</b> <b>9</b> <b>0</b> <b>6</b> <b>12</b> <b>3</b> <b>9</b> <b>0</b> <b>6</b> <b>12</b> <b>3</b> <b>9</b> <b>0</b> <b>6</b> <b>12</b> <b>3</b> <b>9</b> <b>0</b> <b>6</b> <b>12</b> <b>3</b> <b>9</b> <b>0</b> <b>6</b> <b>12</b> <b>3</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b> <b>0</b>		
Not       stated       (7)       3       3       1       3       7       4       3       9       0       6       12       3       0	N_+	
stated     (7)     3     1     3     7     4     3     9     0     6     12     3     0     6     12     3     0 <		
() 3 3 1 3 7 4 3 9 0 6 12 3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	<u>stated</u>	
<b>3</b> <b>1</b> <b>3</b> <b>7</b> <b>4</b> 3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	(7)	
<b>3</b> <b>1</b> <b>3</b> <b>7</b> <b>4</b> 3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3	
1       3       9       0       6       12       3       0 <t< td=""><td>3</td><td></td></t<>	3	
<b>3</b> <b>7</b> <b>4</b> 3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1	
7 4 3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	3	
4 3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	7	
3 9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	4	
9 0 6 12 3 0 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3	
0 6 12 3 0 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	9	
6 12 3 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
12 3 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 0	6	
3 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	12	
0 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0	3	
0 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
0 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
5 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
5 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5	
0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	5	
0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
0 0 0 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0	0	
0 0 5 0 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
U 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	
U 5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	U	
5 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0		
U 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0	ն Ր	
5 5 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	U E	
5 5 0 0 0 0 0	ם ב	
5 0 0 0 0 0	J G	
	5	
0 0 0 0	0	
0 0 0	Ū	
0 0	0	
0	0	
	0	

### Table 16. Time Spent per Week on Teaching Activities Outside the Formal School Day by Educational District (continued)

				Time spent - percentage of teachers						
Educational district		Activity	Total	None	<1 hour	1-2 hours	2-4 hours	>4 hours	Not stated	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Victoria	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exams	100	6	25	41	6	13	9	
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom time	100	19	38	19	16	6	3	
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100	0	22	47	19	13	0	
	4	Professional reading and development activity	100	3	28	47	9	9	3	
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100	19	41	31	3	0	6	
	6	Meeting with parents	100	13	53	16	9	3	6	
St. Patrick	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exams	100	12	12	54	8	12	4	
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom time	100	19	50	12	8	12	0	
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100	0	19	54	23	4	0	
	4	Professional reading and development activity	100	8	31	38	15	4	4	
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100	19	42	27	0	4	8	
	6	Meeting with parents	100	15	65	12	4	0	4	
Tobago	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exams	100	0	0	44	44	6	6	
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom time	100	6	31	31	19	0	13	
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100	0	6	19	44	25	6	
	4	Professional reading and development activity	100	6	13	31	13	25	13	
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100	0	31	38	6	6	19	
	6	Meeting with parents	100	6	44	38	0	0	13	

The table shows that, of the above activities, the majority of teachers devoted one to two hours weekly in each case to preparing or grading students' tests or examinations (50%), planning lessons (45%) and professional reading and development (34%). Of the sample of teachers surveyed, over a half spent no time or less than one hour on meetings with students outside of classroom time (57%); and on administrative tasks including staff meetings (54%) the least time was spent meeting with parents.



# Table 17. Time Spent per Week on Teaching Activities Dutside the Formal School Day by Type of School

	Activity			Time spent - percentage of teachers					
Type of school				N	ر المعرب	1-2	2-4	>4	Not
				Norie	<ו חטער	hours	hours	hours	stated
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
All schools	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exam	100	4	16	50	19	7	3
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom t	100	17	42	23	11	5	3
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100	1	19	45	23	11	1
	4	Professional reading and development activit	100	4	27	34	18	14	3
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100	14	40	30	6	4	7
-	6	Meeting with parents	100	15	54	22	5	1	4
Government	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exams	100	12	× ×	56	19	2	4
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom time	100	13	40	27	12	4	4
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100	4	19	44	19	12	2
	4	Professional reading and development activity	100	10	21	29	17	17	6
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100	17	40	27	2	4	10
	Б	Meeting with parents	100	12	60	21	4	2	2
Government-assisted	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exams	100	1	19	49	21	7	2
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom time	100	19	44	19	11	4	3
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100	1	19	46	22	11	1
	4	Professional reading and development activity	100	3	28	38	16	12	3
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100	16	43	28	Б	2	5
	Б	Meeting with parents	100	16	53	21	4	1	4
Private	1	Preparing or grading students tests or exams	100	4	19	48	11	11	7
	2	Meeting with students outside of classroom time	100	15	33	30	'/	15	U
	3	Planning lessons by yourself	100		15	41	33		
	4	Protessional reading and development activity			33	26	26	15	
	5	Administrative tasks including staff meetings	100		26	44	11	11	7
	6	Meeting with parents	100	11	48	26	7		7

#### Table 18. Meetings with Parents About Student's Achievement in Mathematics by Educational District and Type of School

			Frequency of meetings - percentage of teachers					
Educational district	Type of school	Total	Once a week	Once a month	Once a term	Once a year	Never	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
All districts	Total	100	15	32	46	1	2	4
	Government	100	13	33	50	0	2	2
	Government-assisted	100	16	29	47	1	2	4
	Private	100	19	48	30	0	0	4
Port of Spain	Total	100	15	30	45	3	0	6
	Government	100	11	22	56	0	۵	11
	Government-assisted	100	12	29	47	6	0	6
	Private	100	29	43	29	0	0	0
St. George East	Total	100	21	38	33	0	3	5
	Government	100	30	40	30	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	18	41	32	0	5	5
	Private	100	14	29	43	0	0	14
North Eastern	Total	100	11	50	39	0	0	0
	Government	100	0	75	25	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	8	46	46	0	0	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	5	25	65	0	0	5
	Government	100	0	0	100	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	7	20	67	0	0	7
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
Caroni	Total	100	28	21	45	3	3	0
	Government	100	25	25	38	0	13	0
	Government-assisted	100	30	15	50	5	0	0
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
Victoria	Total	100	19	22	56	0	0	3
	Government	100	0	33	67	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	22	17	57	0	0	4
	Private	100	33	33	33	0	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	8	50	31	0	8	4
	Government	100	14	43	43	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	6	44	31	0	13	6
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
Tobago	Total	100	6	25	63	0	0	6
	Government	100	0	20	80	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	13	25	50	0	0	13
	Private	100	0	33	67	0	0	0

The modal frequency with which teachers (46%) informed parents about student's achievement in mathematics was once a term. Similar information was conveyed by one-third (32%) of the teachers monthly. By educational district, the data reveal that a half (50%) of the teachers in North Eastern and St. Patrick held monthly discussions with parents. A further review of the data by type of school shows that teachers in the private primary schools met more frequently with parents than their counterparts in the government and government-assisted schools.





Source: Table 18

	Once a week	Once a month	Once a term	Once a year	Never
All districts	15	32	46	1	2
Port of Spain	15	30	45	3	0
St. George Ea:	21	38	33	0	3
North Eastern	11	50	39	0	0
South Eastern	5	25	65	0	0
Caroni	28	21	45	3	3
Victoria	19	22	56	0	0
St. Patrick	8	50	31	0	8
Tobago	6	25	63	0	0

