



ISSN: 0975-833X

REVIEW ARTICLE

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT: AN APPROACH FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

*Cyprian Bankakuu Gandeebo

Marist International University College, Kenya

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 07th September, 2013
Received in revised form
11th September, 2013
Accepted 26th October, 2013
Published online 19th November, 2013

Key words:

Curriculum 2005,
Stakeholder Democracy,
In-service training, Teacher Involvement,
Policy process, Outcomes-based education

Copyright © Cyprian Bankakuu Gandeebo. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

In Africa, education policies normally never go beyond the formulation phase because there appear a 'disconnect' between policy formulation and implementation. The thesis of this paper is that stakeholder involvement in education policy development is key to the success of policy implementation. Hence, we contend that there is a positive relationship between stakeholder involvement in the policy development and its implementation.

INTRODUCTION

The goodness of any education policy lies in its successful implementation. In Africa and other developing nations, education policies seldom go beyond the intent. Frantic efforts are being made to ascertain the factors behind such anomalies. The most widely spread reason advanced for this discrepancy is the 'disconnect' between policy formulation and policy implementation. Hierarchical governments and policy makers tend to split the policy process by distinguishing formulation from implementation. The distinction has made policy implementation both complex and problematic. This complexity has made it even more difficult for scholars to reach consensus on the strategies towards bridging the gap between policy intent and policy practice. It is generally acknowledged that education policy failures in Africa are largely as a result of lack of involvement of 'appropriate' stakeholders in the policy process. Education policies are usually decided at the top of the hierarchy and handed down or imposed on teachers to be put into practice. Teachers as implementers of education policies are often alienated or sidelined in education policy decision-making phases. Drawing from the works of McGinn and Reimers (1997) and also Jansen and Christie (Editors) (1999) I will contend that stakeholder involvement (participation) in the policy development process is key to the success of any education policy implementation. In this paper I will thus try to illustrate, with McGinn and Reimer's idea of stakeholder involvement, the relationship between stakeholder involvement in education policy process and its subsequent impact on the policy implementation processes. The paper will then conclude with

the view that teachers' participation in the education policy process is the best alternative strategy to successful implementation. Teachers' active involvement in the process has the greatest potential to influence positively the implementation of education policies. The use of stakeholders, in this paper, requires clarification and simply refers to one of the major role players in the education development process. It certainly refers to teachers and educators within the education sector. Teacher involvement then refers to the active engagement or participation of teachers in all the phases of the education policy decision-making processes. Stakeholder involvement in education policy formulation, as in any other policies, is expected to lead to more realistic and effective policies as well as improve their implementation. The reasons are that greater information and experiences make it easier to develop realistic and implementable policies.

Background

Prior to 1994, education policy formulation in South Africa was highly centralised and largely excluded educators. In the new dispensation, educators had thought that the situation would be reversed to give them a voice in the policy design process so that they can appropriately deal with implementation challenges. Even though the document 'A Policy Framework for Education and Training' (ANC 1994) alluded to greater decentralisation of curriculum development tasks, no significant changes in terms of the involvement of educators was identified (Ramparsad, 2001:287). Although the White Paper on Education (DoE, 1995) specifically refers to commitment to the process of participation in curriculum policy development one of the major stakeholders in education, teachers, appear to be sidelined in the education policy design processes.

The new curriculum policy framework on education (OBE/C2005) focuses on the roles of educators in the change process alluding to greater participation of teachers in the policy development process. This was based on the claim, as asserted by Potenza & Monyokolo (1999), that teachers are key role-players in determining the quality of implementation of any new education policy. It is worth noting that very often change in education has failed because insufficient attention had been taken of the current practices and needs of those who are expected to put it into effect. It appears then that the empowerment of teachers to gain their commitment and ownership of the process has usually been neglected and overlooked in policy designs. When policy makers fail to involve stakeholders in the decision-making process, the result is a lack of commitment by those people (especially teachers) who play important roles in putting the policy into practice. Building commitment is thus an important strategy in policy implementation.