## Not stated

			Frequency of meetings - percented of teachers					
Educational district	Type of school	Total						
	.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Once a week	month	Once a term	Once a year	Never	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
						_		
All districts	All schools	100	24	22	30	5	16	3
	Government	100	15	23	46	2	8	6
	Government-assisted	100	25	21	24	4	22	3
	Private	100	33	26	26	11	4	<u> </u>
Port of Spain	All schools	100	24	15	30	6	21	3
	Government	100	11	U	78	U	11	U
	Government-assisted	100	24	24	12	6	29	6
	Private	100	43	14	14	14	14	U
St. George East	All schools	100	38	18	33	5	5	0
	Government	100	30	30	40	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	45	9	32	5	9	0
	Private	100	29	29	29	14	0	0
North Eastern	All schools	100	6	39	17	0	39	0
	Government	100	0	50	25	0	25	0
	Government-assisted	100	0	38	15	0	46	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0	0	۵
South Eastern	All schools	100	20	30	20	5	15	10
	Government	100	33	0	33	0	33	0
	Government-assisted	100	20	27	20	7	13	13
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
Caroni	All schools	100	17	17	38	3	21	3
	Government	100	13	13	50	0	13	13
	Government-assisted	100	20	15	35	5	25	0
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	0
Victoria	All schools	100	25	16	31	9	19	0
	Government	100	17	0	83	0	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	26	22	17	9	26	0
	Private	100	33	0	33	33	0	۵
St. Patrick	All schools	100	15	35	35	0	12	4
	Government	100	14	57	14	0	0	14
	Government-assisted	100	19	25	38	0	19	0
	Private	100	0	33	67	0	0	0
Tobago	All schools	100	38	19	19	6	6	13
	Government	100	0	40	20	20	0	20
	Government-assisted	100	50	13	13	0	13	13
	Private	100	67	0	33	0	Ω	0

Table 19. Meetings with other Teachers by Educational District and Type of School

Approximately one-third (30%) of the sample of primary school mathematics teachers indicated that meetings were held once a term with other teachers to discuss and plan curriculum or teaching approaches. Such meetings were also convened on a weekly (24%) and monthly (22%) basis. A further review of the data by educational district indicates that teachers in St. George East (38%) and Tobago (38%) held discussions more frequently than their counterparts in the other educational districts.

- 1
- \_
- \_

- \_
- \_
- -
- \_
- \_
- -
- \_
- \_
- -




Source: Table 19

Educational district	Once a week	Once a	Once a term
All districts	24	22	30
Port of Spain	24	15	30
St. George East	38	18	33
North Eastern	6	39	17
South Eastern	20	30	20
Caroni	17	17	38
Victoria	25	16	31
St. Patrick	15	35	35
Tobago	38	19	19

Once a year	Never	Not stated
5	16	3
6	21	3
5	5	0
0	39	0
5	15	10
3	21	3
9	19	0
0	12	4
6	6	13

T	A .	Til	In	Influence - percentage of teachers					
lype of school	Aspect	lotal	A lot	Some	None	Not stated			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)			
All schools	Subject matter to be taught	100	46	36	16	1			
	Specific textbooks to be used	100	18	56	23	2			
	Materials and supplies	100	29	59	12	0			
Government	Subject matter to be taught	100	46	33	21	0			
	Specific textbooks to be used	100	13	52	33	2			
	Materials and supplies	100	27	62	12	0			
Government-assisted	Subject matter to be taught	100	43	38	17	1			
	Specific textbooks to be used	100	16	60	22	1			
	Materials and supplies	100	28	59	12	1			
Private	Subject matter to be taught	100	63	30	4	4			
	Specific textbooks to be used	100	37	48	11	4			
	Materials and supplies	100	37	52	11	0			

Table 20. Influence on Aspects of Teaching by Type of School

The data reveal that while 46% of the mathematics teachers had a lot of influence on the subject matter to be taught, the response from the majority of teachers shows that they exerted considerably less influence on the acquisition of materials and supplies (29%) and specific textbooks (18%). Teachers in the private primary schools were more influential in each of the identified areas of teaching compared to those in public schools.



# Table 21. SEA Mathematics Prepared Students for Secondary School by Educational District and Type of School

<b>F</b> 1 (2) <b>1</b> (2) (2)	тгіі	τ	SEA mathematics prepa	ared students for secondary	/ school - percentage of
Educational district	Type of school	Iotai	Yes	No	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
All districts	All schools	100	91	7	2
	Government	100	85	10	6
	Government-assisted	100	91	7	1
	Private	100	100	0	0
Port of Spain	Total	100	76	12	12
	Government	100	33	33	33
	Government-assisted	100	88	6	6
	Private	100	100	0	0
St. George East	Total	100	97	3	0
	Government	100	100	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	95	5	0
	Private	100	100	0	0
North Eastern	Total	100	89	11	0
	Government	100	100	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	85	15	0
	Private	100	100	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	95	5	0
	Government	100	100	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	93	7	0
	Private	100	100	0	0
Caroni	Total	100	97	3	0
	Government	100	100	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	95	5	0
	Private	100	100	0	0
Victoria	Total	100	91	9	0
	Government	100	83	17	0
	Government-assisted	100	91	9	0
	Private	100	100	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	92	8	0
	Government	100	86	14	0
	Government-assisted	100	94	6	0
	Private	100	100	0	D
Tobago	Total	100	88	6	6
	Government	100	100	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	75	13	13
	Private	100	100	0	0

Almost all the primary school teachers (91%), especially those in the private schools (100%), who participated in the survey, agreed that the Secondary Entrance Assessment (SEA) examination in mathematics prepared students in the subject for secondary school.





Source: Table 21

	Yes	No	Not stated
All districts	91	7	2
Port of Spain	76	12	12
St. George Ea:	97	3	0
North Eastern	89	11	0
South Eastern	95	5	0
Caroni	97	3	0
Victoria	91	9	0
St. Patrick	92	8	0
Tobago	88	6	6

				No	. of mather	atics perio	ids/week -	percentage	e of teacher	S
Type of school	Standard	Total	< 5 periods	5 periods	6 periods	7 periods	8 periods	9 periods	10 periods	> 10 periods
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
					_	_		_		_
All schools	All standards	100	4	26	7	8 F	18	5	28	3
	Standard 1		2	28	9	7	13	7	33	U -
	Standard 2		5	36		7	11	7	18	5 5
	Standard 3			39	5	9	16	U 2	20	5
	Standard 4 Standard 5			13 10	ŭ 7	0 17	20	১ 7	34 7/	ن د
Courses t	Standard J	100	<b>U</b> 2	10	2 0	IZ ID	24 21	<u>и</u>	34 75	0 //
oovernment	IULAI Stondard 1			13 70	0 10	IU N	21 Π		20 70	4 П
	Standard 7	100		טט רר	10 77	U N	11		00 77	U 11
	Standard 2	100	10	ער ער	22 П	и П	וו חג	П	22 10	11 10
	A brahard	100	n	о П	П	ים חיג	ао /Л	П	ים ער	П
	Standard 5	100	П	8	Π	8	75	25	25	Π
Government-assisted	Total	100	4	29	6	7	19	3	20	2
	Standard 1	100	3	74	3	, 7	71	3	38	Г П
	Standard 7 Standard 7	100	Π	<u>4</u> П	10	Ю	10	7	20	3
	Standard 3	100	7	46	7	7	11	Ū	21	0
	Standard 4	100	9	17	4	0	26	4	35	4
	Standard 5	100	0	13	4	13	29	0	33	4
Private	Total	100	7	22	11	11	7	4	26	7
	Standard 1	100	0	33	17	17	0	17	0	0
	Standard 2	100	40	40	0	0	20	0	0	0
	Standard 3	100	0	17	0	17	17	0	33	17
	Standard 4	100	0	20	40	0	0	0	40	0
	Standard 5	100	0	0	0	20	0	0	60	20

#### Table 22. No. of Mathematics Periods/Week by Type of School and Standard

Table 22 shows that the modal number of mathematics periods was 10 (28%) each week, followed by five periods (26%) weekly. The survey resul show that standards 4 and 5 teachers taught mathematics more often than their counterparts in the lower standards on a weekly basis. A review data by type of school indicates that in standard 5, one-quarter (25%) of the government school teachers and one-third (33%) of those government-assisted schools taught mathematics for 10 periods each week compared to three-fifths (60%) in the case of private schools.

lts also w of the 3 in the



Source: Table 22

#### Table 23. Most Difficult Subject Area for Students to Conceptualise by Standard

			Subject area - percentage of teachers								
Standard	Total	Geometry	Number	Fractions	Decimals	Money	Percent	Measurement	Statistics	Not stated	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	
All standards	100	18	8	22	22	7	6	10	4	3	
Standard 1	100	13	18	28		18		13	5	5	
Standard 2	100	22	12	27		12		10	12	5	
Standard 3	100	19	2	21	47	0		12	0	0	
Standard 4	100	16	8	16	24	3	21	5	3	5	
Standard 5	100	22	0	17	37	2	10	10	0	2	

Approximately two-fifths of the sample of teachers identified fractions (22%), decimals (22%) and geometry (18%) as the most difficult areas of the mathematics syllabus for primary school students to conceptualise. A relatively large percentage of teachers of standards 3 to 5 reported difficulty with decimals amongst students. The data, however, show that the difficulty encountered with fractions in standard 1 declined as students progressed towards standard 5.



# Table 24. Performance of Mathematical Activities by Educational District

				Frequency of activity - percentage of teacher					
Educational district		Activity	Total	Every lesson	Most lessons	Some lessons	Never		
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
All districts	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	1	14	83	1		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	41	48	10	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	2	20	73	2		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	14	84	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	8	89	2		
	6	Work in groups	100	9	28	61	1		
Port of Spain	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	3	9	88	0		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	42	42	12	3		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	6	12	79	3		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	6	88	3		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	6	85	9		
	6	Work in groups	100	6	27	58	9		
St. George East	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	5	5	85	3		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	44	46	10	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	0	18	79	3		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	10	90	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	10	90	0		
	6	Work in groups	100	13	21	67	0		
North Eastern	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	11	89	0		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	44	39	17	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	6	33	56	0		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	28	72	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	6	89	6		
	6	Work in groups	100	6	33	61	0		
Caroni	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	21	72	7		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	0	52	41	7		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	0	28	72	0		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	21	79	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	10	90	0		
	6	Work in groups	100	7	45	48	0		
Victoria	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	16	84	0		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	41	47	13	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	3	3	84	6		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	3	9	88	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	3	6	91	0		
	6	Work in groups	100	9	28	63	0		

3	-
Not stated	
(E)	-
(0)	
1	
0	
2	
1	
0	
<u> </u>	-
U	
Π	
3	
0	
0	-
3	
0	
U	
U	
Π	
0	-
0	
6	
0	
0	
<u> </u>	-
U N	
0	
0	
0	
0	-
0	
0	
З п	
U N	
0	
	-

				Frequency of activity - percentage of teachers					
Educational district		Activity	Total	Every lesson	Most lessons	Some lessons	Never	Not stated	
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
South Eastern	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	15	80	0	5	
	2	Practise computational skills	100	40	55	0	0	5	
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	0	20	65	5	10	
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	10	85	0	5	
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	5	90	0	5	
	6	Work in groups	100	5	20	70	0	5	
St. Patrick	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	23	77	0	0	
	2	Practise computational skills	100	23	69	8	0	0	
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	0	31	65	0	4	
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	19	81	0	0	
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	12	88	0	0	
	6	Work in groups	100	15	27	58	۵	0	
Tobago	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	13	88	۵	0	
	2	2 Practise computational skills 3 Work on fractions and decimals		38	44	19	0	0	
	3			6	25	69	0	0	
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	19	81	0	0	
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	13	88	0	0	
	6	Work in groups	100	13	19	69	۵	0	

 Table 24. Performance of Mathematical Activities by Educational District (continued)

In general, the most frequently performed mathematical activity was the practice of computational skills at every lesson (41%) and most lessons (48%), followed by working in groups at every and most lessons as stated by 37% of the teachers accumulatively. The frequency with which students were engaged in the various activities was comparable by educational district and type of school (Tables 24 and 25).



# Table 25. Performance of Mathematical Activities by Type of School

				Frequency of activity - percentage of teachers					
Type of school		Activity	Total	Every lesson	Most lessons	Some lessons	Never		
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
All schools	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	1	14	83	1		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	41	48	10	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	2	20	73	2		
	4	Learn about shapes	100		14	84	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100		8	89	Z		
	6	Work in groups	100	9	28	61	1		
Government	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	15	81	2		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	29	52	19	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	0	17	77	4		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	13	87	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	6	94	0		
	6	Work in groups	100	12	29	60	0		
Government-assisted	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	2	13	82	1		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	46	46	7	1		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	3	19	72	2		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	1	15	83	1		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	1	10	86	2		
	6	Work in groups	100	9	28	60	2		
Private	1	Make tables, charts or graphs	100	0	11	89	0		
	2	Practise computational skills	100	41	52	7	0		
	3	Work on fractions and decimals	100	4	26	70	0		
	4	Learn about shapes	100	0	11	85	0		
	5	Measure things in the classroom	100	0	4	93	4		
	6	Work in groups	100	7	26	67	0		

N-+	
stated	
(6)	
1	
і П	
U	
2	
1	
0	
0	
2	
0	
2	
0	
0	
0	
1	
1	
3	
1	
1	
1	
0	
0	
0	
4	
0	
0	

# Table 26. Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Educational District and Standard

		Total	Frequency of mathematics homework - percentage of teachers				
Educational district	Standard	Total	Every day	Once or twice a week	Sometimes	Never	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
AU 1	AU . I I	(88	70	(7	F		
All districts	All standards	100	76	19	5		
	Standard I	100	57	30	13		
	Standard Z	100	68	27	Z	Z	
	Standard 3	100	/5	18	/		
	Standard 4	100	84	16	U		
Dent of Quein	Standard D	100	<b>38</b> 70		<b>U</b>	U	
Port of Spain			/3 57	21 مەر	ن ۱۸	ъ п	
	Standard I	100	٦/ دە	29 20	14 n	U 00	
	Standard Z	100	0U 7C	20 95	U	2U n	
	orendary %		/J 07	20 00	U		
	Standard 4		07 100	<u>а</u> а п	U		
St. Coonce Foot	Jianuaru J Totol		76	U 71	U	U	
at. Deurge Last	Standard 1	100	74 67	21	ם קר		
	Standard 7	100	U7 50	" 50	22 П		
	Standard 2	100	30 71	30 79	Π		
	A bandard	100	71 100	23 N	Π	0	
	Standard 5	100	100	Π	Π	0	
North Fastern	Total	100	78	11	11	0	
	Standard 1	100	75	25	Π	Π	
	Standard 7	100	75	<u>г</u>	25	Π	
	Standard 3	100	75	Π	25	Π	
	Standard 4	100	67	33	П	Π	
	Standard 5	100	100	Π	Π	Π	
South Eastern	Total	100	80	20	0	0	
	Standard 1	100	33	67	0	0	
	Standard 2	100	100	0	0	0	
	Standard 3	100	50	50	0	0	
	Standard 4	100	100	0	0	0	
	Standard 5	100	100	0	0	0	
Caroni	Total	100	76	21	3	0	
	Standard 1	100	50	33	17	0	
	Standard 2	100	80	20	0	0	
	Standard 3	100	83	17	0	0	
	Standard 4	100	83	17	0	0	
	Standard 5	100	83	17	0	0	
Victoria	Total	100	81	13	6	0	
	Standard 1	100	57	29	14	0	
	Standard 2	100	88	13	0	0	
	Standard 3	100	86	0	14	0	
	Standard 4	100	75	25	0	0	
	Standard 5	100	100	0	0	0	

#### Table 26. Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Educational District and Standard (continued)

Educational district	Ctondond	Tatal	Frequency of mathematics homework - percentage of to			
Euucational district	orannaun	TULAI	Every day	Once or twice a week	Sometimes	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
St. Patrick	Total	100	81	15	4	
	Standard 1	100	83	17	0	
	Standard 2	100	60	40	0	
	Standard 3	100	80	0	20	
	Standard 4	100	80	20	0	
	Standard 5	100	100	0	0	
Tobago	Total	100	56	38	6	
	Standard 1	100	0	75	25	
	Standard 2	100	33	67	0	
	Standard 3	100	67	33	0	
	Standard 4	100	100	0	0	
	Standard 5	100	100	0	0	

Three-quarters (76%) of the teachers assigned mathematics homework everyday mainly of duration 15-30 minutes (Tables 26 and moved up the primary school system from standard 1 to 5 homework assignment increased; three-fifths (57%) of the standard 1 homework everyday compared to almost all (98%) in the case of the standard five. By educational district, teachers in Tobago assign frequently, especially in standards 1, 2 and 3. When analysed by type of school the data depict a similar pattern (Table 27). A review 1 such assignment by educational district reveals that a substantial percentage of the teachers in Victoria (31%), St. Patrick (31%) (27%) reported duration of homework everyday of duration of more than 30 minutes (Table 28). By type of school, a relatively higher per private primary schools assigned homework everyday of duration of more than 30 minutes compared to 27% and 23% in the govern government schools respectively (Table 29).