The stakeholder Approach

The stakeholder approach in policy making, according to Sevaly (2001), has arisen out of a new general development model which seeks a different role for the state, which is based on pluralistic structures, legitimacy and consensus. In the new South Africa this approach to education policy making has been advocated but less frequently applied as pointed out. The stakeholder approach calls for greater stakeholder involvement at all levels of education policy decision-making. This approach assumes that good governance requires political, social and economic priorities to be based on broad social consensus, and that the marginalised and most vulnerable in society should be allowed to directly influence political decision-making. However, this can only be achieved if stakeholders are opportune to actively involve in decisions that affect their interests. Stakeholder involvement can take several forms. In his work on involving stakeholders in Aquaculture policy making, Sevaly (2001) classified stakeholder involvement into three types: instructive, consultative and cooperative. In his view, the instructive involvement is where government makes the decision but mechanisms exist for information exchange. Consultative involvement is where government is the decision maker but stakeholders have a degree of influence over the process and outcomes. Cooperative involvement, on the other hand, is where primary stakeholders (teachers) act as partners with government in the decision-making processes. In adopting any one of these three forms, mechanisms would have to be put in place to be successful.

Influencing the Policy Process

The stakeholder approach to policy process of which this paper advocates, in my opinion, is much more democratic as it provides space for a variety of voices, rather than having a single majoritarian interest making all the decisions. This approach provides room for minority voices against large and powerful interests. Fleisch (2002) calls it stakeholder democracy and it is an important transitional mechanism in the movement towards representative democracy. However, one of the arguments put forward for the lack of involvement of teachers in education policies is the lack of expertise of the majority of educators. Ramparsad (2001) has argued that because teachers have previously not been involved in the

process even now, they lack enthusiasm and feel that the quality of their input will have no significant impact in the design process. Policy makers, as a result, use union representatives like the South Africa Democratic Trade Union (SADTU) and professional organisations like South African Council for Educators (SACE) and merely 'consult' with only a few teachers who are to put the policy into practice. Within such a system where policy decisions are exercised only at the highest levels, Fleisch, (2002) observes, poor parents, teachers and students are seldom in the position to influence decisions in their interest. From the foregoing, therefore I cannot but agree with McGinn and Reimers (1997), who argue that policies can be effectively implemented if they are informed by research and that stakeholders are capacitated to participate actively in the entire policy design phases. They assert that a good policy is one that is informed by research and which takes into account context and capacity of those who really put policy into practice. Their endeavour explicates and provides a perception on how the process of deciding about education policy making can be informed by research based knowledge and sustained by stakeholder involvement. Education policies developed in this way have a greater potential for success and would better respond to the education development needs of the country than when imposed from the top. Bah-Lalya and Sack (2003) concur with this viewpoint and advised that policy formulation processes that are restricted to leaders at the top and their advisors only are unhealthy since such processes inhibit the policy implementation process.

The contributors in Jansen and Christie's (1999) edited book, *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, argue that because the top-down approach was used to implement OBE and Curriculum 2005 (C2005) in South Africa the policy is less likely to yield its desired benefits. Teachers, they argue, were sidelined and relegated to the background to the extent that they are no longer 'important' in the classroom. The teacher in this approach becomes merely 'a guide on the side rather than the sage on the stage' (Jansen & Christie, 1999). In OBE, the teacher has been marginalised in the classroom to the point that s/he plays just a minor role in the educative process. The teacher, in the new curriculum, is relegated to the background and disappears into a facilitative role while the learners emerge as the initiators and creators of learning. This means the teacher simply fades away so that learning displaces teaching. There is consensus among the contributors in Jansen and Christie's work that teacher capacity is inadequate and the lack of involvement thereof in the educational policy implementation process is a major cause of resistance and staggering nature of the current reform process. The teacher factor, they argue is, thus, a major element for the success or otherwise of the OBE/C2005. The challenge for education reformers hence is to include all stakeholders from across government, civil society, schools teachers and even parents who are the direct beneficiaries of the services of the system. In conventional policy analysis there is a split between policy formulation and policy implementation with two distinct people or groups of people responsible for their enactment. This means those who make policies are seldom those responsible for their implementation. de Clercq (1997) asserts that this separation of policy intent from action is problematic both conceptually and in practice. Most policies fail to do what they were intended because insufficient attention is given to those who

will be responsible for their implementation. As de Clercq (1997) reiterates "failure to take into consideration aspects of the culture in which these innovations are inserted is a major challenge for policy makers".