achers
Never
(5)
D
0
0
0
0
D
0
0
0
0
0
0

28). As students one teachers gave ned homework less of the frequency of and Port of Spain rcentage (38%) of ment-assisted and



	Every day	Once or twice a week	Sometimes	Never
All districts	76	19	5	0
Port of Spain	73	21	3	3
St. George Ea:	74	21	5	0
North Eastern	78	11	11	0
South Eastern	80	20	0	0
Caroni	76	21	3	0
Victoria	81	13	6	0
St. Patrick	81	15	4	0
Tobago	56	38	6	0

Type of echool	Ctanda.	ad a	Total	Frequer	icy of mathematics homework	- percentage of t
Type of school	Statioal			Every day	Once or twice a week	Sometimes
			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
All schools	Total		100	76	19	5
	Standard	1	100	57	30	13
	Standard	2	100	68	27	Z
	Standard	3	100	75	18	7
	Standard	4	100	84	16	0
	Standard	5	100	98	2	0
Government	Total		100	75	23	2
	Standard	1	100	64	36	0
	Standard	2	100	44	56	0
	Standard	3	100	70	20	10
	Standard	4	100	90	10	0
	Standard	5	100	100	0	0
Government-assisted	Total		100	75	19	5
	Standard	1	100	55	31	14
	Standard	2	100	73	20	3
	Standard	3	100	75	18	7
	Standard	4	100	83	17	0
	Standard	5	100	96	4	۵
Private	Total		100	78	15	7
	Standard	1	100	50	17	33
	Standard	2	100	80	20	0
	Standard	3	100	83	17	۵
	Standard	4	100	80	20	0
	Standard	5	100	100	0	0

Table 27. Assignment of Mathematics Homework by Type of School and Standard



ache	ILS N	
	Never	
	(៦)	
	0	
	0	
	2	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	1	
	0	
	3	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	
	0	



Source: Table 27

Every day
76
75
75
78

Once or twice a week	Sometimes	Never
19	5	0
23	2	0
19	5	1
15	7	0

# Table 28. Frequency of Mathematics Homework Assignment by Educational District and Duration

	Frequency of homework	T_+_l	Duration of m	athematics home	work - percentag	e of teachers
	assignment	IDTAI	<15 mins	15-30 mins	>30 mins	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	Total	100	29	48	23	0
	Every day	100	29	43	27	0
	Once or twice a week	100	34	59	7	0
	Sometimes	100	10	70	10	10
Port of Spain	Total	100	21	48	27	3
	Every day	100	29	42	29	0
	Once or twice a week	100	0	71	29	0
	Sometimes	100	0	0	0	100
St. George East	Total	100	33	49	18	0
	Every day	100	34	41	24	0
	Once or twice a week	100	38	63	0	0
	Sometimes	100	0	100	0	0
North Eastern	Total	100	28	56	17	0
	Every day	100	21	57	21	0
	Once or twice a week	100	50	50	0	0
	Sometimes	100	50	50	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	40	40	20	0
	Every day	100	38	38	25	0
	Once or twice a week	100	50	50	0	0
	Sometimes	0	0	D	0	0
Caroni	Total	100	31	55	14	0
	Every day	100	27	59	14	0
	Once or twice a week	100	50	33	17	0
	Sometimes	100	0	100	0	0
Victoria	Total	100	28	41	31	0
	Every day	100	31	35	35	0
	Once or twice a week	100	25	75	0	0
	Sometimes	100	0	50	50	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	35	35	31	0
	Every day	100	29	33	38	0
	Once or twice a week	100	75	25	0	0
	Sometimes	100	D	100	0	0
Tobago	Total	100	13	69	19	0
	Every day	100	11	56	33	0
	Once or twice a week	100	17	83	0	0
	Sometimes	100	0	100	0	0



Source: Table 28

# Table 29. Frequency of Mathematics Homework Assignment by Type of School and Duration

Tuno of aphaol	Frequency of homework	Tatal	Duration of m	nathematics home	work - percentag	e of teachers
Type of school	assignment	IULAI	<15 mins	15-30 mins	>30 mins	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All schools	Total	100	29	48	23	0
	Every day	100	29	43	27	0
	Once or twice a week	100	34	59	7	0
	Sometimes	100	10	70	10	10
Government	Total	100	33	46	21	0
	Every day	100	31	46	23	0
	Once or twice a week	100	42	50	8	0
	Sometimes	100	0	0	100	0
Government-assisted	Total	100	28	50	22	0
	Every day	100	28	46	27	0
	Once or twice a week	100	36	56	8	0
	Sometimes	100	14	86	0	0
Private	Total	100	26	41	30	4
	Every day	100	33	29	38	0
	Once or twice a week	100	0	100	0	0
	Sometimes	100	0	50	0	50

# Table 30. Assessment of Students' Work by Educational District

	Tuna of anonanat	Tatal	Assessment used - percentage of teachers		
concational district	Type of assessment	TOLAT	Yes	No	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
All districts	Homework assignments	100	89	10	0
	Responses of students in class	100	98	2	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	90	9	1
	Projects	100	72	28	0
Port of Spain	Homework assignments	100	91	9	0
	Responses of students in class	100	94	6	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	85	15	0
	Projects	100	64	36	0
St. George East	Homework assignments	100	90	10	0
	Responses of students in class	100	95	5	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	95	3	3
	Projects	100	77	23	0
North Eastern	Homework assignments	100	89	11	0
	Responses of students in class	100	100	0	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	94	6	0
	Projects	100	67	33	0
South Eastern	Homework assignments	100	90	10	0
	Responses of students in class	100	100	0	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	85	10	5
	Projects	100	85	15	0
Caroni	Homework assignments	100	93	7	0
	Responses of students in class	100	97	3	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	93	7	0
	Projects	100	66	34	0
Victoria	Homework assignments	100	94	6	0
	Responses of students in class	100	100	0	0
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0
	Standardised tests	100	94	3	3
	Projects	100	75	25	0

	T C .	TIL	Assessment used - percentage of teachers				
Educational district	lype of assessment	lotal	Yes	No	Not stated		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
St. Patrick	Homework assignments	100	85	12	4		
	Responses of students in class	100	100	0	0		
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0		
Standardised tests		100	81	19	0		
	Projects	100	73	27	0		
Tobago	Homework assignments	100	75	25	0		
	Responses of students in class	100	100	0	0		
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0		
	Standardised tests	100	88	13	0		
	Projects	100	69	31	0		

Table 30. Assessment of Students' Work by Educational District (continued)

The most significant methods which teachers used to determine students' progress in mathematics was teacher-made tests (100%), followed by responses of students in class (98%). Overall, one-quarter (28%) of the teachers, more so in the educational districts of Port of Spain (36%), Caroni (34%) and North Eastern (33%) (Table 30), and in government schools (33%) (Table 31), indicated that students' progress were not evaluated using projects.



			Assessment used - nercentage of teachers				
Type of school	Type of assessment	Total	Yes	Nn	Not stated		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)		
All schools	Homework assignments	100	89	10	٥		
	Responses of students in class	100	98	2	0		
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0		
	Standardised tests	100	90	9	1		
	Projects	100	72	28	0		
Government	Homework assignments	100	98	2	0		
	Responses of students in class	100	100	0	D		
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0		
	Standardised tests	100	90	8	2		
	Projects	100	67	33	D		
Government-assisted	Homework assignments	100	87	12	1		
	Responses of students in class	100	99	1	0		
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0		
	Standardised tests	100	90	9	1		
	Projects	100	74	26	0		
Private	Homework assignments	100	81	19	0		
	Responses of students in class	100	89	11	0		
	Teacher-made tests	100	100	0	0		
	Standardised tests	100	85	11	4		
	Projects	100	70	30	0		

# Table 31. Assessment of Students' Work by Type of School

# Table 32. Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education by Educational District

Educational district	Statement	Total	Strongly acree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		
			percentage						
All districts	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics.	100	5	31	52	9	3		
	<ul> <li>Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how children learn.</li> </ul>	100	3	32	54	9	2		
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my school.	100	11	32	44	12	1		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	100	38	43	14	4	1		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught.	100	23	29	32	14	1		
Port of Spain	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an inadequate background for the teaching of	100	9	24	52	6	9		
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how children learn.	100	9	30	42	9	9		
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my school.	100	15	33	33	12	6		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	100	39	42	15	0	3		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught.	100	33	33	18	9	6		
St. George East	<ol> <li>Most primary school teachers generally have an inadequate background for the teaching of</li> </ol>	100	3	33	54	10	0		
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how children learn.	100	0	26	67	8	0		
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my school.	100	13	23	56	8	0		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	100	21	38	26	10	5		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught.	100	21	31	33	15	0		
North Eastern	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an inadequate background for the teaching of	100	6	22	67	6	0		
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how children learn.	100	6	50	33	11	0		
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my school.	100	17	39	28	17	0		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	100	17	50	28	6	0		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught.	100	11	33	56	0	0		

# Table 32. Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education by Educational District (continued)

Educational district	Statement	Total	Strongly aoree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disaoree	Not stated	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
			I I I I I I					
South Eastern	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an				j_			
	inadequate background for the teaching of	100	5	40	50	0	5	
	mathematics.							
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient	100	0	50	50	0	0	
	understanding of how children learn.							
	literature in my school	100	15	35	40	10	0	
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary		05	rr.	F	F	п	
	schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	IUU	ሪጋ	66	5	5	U	
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before	100	25	40	35	0	۵	
<u>г</u> .	mathematics can be successfully taught.					_		
Laroni	Most primary school teachers generally have an	100	Ţ	21	<u>/8</u>	17	П	
	mathematics	100	U		UT	17	U	
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient	100	ŋ	70	50	ſŪ	п	
	understanding of how children learn.	100	ŭ	20	10	IU	U	
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics	100	7	41	45	3	3	
	literature in my school.							
	4 Frinary schools should operate like secondary schools utilising teachers in specialised fields	100	41	48	7	3	0	
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before		Π.			пі	п	
	mathematics can be successfully taught.	IUU	24	ZI	اک	ZI	ឋ	
Victoria	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an	100		95	- 0	(0		
	inadequate background for the teaching of	100	6	25	53	13	3	
	mathematics. 7 Most teachers have an insufficient							
	understanding of how children learn.	100	3	22	59	13	3	
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics	IUU	q	21	67	ł۷.	П	
	literature in my school.	100	U	01	1	IU IU	U	
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary	100	50	41	9	0	0	
	schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields. 5. Students need to learn to read and write before							
	mathematics can be successfully taught.	100	13	22	41	25	0	
St. Patrick	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an							
	inadequate background for the teaching of	100	4	46	35	12	4	
	mathematics.							
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient	100	4	42	46	8	0	
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics	100	,		Γ,	15	-	
	literature in my school.	100	4	27	54	15	U	
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary	IUU	50	35	8	Я	П	
	schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	,						
	o Students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught	100	23	38	23	15	0	

#### Table 32. Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education by Educational District (concluded)

Educational district	Statement	Total	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
				F	Jercentage		
Tobago	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics.	100	6	19	69	6	D
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how children learn.	100	0	25	63	13	0
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my school.	100	6	38	31	25	0
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.	100	56	38	6	0	0
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully tauoht.	100	38	13	31	19	0



Table 32 shows that a significant percentage (81%) of the sample of mathematics teachers who participated in the survey agreed that primary schools should operate like secondary schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields. There was also a substantial level of agreement (52%) that students need to learn to read and write before mathematics can be successfully taught. However, over a half disagreed that most teachers had an insufficient understanding of how children learn (63%), that they generally had an inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics (61%) and there was a lack of suitable mathematics literature in their schools (56%). By educational district the data show that a half (50%) of the teachers in St. Patrick felt that most primary school teachers generally had an inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics and 45% in South Eastern shared a similar view. Private primary schools were better equipped with suitable mathematics literature than public schools (Table 33).

# Table 33. Agreement with Statements on Mathematics Education by Type of School

Type of school	Statement	Total	Strongly aoree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disaoree		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
			nercentane					
All schools	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an			P=				
	inadequate background for the teaching of	100	5	31	52	9		
	mathematics.							
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how oblideen loope	100	3	32	54	9		
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in				<i>,,</i>	15		
	my school.	100	11	32	44	12		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary	100	38	43	14	4		
	schools, utilising teachers in specialised fields.							
	3 Students need to learn to read and write defore mathematics can be successfully taught	100	23	29	32	14		
Government	1 Most primary school teachers generally have an	100	L		05	n		
	inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics.		4	21	00	0		
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how	100	2	25	63	8		
	children learn. 3 Thans is a lack of suitable mathematics literature is my							
	school	100	13	33	42	12		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools,	100	67	77	17	Q		
	utilising teachers in specialised fields.	100	42	10	IJ	U		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before	100	19	33	29	19		
Government-assisted	Mathematics can be successfully taught.							
	inadequate background for the teaching of mathematics.	100	4	34	50	11		
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how	100	4	33	57	们		
	children learn.	100		00	02	10		
	3 There is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my appeal	100	10	35	43	10		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools,		00	/ 7	10			
	utilising teachers in specialised fields.	IUU	3۵	4/	ال	٢		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before	100	22	29	33	13		
 Privata	mathematics can be successfully taught.							
TTVELE	inadeouate background for the teaching of mathematics.	100	15	30	37	7		
	2 Most teachers have an insufficient understanding of how	INN	4	44	41	4		
	children learn.	100	1			1		
	ن Inere is a lack of suitable mathematics literature in my school	100	11	19	52	19		
	4 Primary schools should operate like secondary schools.	100	/1	00	10	,		
	utilising teachers in specialised fields.	IUU	41	33	19	4		
	5 Students need to learn to read and write before	100	33	22	37	7		
	mathematics can be successfully taught.					-		

Not			
(6)			
3			
2			
1			
1			
1			
4			
2			
0			
0			
0			
1			
1			
2			
1			
2			
11			
7			
٥			
4			
0			



Source: Table 33
## Table 34. Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Educational District

Educational district	ali55	Total		Limit - perci	entage o	of teachers
	12205	10101	A great deal	Quite a lot	A little	Not at all
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	1 Students who come from a wide rance of backorounds	100	19	27	38	13
	2 Disruptive students	100	25	26	38	9
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and	100	28	34	28	9
	progress					
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students'	100	14	29	42	15
	USE					
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	10	18	35	35
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	19	19	41	20
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	15	10	22	52
	8 Student absenteeism	100	29	26	35	10
Port of Spain	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	12	12	42	27
	2 Disruptive students	100	18	27	39	12
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and progress	100	9	42	27	18
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' use	100	6	30	39	21
	5 High student/teacher ratio 6 January - Angel Facilities		ь 7	15 10	39 20	36 22
	o inadequate physical facilities 7. Theost(s) to popposed pofety on the sefety of students	100 100	ى 0	10 17	សម 15	აა 50
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety of the safety of stopents 8 Student abcentaciem	100 100	а (2	12 7/	ים עם	30 15
St. George Fast	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	13	33	41	8
	7 Disputtive students	100	71		 /C	<u>с</u> (П
	2 Disruptive students 3 Dependents pat interpreted in their children's learning and preserves	IUU INN	21 21	21 70	40 77	U Q
	A. Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' yea	100	DI D	20 76	57	ם וע
	5 Hinh student/teacher catin	100	13	18	33	33
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	18	13	41	78
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	8	10	28	54
	8 Student absenteeism	100	28	21	41	10
North Eastern	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	11	33	39	17
	2 Disruptive students	100	33	22	44	0
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and progress	100	33	33	33	0
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' use	100	17	22	50	11
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	11	22	44	22
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	17	39	33	11
	7 Ihreat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	11	11	11	61
0.1.5.	8 Student absenteeism	100	28	17 40	5U 95	6
South Eastern	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds 2 Disputtive students		25 קת	4U 75	ሪጋ ୨୮	U ID
	2 Disruptive Students 3 Dananta pat interpreted in their shildren's learning and recorded		20 25	טם קר	აე 75	IU ς
	o in a cinis nou interesteu in their children's learning and progress Al Shortage of other instructional aquinment for students' use	100 100	ىن (2	ני חג	ר 7 ער	ט 75
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	ы П		30	20 45
	6 Inadenuate novsical facilities	100	15	20 70	45	чо 2П
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	15	<u>го</u> 10	20 20	55
	8 Student absenteeism	100	30	45	15	10

Not stated
(6)
3
2
0
0
-
2 1
2
6 3
3
3
د 6
6
<u> </u>
3
0
0
3 0
Ō
U ()
Ō
0
U
6
<u> </u>
0
0
0 N
0
0
U