Unless all stakeholders are made to actively and constructively participate and contribute to the reform process, Rosekrans (2006) argues, the policy process can be self-defeating. For to effect real change in education all stakeholders must change their mindsets about the way they think and do things in the context of education. This can be possible only when everybody with a stake in education is given the opportunity to participate and contribute actively in the policy process. Rosekrans, (2006) reiterates that good education policy making requires making informed decisions based on an understanding of the challenges and potential strategies for meeting them as well as ensuring stakeholder 'buy-in'. It should be noted, however, that the success of the approach depends on how much information provision is made available, the level of consultation and the involvement of the stakeholders. Due to the limited time frame for the new curriculum take off, advocacy and training was inadequately or hurriedly done. Thus teacher involvement was rarely met as only a small group of decision makers at the top and few teacher representatives typically made these policy decisions and simply imposed their decisions on the majority of the stakeholders (especially teachers) for their implementation.

Approaches to Policy Process

The approach just alluded to above is one of three approaches described in the literature in the policy analysis process. These will be briefly discussed here since the stakeholder perspective is located in one of them. Policy and its analysis have been variously described. This is due to its complexity as previously indicated. The way policy is conceptualised also shows its approach. For instance, Haddad (1996) views policy as 'an explicit or implicit decision or group of decisions which may set out directives for guiding future decisions, or initiate, sustain or retard action, or guide the implementation of previous decisions'. Hence, policy is portrayed as a text and a document and indicates that the text is produced by one group of people (policy makers) and its implementation is the responsibility of another group of people (teachers). Reimers and McGinn (1997), view policy not just as a text or document but includes all the processes involving into producing the text. Policy is seen as a set of 'actions by persons involved in the compilation or organization of observable facts or data, and the arrangements of the data using analytic techniques, and the ability to interpret and explain the data in terms of non-observable concepts or constructs' (ibid: p.4). This means the policy process is not just the action of a select few but the actions of all who have a stake in education. McGinn and Reimers (1997), contend that policy making should not be seen as a rational and hierarchical model with policies developed at the top and handed down to others to be executed. They argue that the policy process should be viewed as a political and negotiated process whereby all stakeholders participate to deliberate and arrive at the best possible solution for a policy problem. Policy making should be perceived as a process whereby various stakeholders negotiate to arrive at consensus. As de Clercq articulates (1997), the policy process is an interactive, continuous and contradictory political process which includes the activities and decisions of the different

social actors concerned at the different stages of the policy process. She adds that the policy process is not static or linear but constantly formulated, constructed and adapted. It is not and should not be conceived as linear. Policy would be much more effective in its interactive political process when all stakeholders agree to undertake an event or a course of action. This is likely to lead to good policy decisions and effective implementation of policy programs.

The approach adopted for implementing OBE/C2005, is the orthodox or top-down model. The process is composed of four phases including: policy initiation, policy formulation, policy implementation and policy evaluation. Policy formulation and implementation is usually conceptualised in this approach as two distinct and separate activities to be dealt with. In this way policy formulation is viewed as the responsibility of policy makers and politicians while policy execution is the activity of bureaucrats who aim to translate the policy into action. This approach assumes that translating policy into action is linear and unproblematic requiring strong controls to ensure that bureaucrats execute faithfully the directives of their political bosses (De Clerq 1997:129).

Mechanisms for Teacher Involvement

It has been argued that teachers were insufficiently involved in the new curriculum reform policy process (Department of Education, 1995). This is not to suggest that the process should be stopped. Rather it is suggested that steps should be taken to correct the mistakes and improve the situation so that reforms can produce the desired benefits. So government needs to put into place structures and procedures to help correct or at least ensure the quality of involvement in the reform process. In this perspective teachers should first of all be trained in policy formulation if effective involvement in policy is to be guaranteed. Teachers might feel inadequate and show some resistance but they should be encouraged to make suggestions in this regard as the adage says 'practice makes perfect'. Teachers can only learn by trying and doing. Government and the department of education, in particular, can support in this endeavour by giving training in order to provide quality information that can inform good policy decisions. This will help to sharpen the skills of teachers to make significant inputs in the policy process. In order to be actively involved and fully contribute in the current curriculum reform process there is need for In-service Training (INSET) on large scale. And this should be based on the theoretical features of OBE as well as the curriculum change process. This is the most appropriate mechanism at this stage for developing teachers' skills to participate in the reform process. As indicated previously, teachers did not possess the necessary skills to impact on policy decisions due to the lack of training and/or information.