#### Table 34. Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Educational District (continued)

Educational	lagua	Tatal	Total Limit - percentage of teachers					
district	12205	TULAT	A great deal	Quite a lot	A little	Not at all	Not stated	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
Caroni	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	21	17	55	7	0	
	2 Disruptive students	100	31	28	31	10	0	
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and	100	28	41	17	14	0	
	progress							
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students'	100	24	28	38	10	0	
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	17	28	24	31	0	
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	24	21	34	21	0	
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	21	7	28	45	0	
	8 Student absenteeism	100	41	31	21	7	0	
Victoria	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	38	31	22	6	3	
	2 Disruptive students	100	38	25	28	6	3	
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and	100	41	22	38	0	0	
	progress							
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students'	100	16	34	38	13	0	
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	3	13	34	47	3	
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	31	19	38	13	0	
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	19	9	25	47	0	
	8 Student absenteeism	100	25	22	47	6	0	
St. Patrick	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	19	31	23	23	4	
	2 Disruptive students	100	15	31	38	15	0	
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and	100	35	31	19	15	0	
	progress							
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students'	100	12	27	42	19	0	
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	12	8	50	31	0	
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	12	23	54	8	4	
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	15	12	23	50	0	
	8 Student absenteeism	100	31	31	23	15	0	
Tobago	1 Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	6	19	50	19	6	
	2 Disruptive students	100	25	19	44	6	6	
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and	100	13	44	31	13	0	
	progress							
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students'	100	19	31	38	13	0	
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	19	25	19	31	6	
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	38	0	50	13	0	
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	31	6	13	44	6	
	8 Student absenteeism	100	31	25	38	6	0	

Table 34 represents the teachers' responses to issues that limited their teaching of the subject. A substantial percentage of teachers identified the lack of parental interest in children's learning and progress (62%), student absenteeism (55%), disruptive students (51%), students who came from a wide range of backgrounds (46%) and the shortage of instructional equipment (43%) as key issues affecting the teaching of mathematics. Three-quarters (74%) of the teachers stated that threats to personal safety or that of students had little or no effect on teaching. By educational district, student absenteeism was more pronounced in South Eastern (75%) and Caroni (72%) as an issue impacting on teaching. A further review of the data by type of school reveals that a relatively larger proportion of teachers in the government (65%) and government-assisted primary schools (64%) reported that parents were not interested in their children's learning and progress compared to private schools (45%) (Table 35).

# Survey of Mathematics in Primary Schools, 2007

-

\_

-

-

-



Source: Table 34

## Table 35. Issues that Limit Teaching Mathematics by Type of School

			Limit -	percent	tage of t	teacher:
Type of school	lssue	Total	A anast dasl	Quite	A  ;++ _	Not at
			A yreat uear	a lot		all
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All schools	Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	19	27	38	13
	2 Disruptive students	100	25	26	38	9
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and progress	100	28	34	28	9
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' use	100	14	29	42	15
	5 High student/teacher ratio	100	10	18	35	35
	6 Inadequate physical facilities	100	19	19	41	20
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	15	10	22	52
	3 Student absenteeism	100	29	26	35	10
Government	Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	19	29	35	13
	2 Disruptive students	100	21	23	46	10
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and progress	100	25	40	19	15
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' use	100	10	33	50	× ×
	o High student/teacher ratio	100	8 I	17	37	38
	3 Inadequate physical facilities	100	12	17	44	25
	7 Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	8	17	29	46
	3 Student absenteeism	100	29	31	37	4
Government-assisted	Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	20	27	40	10
	2 Disruptive students	100	28	28	33	9
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and progress	100	32	32	30	5
	4 Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' use	100	16	28	40	15
	High student/teacher ratio	100	10	21	36	31
	Inadequate physical facilities	100	20	22	42	15
	/ Threat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students	100	18	y	20	50
	3 Student absenteeism	100	31	27	34	<u> </u>
Private	Students who come from a wide range of backgrounds	100	11	22	37	30
	2 Disruptive students	100	19	22	48	11
	3 Parents not interested in their children's learning and progress		15	30	37	19
	A Shortage of other instructional equipment for students' use		1	26	33	33
	High student/teacher ratio			1	26	52
	i Inadequate physical facilities		26	4	33	33
	/ Ihreat(s) to personal safety or the safety of students		15		15	70
	3 Student absenteeism	100	19	15	37	30

S
Not
stated
(6)
_
3
2 n
U N
7
1
2
0
4
U
U N
Π
2
0
0
4
3
1
ן ח
2 1
3
1
0
0
0
U A
4
<del>4</del> П
0







Source: Table 35

Table 36. Percentage of Teachers Attending Mathematics Workshops by Educational District and

Educational district	Type of appeal	Total	Attended mathematics works
	туре от ъслові	IULAI	Yes
		(1)	(2)
All districts	All schools Government Government-assisted Private	100 100 100	85 87 85
Port of Spain	Total	100	72
	Government	100	78
	Government-assisted	100	65
	Private	100	86
St. George East	Total	100	85
	Government	100	90
	Government-assisted	100	86
	Private	100	71
North Eastern	Total	100	83
	Government	100	50
	Government-assisted	100	92
	Private	100	INN
South Eastern	Total	100	85
	Government	100	67
	Government-assisted	100	87
	Private	100	100
Caroni	Total	100	90
	Government	100	88
	Government-assisted	100	90
	Private	100	100
Victoria	Total	100	88
	Government	100	100
	Government-assisted	100	87
	Private	100	67
St. Patrick	Total	100	92
	Government	100	100
	Government-assisted	100	88
	Private	100	100
Tobago	Total	100	94
	Government	100	100
	Government-assisted	100	88
	Private	100	100

A significant proportion (85%) of the primary school teachers, especially in Tobago (94%), St. Patrick (92%), Caroni attended mathematics workshops, of which 86% attended at least one workshop in the last five years (Table 36 and 37) of the teachers who did not attend workshops was observed in Port of Spain, mainly in the government-assisted schu government school teachers in the North Eastern educational district also did not attend such workshops. Table 37 s workshops attended in the last five years was one (32%), followed by two (26%). In addition, a larger proportion of schools, in Tobago (33%), North Eastern (27%) and St. Patrick (25%) districts were exposed to four or more workshops

## Type of School

hop - percentage of teachers
No
(3)
<i>1</i> <b>-</b>
15
13
13
<b>ם</b> רי
21 77
22 35
14
 [5
10
14
29
17
50
8
0
15
33
13
0
10
13
U 10
្រ សេ ក
12 1
נו גע
<u>کر</u>
Π
13
Π
6
0
13
0

(90%) and Victoria (88%), had ). The largest percentage (27%) pols (35%); a half (50%) of the shows that the modal number of f teachers, especially in private in mathematics in the last five



Source: Table 36

	Yes	No
All districts	85	15
Port of Spain	73	27
St. George Eas	85	15
North Eastern	83	17
South Eastern	85	15
Caroni	90	10
Victoria	88	13
St. Patrick	92	8
Tobago	94	6

## Table 37. Number of Mathematics Workshops Attended last Five Years by Educational District and Type of School

Educational district Type of school Total Number of workshops atter			ttended in the l	ended in the last five years - percentage o				
			None	1	2	3	4 or more	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
All districts	All schools Government	100 100	12 16	32 24	26 31	14 18	14 11	
	bovernment-assisted Private	100	9	39 17	23 77	1Z 13	1U 79	
Port of Spain	Total	100	17 17	75	<u>/7</u>	 /	17	
т от с от орант	Government	100	79	20 79	70	т П	1/	
	Government-assisted	100	9	36	45	Π	9	
	Private	100	Π	П	50	17	33	
St. George Fast	Total	100	ĥ	45	30	17	6	
	Government	100	n	56	77	77	л П	
	Government-assisted	100	11	47	37	5	5	
	Private	100	П	40	20	20	2N	
North Eastern	Total	100	13	40	13	7	27	
	Government	100	50	50	0	Ū	0	
	Government-assisted	100	8	42	17	8	25	
	Private	100	0	0	0	0	100	
South Eastern	Total	100	6	35	12	18	18	
	Government	100	50	0	0	0	50	
	Government-assisted	100	0	46	15	15	8	
	Private	100	0	0	0	50	50	
Caroni	Total	100	19	35	35	4	0	
	Government	100	29	14	57	0	0	
	Government-assisted	100	11	44	28	6	0	
	Private	100	100	0	0	0	0	
Victoria	Total	100	18	43	18	18	4	
	Government	100	17	0	33	50	0	
	Government-assisted	100	20	50	15	10	5	
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0	
St. Patrick	Total	100	8	8	25	33	25	
	Government	100	0	14	29	29	29	
	Government-assisted	100	14	7	21	43	14	
	Private	100	0	0	33	0	67	
Tobago	Total	100	13	20	20	13	33	
	Government	100	0	20	40	20	20	
	Government-assisted	100	14	29	14	14	29	
	Private	100	33	0	0	0	67	