Time constraint is a major factor in any policy implementation process. According to Jansen (1997), only five days were used to inform and educate teachers about 2005/OBE. Of course, this was simply inadequate vis-à-vis the magnitude of the reform. As a result sufficient time needs to be allocated now for the training of teachers before participation can be meaningful. The cascading model employed to disseminate information and the method of OBE during the advocacy stages was also adjudged inadequate and requires a wider approach like INSET. Apart from INSET teachers should be encouraged to strive to update and upgrade their skills by going

for more professional and academic courses. What this means is that education could be much more effective and efficient than it is if policy makers made use of research-based knowledge in their decision-making processes (Reimers & McGinn, 1997). If sufficient research was done before adopting OBE, proponents of the policy would have known that OBE requires well prepared and qualified personnel, and that their active participation is necessary for successful policy implementation. Mortimore (2000) argues that 'if research were of good quality, rigorous and conclusive, it would [certainly] influence policy'. However, policy makers have their reasons for not using research-based knowledge in their decision-making processes. Policy makers have made us believe that research seems to be one of the less relevant and more impenetrable of the many influences, to which they are subjected (Haddad 1996). Although research is anticipated to make an impact on people's everyday lives, Neilson's (2001) review of literature on the influence of research on policy shows a disappointingly low expectation of research influencing policy makers or decision makers. In Neilson's (2001) view, little research is expected to influence policy since as he notes 'policy makers think research is less relevant'. If Nielson's assertion is true, then Outcomes-based Education (OBE) will certainly not be able to produce its desired fruits. Although there is as yet no evidence, at the macro level, to support the claim that stakeholder involvement improves the policy process, there is some evidence at the micro-level showing that when teachers are involved in making school level decisions there is commitment and ownership which leads to success in the implementation of those decisions or tasks which they themselves have helped to formulate.

In my opinion, Neilson's assertion cannot be taken to be any viable. This is so because there is evidence and research has documented the importance and contributions of the teacher (educator) as a determinant of student learning (Dyer, 1999). More than anything else the teacher is the most central actor in curriculum reforms. And for any education policy to succeed it must take into consideration the contributions of those closest to the educative process. On the contrary, teachers are the most relegated and neglected when it comes to education decision-making, particularly in Africa. It is time for policy makers to shift from their conception of teachers as mere deliverers of the curriculum to a conception of teachers as managers of the teaching and learning process that takes place in the classroom. Reimers and McGinn (1997) have consistently argued that knowledge gained through research points out the need for mutual reinforcement between changes in instructional technology and changes in opportunities for professional development of teachers. Complementing this argument, Potenza and Monyokolo (1999) highlighted on the importance of the teachers' role in the implementation process asserting that teachers are, in most senses, the most important educational resource that any country can have and it is they who determine whether or not curriculum reforms will succeed. Therefore, the authors maintained, the success of OBE and curriculum 2005 depends on the training and support that teachers receive, and their ability to mobilise and manage the resources around them to implement the curriculum. To be successful any educational policy or curriculum change should have as an integral part teacher involvement and development. The point here is that curriculum change only comes alive in

the classroom as a result of the choices made by teachers as to how instructional time and resources are to be utilised. For a curriculum reform to be successful teachers must be trained in new instructional practices but most importantly they must be made to be active participants in the policy processes, from policy design to its evaluation. Apart from active participation in formulating policies they should also be provided with the needed materials for their practice and engagement in the classroom. It is sad mentioning, though, that in Africa and other developing countries, policy makers have tended to change curriculum and instruction without involving or paying attention to teachers. The consequences of such moves, of course, have often been absolute failure and disaster. This orthodox approach to the policy making focuses on the implementation of policies developed at the top and identifies the conditions that would maximise the translation of policy objectives into practice. It has thus been criticised as being too technical. As de Clercq (1997) puts it:

the ability of policy makers to have decisive control over the organisational, social and political processes that affect implementation can never be sufficiently close or rooted in the dynamics on the ground to produce anything but vague, ambiguous recommendations which are in conflict with one another (p.129).