#### teachers

Not stated
(7)
2
0
4
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0
U
U
U
1Z N
15
П
8
D D
11
л П
0
0
0
0
D
0
0
0
0
0
0



Source: Table 37

Table 38. Attendance at Mathematics Workshops in Curriculum, Assessment and Teaching Methods by Educational District and Type o

				Works	hop attend	ed - percei	ntage of te	achers	
Educational district	Type of school	Curriculum			. /	lssessmer	it	Teaching meth	
		Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
All districts	All schools Government	100 100	41 42	59 58	100 100	47 44	53 56	100 100	79 80
	Government-assisted	100	38	62 70	100	47	53	100	77
Port of Spain	Total	100	47	<b>40</b> 58		40 54	46		<b>07</b> 79
тық ағараш	Government	100	57	43	100	71	79		71
	Government-assisted	100	36	-10 64	100	55	20 45		87
	Dovernment assisted Privata	100	33	67	100	33	67		83
St. George Fast	Total	100	47	58	100	58	47	100	87
	Government	100	44	56	100	33	67	100	78
	Government-assisted	100	37	63	100	74	26 26	100	84
	Private	100	60	40	100	40	60	100	80
North Eastern	Total	100	47	53	100	40	60	100	67
	Government	100	0	100	100	0	100	100	100
	Government-assisted	100	50	50	100	42	58	100	58
	Private	100	100	0	100	100	0	100	100
South Eastern	Total	100	47	53	100	71	29	100	76
	Government	100	100	0	100	100	0	100	100
	Government-assisted	100	38	62	100	69	31	100	69
	Private	100	50	50	100	50	50	100	100
Caroni	Total	100	35	65	100	46	54	100	65
	Government	100	29	71	100	43	57	100	71
	Government-assisted	100	33	67	100	44	56	100	67
	Private	100	100	0	100	100	۵	100	0
Victoria	Total	100	39	61	100	25	75	100	82
	Government	100	50	50	100	50	50	100	67
	Government-assisted	100	40	60	100	20	80	100	85
	Private	100	0	100	100	۵	100	100	100
St. Patrick	Total	100	33	67	100	42	58	100	83
	Government	100	43	57	100	57	43	100	86
	Government-assisted	100	21	79	100	29	71	100	79
	Private	100	67	33	100	67	33	100	100
Tobago	Total	100	47	53	100	40	60	100	100
	Government	100	20	80	100	0	100	100	100
	Government-assisted	100	57	43	100	57	43	100	100
	Private .	100	67	33	100	67	33	100	100

Attendance at workshops in teaching methods (79%) was considerably higher when compared to assessment (47%) and curriculum (41%) ( Exposure to workshops in curriculum in Caroni (35%) and St. Patrick (33%), and in assessment in Victoria (25%) was relatively low when cor other educational districts.

ods	
No	
(9)	
71	
21 חרי	
20 77	
23 17	
נו יר	
21 ס פ	
29 10	
10 17	
1/	
ם הה	
<u>۲۲</u>	
16 חרי	
2U 00	
<u></u> 33 П	
U 47	
4Z п	
U 7/	
24 П	
ם ות	
اک ח	
םט חר	
23 77	
ប់ប័ ព្រក	
100	
ום סיס	
۵۵ ۱۲	
ט ח	
17	
1/	
14 91	
21 п	
<u> </u>	
U n	
U	
U	
U	

of School

Table 38). mpared to



Source: Table 38

	Yes	No
Curriculum	41	59
Assessment	47	53
Teaching methods	79	21

#### Table 39. Benefits Derived from Workshops by Educational District

Educational district	Benefit	Total	Percentage
	Delient	10101	Yes
		(1)	(2)
All districts	Provided content knowledge	100	55
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	83
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	59
	Exposure to child development principles	100	37
Port of Spain	Provided content knowledge	100	58
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	83
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	58
	Exposure to child development principles	100	42
St. George East	Provided content knowledge	100	42
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	82
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	58
	Exposure to child development principles	100	42
North Eastern	Provided content knowledge	100	73
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	87
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	40
	Exposure to child development principles	100	47
South Eastern	Provided content knowledge	100	82
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	76
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	71
	Exposure to child development principles	100	35
Caroni	Provided content knowledge	100	54
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	69
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	62
	Exposure to child development principles	100	19
Victoria	Provided content knowledge	100	39
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	89
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	54
	Exposure to child development principles	100	36
St. Patrick	Provided content knowledge	100	58
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	88
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	71
	Exposure to child development principles	100	42
Tobago	Provided content knowledge	100	60
-	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	93
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	53
	Exposure to child development principles	100	33

By attending workshops in mathematics most primary school teachers (83%) benefited from exposure to new teaching techniqu (59%) from alternative forms of assessment and the provision of content knowledge (55%) (Table 39). Generally, the problems tea when applying the content of workshops were lack of time (66%), mainly in the educational districts of South Eastern (94%), Victoria (73%) and North Eastern (73%), and lack of materials (57%), especially in Caroni (77%) (Table 41). An examination of the data by type that a larger proportion of the government and government-assisted teachers indicated that they were limited by lack of time and r to private school teachers (Table 42).

of teachers
No
(3)
45
17
41
63
42
17
42
58
58
18
42
58
27
13
60
53
18
24
29
65
46
31
38
81
61
11
46
64
42
13
29
58
40
47
67

ies and over a half ichers encountered i (82%), St. George ie of school reveals naterials compared



Source: Table 39

Table 4D. Benefits Derived from Workshops by Type of School						
Type of echool	Banafit	Total	Percentage	Percentage of teachers		
туре от аспоот	Dellelit	TULAI	Yes	No		
		(1)	(2)	(3)		
All schools	Provided content knowledge	100	55	45		
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	83	17		
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	59	41		
	Exposure to child development principles	100	37	63		
Г <b>.</b>		100	6.6	50		
onverument	Provided content knowledge	100	44 01	00 00		
	Exposure to new teaching techniques		0U C1	2U 40		
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	ונ ספ	43 C 4		
	cxpusure to child development principles	IUU	٥٥	04		
Government-assisted	Provided content knowledge	100	54	46		
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	82	18		
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	62	38		
	Exposure to child development principles	100	38	62		
Private	Provided content knowledge	100	83	17		
	Exposure to new teaching techniques	100	96	4		
	Exposure to alternative forms of assessment	100	57	43		
	Exposure to child development principles	100	35	65		

# 

- -
- \_

- —
- \_
- \_
- \_

Survey of Mathematics in Primary Schools, 2007

## Table 41. Problems Teachers Encounter when Applying the Content of Workshop by Educational District

Educational district	Problem	Total	Percentage Vas
		(1)	(7)
		(0)	(-/
All districts	Lack of time	100	66
	Lack of materials	100	57
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	3
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	5
	ldeas not simple enough	100	5
	Disorder in the classroom	100	12
Port of Spain	Lack of time	100	42
	Lack of materials	100	46
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	0
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	4
	ldeas not simple enough	100	4
	Disorder in the classroom	100	8
St. George East	Lack of time	100	73
	Lack of materials	100	52
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	9
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	9
	ldeas not simple enough	100	6
	Disorder in the classroom	100	21
North Eastern	Lack of time	100	73
	Lack of materials	100	67
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	0
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	7
	ldeas not simple enough	100	13
	Disorder in the classroom	100	7
South Eastern	Lack of time	100	94
	Lack of materials	100	59
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	0
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	0
	ldeas not simple enough	100	18
	Disorder in the classroom	100	18
Caroni	Lack of time	100	65
	Lack of materials	100	77
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	4
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	4
	ldeas not simple enough	100	4
	Disorder in the classroom	100	4

of teachers
No
(3)
34
43
97
95
95
88
58
54
100
96
96
92
27
48
91
91
94
79
27
33
100
93
8/
<u>មវ</u>
41 100
100 100
וטט קס
۵۷ ۵۷
<u>סג</u> זג
טט 72
20 QC
00 QC
30 96
00 QC
00

Table 41. Problems Teachers Encounter when Applying the Content of Workshop by Educational District (continued)

Educational district	Brahlam	Tatal	Percentage	Percentage of teachers		
	FTUDIEIII	TULAT	Yes	No		
		(1)	(2)	(3)		
Victoria	Lack of time	100	82	18		
	Lack of materials	100	54	46		
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	0	100		
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	0	100		
	ldeas not simple enough	100	0	100		
	Disorder in the classroom	100	11	89		
St. Patrick	Lack of time	100	46	54		
	Lack of materials	100	54	46		
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	4	96		
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	8	92		
	ldeas not simple enough	100	0	100		
	Disorder in the classroom	100	17	83		
Tobago	Lack of time	100	53	47		
	Lack of materials	100	47	53		
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	0	100		
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	7	93		
	ldeas not simple enough	100	7	93		
	Disorder in the classroom	100	7	93		



Table 42. Problems Teachers Encounter when Applying the Content of Workshop by Type of School

Tura of ashaol	Daablam	Tatal	Percentage of teachers		
Type of school	Fibbleni	TULAT	Yes	No	
		(1)	(2)	(3)	
All schools	Lack of time	100	66	34	
	Lack of materials	100	57	43	
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	3	97	
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	5	95	
	ldeas not simple enough	100	5	95	
	Disorder in the classroom	100	12	88	
Government	Lack of time	100	73	27	
	Lack of materials	100	62	38	
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	7	93	
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	7	93	
ldeas not simple enough		100	4	96	
	Disorder in the classroom	100	16	84	
Government-assisted	Lack of time	100	67	33	
	Lack of materials	100	56	44	
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	2	98	
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	4	96	
	ldeas not simple enough	100	7	93	
	Disorder in the classroom	100	12	88	
Private	Lack of time	100	48	52	
	Lack of materials	100	48	52	
	Topics not applicable to the syllabus	100	0	100	
	Topics not suited to the age groups	100	4	96	
	ldeas not simple enough	100	0	100	
	Disorder in the classroom	100	4	96	

Table 43. Update Sessions/Reports on Workshops Held in Schools by Educational District and Type of School

	Type of school	Tatal	Update sessions/reports - percentage of teachers			
		IULdi	Yes	No	Do not know	Not stated
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	All schools	100	64	17	17	1
	Government	100	69	19	12	0
	Government-assisted	100	59	19	19	2
	Private	100	78	4	19	0
Port of Spain	Total	100	67	12	21	0
	Government	100	78	11	11	0
	Government-assisted	100	53	12	35	0
	Private	100	86	14	0	0
St. George East	Total	100	67	18	15	0
	Government	100	70	20	10	0
	Government-assisted	100	68	23	9	0
	Private	100	57	0	43	0
North Eastern	Total	100	61	11	28	0
	Government	100	75	0	25	0
	Government-assisted	100	54	15	31	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	65	10	20	5
	Government	100	67	0	33	0
	Government-assisted	100	60	13	20	7
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
Caroni	Total	100	55	28	14	3
	Government	100	50	50	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	60	20	15	5
	Private	100	0	0	100	0
Victoria	Total	100	56	28	13	3
	Government	100	67	17	17	0
	Government-assisted	100	48	35	13	4
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	73	15	12	0
	Government	100	71	14	14	0
	Government-assisted	100	69	19	13	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
Tobago	Total	100	69	6	25	0
	Government	100	80	20	0	0
	Government-assisted	100	63	0	38	0
	Private	100	67	0	33	0

Most schools (64%), especially private schools (78%), held update sessions or produced reports for the benefit of the teachers who did not attend workshops (Table 43). However, over one-quarter of the teachers in Caroni (28%) and Victoria (28%) indicated that update sessions were not conducted in their schools. On the frequency of workshops, 46% of the teachers felt that they should be held at least once a term while two-fifths (41%) opted for once a year (Table 44). Approximately three-fifths (62%) of the teachers surveyed indicated that workshops should be held during school time (Table 45).





Source: Table 43

	Yes	No	Do not know
All districts	64	17	17
Port of Spain	67	12	21
St. George Eas	67	18	15
North Eastern	61	11	28
South Eastern	65	10	20
Caroni	55	28	14
Victoria	56	28	13
St. Patrick	73	15	12
Tobago	69	6	25

Not stated	
1	
0	
0	
0	
5	
3	
3	
0	
0	

				requency - perce	entage of teacher	S
Educational district	Type of school	Total	At least once a	As the syllabus	At least once a	Not poposony
			term	changes	year	NUL HECESSARY
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
All districts	All schools	100	46	13	41	0
	Government	100	33	17	50	0
	Government-assisted	100	48	10	42	1
	Private	100	63	19	19	0
Port of Spain	Total	100	55	9	36	0
	Government	100	56	0	44	0
	Government-assisted	100	59	6	35	0
	Private	100	43	29	29	0
St. George East	Total	100	46	8	46	0
	Government	100	40	10	50	0
	Government-assisted	100	45	5	50	0
	Private	100	57	14	29	0
North Eastern	Total	100	61	22	17	0
	Government	100	25	50	25	0
	Government-assisted	100	69	15	15	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	45	15	40	0
	Government	100	0	67	33	D
	Government-assisted	100	47	7	47	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
Caroni	Total	100	28	7	66	0
	Government	100	13	13	75	0
	Government-assisted	100	35	5	60	0
	Private	100	0	0	100	0
Victoria	Total	100	41	22	34	3
	Government	100	33	17	50	0
	Government-assisted	100	39	22	35	4
	Private	100	67	33	0	0
St. Patrick	Total	100	54	12	35	0
	Government	100	29	29	43	0
	Government-assisted	100	56	6	38	0
	Private	100	100	0	0	0
Tobago	Total	100	44	13	44	0
	Government	100	40	0	60	0
	Government-assisted	100	38	13	50	0
	Private	100	67	33	n	П

## Table 44. Frequency of Mathematics Workshops by Educational District and Type of School



Source: Table 44

	1	1	Time - percentage of teachers				
Educational district	Type of school	Total					
			Caster	JUIY/ AUGUST	Saturdays	During school	Not stated
		(1)	Vacation (7)	vacation (?)	(4)	<u>time</u> (5)	(E)
		(1)	(2)	(0)	(4)	(1)	(0)
All districts	All schools	100	8	75	4	67	1
	Government	100	4	33	4	58	7
	Government-assisted	100	7	20	3	69	1
	Private	100	19	33	7	41	П
Port of Spain	Total	100		74	3	64	 
	Government	100	n	56	11	33	Π
	Government-assisted	100	n	Б	л П	94	Π
	Private	100	43	29	0	29	0
St. George East	Total	100	8	21	8	62	3
	Government	100	10	10	10	70	0
	Government-assisted	100	9	18	5	64	5
	Private	100	0	43	14	43	0
North Eastern	Total	100	6	28	0	67	0
	Government	100	0	50	0	50	0
	Government-assisted	100	8	15	0	77	0 '
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0
South Eastern	Total	100	5	15	10	70	0
	Government	100	0	0	0	100	0
	Government-assisted	100	7	20	7	67	0
	Private	100	0	0	50	50	0
Caroni	Total	100	3	28	3	66	0
	Government	100	0	63	0	38	0
	Government-assisted	100	5	10	5	80	0
	Private	100	0	100	0	0	0
Victoria	Total	100	16	34	3	47	0
	Government	100	17	0	0	83	0
	Government-assisted	100	13	43	4	39	0
	Private	100	33	33		33	
St. Patrick	lotal	100	U I	23	U	73	4
	Government	100		43	0	43	14
	Government-assisted	100		19	0	81	U
	<u>Private</u>	100					
lobago	lotal		13	25	U	56	b r
	liovernment			20	U		
	Government-assisted		13	25	U	50	13
	Private	100	33	- 33		- 33	0

## Table 45. Time Mathematics Workshops Should be held by Educational District and Type of School



Source: Table 45