De Clercq's view is that although the new education reform has the potential to restructure and realign a poor and ineffective system, the way it is conceptualised and introduced may jeopardise its ability to address and redress the real problems and causes of the existing poor system. At the most, she reaffirms, it could assist the already privileged educational institutions to use this new approach to enhance and improve their teaching and learning. One of the main reasons for resistance to C2005 in South Africa, it has been argued, is due to the failure to involve teachers at the designing it. Without the involvement, support and commitment of teachers as primary stakeholders, de Clercq, (1997) argues, outcomes-based education reforms becomes a mere technicist, top-down and controlling exercise alienating teachers and stifling their professionalism while at the same time reproducing the status quo with new labels and changed forms. The limitations of the conventional model led to the bottom-up approach. However, the bottom-up strategy to policy implementation did not have support either. The bottom-up approach to policy formulation emphasises the importance of 'street' level bureaucrats and locally based organisations to the success or otherwise of education policy process. The bureaucrats here would include teachers and teacher organisations and professional associations considered to be most closely involved in the lives of learners and the teaching and learning process and it is they, through their interactions with learners, who determine the extent to which policies are rendered effective (Fitz, Halpin & Power, 2001: 55). But the bottom-up approach, as mentioned, has its own limitations as Sabatier (1999) notes. First the approach has the ability to over-emphasise the ability of the periphery to frustrate the centre's intentions. Secondly, it focuses on present participants in the policy process and tends to overlook policy developments in the past and the influence of earlier participants. Thirdly, in making the perceptions and activities of participants paramount, it is in danger of leaving unanalysed social, legal and economic factors which structure the perceptions, resources and participation of those actors

(Sabatier 1986 cited in Fitz *et al*, 2001). Elmore's (1980) backward mapping approach is then seen as an appropriate alternative for the policy implementation process which he defines as:

... backward reasoning from the individual and organisational choices that are the hub of the problem to which the policy is addressed, to the rules, procedures and structures that have the closest proximity to those choices, to the policy instruments available to affect those things and hence to feasible policy objectives (p. 1).

Elmore's (1980:604) backward mapping begins with calls for a specific behaviour at the lowest level of the implementation process that generates the need for a policy. Policy making is thus not informed by 'a statement of intent' from the top but by an understanding of the discrepancy between actual and desired practice which the policy message seek to close. Policies are formulated by all stakeholders only after a thorough review of the implementation path. This then allow resources to be directed 'at the organisational units likely to have the most effect' (Elmore 1980:604). Elmore also suggests that this process reduces 'reliance on abstract, standardised solutions', making way for 'local knowledge and skill at delivery' level, which is essential since 'the problem-solving ability of complex systems depends not on hierarchical control, but on maximising discretion at the point where the problem is most immediate (p. 605). Policy makers should thus work with and not over educators in search for meaningful ways of making policies practicable and to achieving the desired policy goals. Using this approach means that teachers are to be made active participants both at the design and execution levels in the policy process. Outcomes-based education as it is introduced in the South Africa context is unlikely to achieve its ambitious intentions of promoting at the same time effectiveness, redress, development and equity if new strategies are not sought.

The new curriculum, according Potenza and Monyokolo (in Jansen & Christie 1999), has ignored the need to focus on the teacher and the teaching and learning process. As Jansen (in Jansen & Christie, 1999), reports teachers as constituents have been limited in their participation around this important policy. He concurs that teachers were not involved in the design of C2005/OBE claiming that only a few elite teachers, often expert and white, were involved in its structuring. This means that the overwhelming majority of teachers did not have access to information about OBE or understood it. In the new democracy teachers are still regarded as mere implementers of curriculum as it was in the centralised system. Potenza and Monyokolo (in Jansen & Christie, 1999) caution, policy designers need to take into account the teacher factor seriously because research has demonstrated that teachers are the most critical factor in any curriculum reform. Reformers that try to be teacher-proof will surely have problems with implementing educational reforms. Bah-Lalya and Sack (2003) adds that if primary stakeholders are excluded from the policy decision-making processes, they will have little incentive to make it work. The authors reaffirmed that such exclusion usually results in a lack of in-depth information and understanding necessary for detailed policies to become translated into their daily activities as teachers and school directors. Additionally, Stakeholders who did not have their say in the policy making

processes "may 'distort' the policies to ensure that they fit with the realities of the field (that is, closer to the classroom)" (p.21). Evidence from Venezuela, as reported by McGinn and Reimers (1997), indicate that the education reforms initiated there did not yield the desired benefits because the designers of the policy overlooked teacher involvement and training. The situation was so puzzling that they asked why an education reform aimed at helping students to think critically end up producing students who could not read. The authors showed that new curricula and books were produced but neglected teacher involvement and teacher training institutions in the reform process. Similar curriculum reform mistakes were observed in Pakistan and Paraguay as well where governments decided to change the curriculum in primary education without the active involvement of the teacher or educator.

Conclusion

It is generally acknowledged that teachers have been insufficiently involved in the design and implementation process of the new curriculum. It has also been observed that teacher development has not been an integral part of the design process. As Jansen (1999) bluntly put it only became an 'after thought' in the process. However, as Potenza and Monyokolo (cited in Jansen & Christie, 1999) note, curriculum change should have as an integral part teacher involvement as well as teacher development. Intensive teacher development should be a priority 'if we are to develop the calibre of teachers required by OBE'. Teacher development in the opinion of the authors should thus be a national priority. Teachers need training to be able to understand the new curriculum and its challenges. Teachers also need to understand the complex language embedded in the new curriculum and learn new approaches to planning learning programs in an integrated way as desired by the reforms. Unless teachers are properly trained and supported and unless they develop a sense of ownership and commitment of the process, the implementation of the curriculum 2005 will simply remain a mirage. Policy makers should endeavour to have structures and procedures in place to assist policy implementation. One such structure and procedure is the stakeholder involvement approach which, in my opinion, is one of the ways to influence education policy in African nations. Teachers will be actively involved in the policy process if they are adequately informed of the new curriculum and its challenges. This can be made possible through in-service training and workshops. The cascading model to delivery of curriculum should, as much as possible, be avoided since it is inappropriate for a reform of this magnitude. The one-off workshops and orientation sessions should also be avoided.

REFERENCES

- African National Congress. (1994). A Policy Framework for Education and Training. Pretoria: Government Printers
- Bah-Lalya, I & Sack, R. (2003). Implementation Matters: Exploring its Critical Role in Transforming policies and Investments into results. A Paper presented at the ADEA 2003 Biennial Meeting, Mauritius.
- De Clerq, F. (1997). Policy Intervention and Power Shifts: an Evaluation of South Africa's Education Restructuring Policies, *Journal of Education Policy*, 12(3), 127 – 146

- Department of Education. (1995). White Paper on Education. Pretoria: Government Printers [www.gov.za/govdept/ DoE.pdf]
- Dyer, C. (1999). Researching the Implementation of Educational Policy: Backward Mapping Approach, *Comparative Education*, 35(1), 45 – 61.
- Elmore, R. (1980). *Backward Mapping: Implementation of Research & Policy Decisions*, *Political Science Quarterly*, 94(4), 601 – 616.
- Fitz, J., Halpin, D. & Power, S. (2001). Implementation Research and Education Policy: Practice and Prospects, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 42(1), 53 – 69.
- Fleisch, B. (2002). *Managing Educational Change: The State and School Reforms in South Africa*, Heinemann Publishers Ltd: Sandown.
- Haddad, W. D. (1994). *The Dynamics of Education Policy Making*. World Bank, EDI Development Policy Case Study Series. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- Jansen, J. & Christie, P. (eds) (1997). *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-based Education in South Africa*, Cape Town: Juta & Co Ltd.
- Mortimore, P. (2000). Does Education Research Matter? *British Educational Research Journal*, 26(1), 5 – 24.
- Neilson, S. (2001). IDRC-Supported Research and its Influence on Public Policy – Knowledge Utilization and Public Policy Processes: A Literature Review, Evaluation Unit of IDRC: Ottawa
- OBE/Curriculum (2005). Department of Education. Government Printers: Pretoria
- Potenza, E. & Monyokolo, M. (1999). *A Destination Without a Map: Premature Implementation of Curriculum 2005*: In: Jansen, J. and Christie, P. (1999). *Changing Curriculum: Studies on Outcomes-Based Education in South Africa*, Cape Town: Juta Ltd.
- Ramparsad, R. (2001). A Strategy for Teacher Involvement in Curriculum Development. *South African Journal of Education*, 21(4)
- Reamers, F. & McGinn, N. (1997). *Informed Dialogue: Using Research to Shape Education Policy around the World*, Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group Inc.
- Rosekrans, K. (2006). Using Participatory Research and Informed Dialogue to Influence Education Policy: Lessons from El Salvador. *Journal of Education for International Development*, 2:2. Retrieved from www.equip123.net/jeid/articles/3/IEP.pdf on 12/09/2006.
- Sabatier, P. A. (1999). *Theories of the Policy Process*, Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Sevaly, S. (2001). *Involving Stakeholders in Aquaculture Policy-Making, Planning and Management*. Retrieved from www.fao.org/DOCREP/003/AB412E/ab412e32.htm, accessed on 5/10/2006
