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A curriculum is a foundation of any education system. No matter how well the curriculum is developed, if teachers do not extensively understand and accept it, it causes variation in interpretation in classrooms. Variance leads to less efficiency and puts the attainment of national goals of basic education in jeopardy. In order to avoid this predicament, teachers should be actively involved in curriculum planning and development. The purpose of this study is to determine the basic education teachers’ perceptions of their involvement in the curriculum development process in Namibia. This study bridges the gap in literature as no study is conducted in Namibia regarding this phenomenon. The study employed a qualitative case study and used purposive and convenience sampling to select participants. Participants were 8 teachers who received teachers’ training with teaching experience of 5 years and above from 4 schools in the Khomas region; 2 teachers per phase of basic education. In addition, this study employed a semi-structured interview to collect data. Collected data were analysed inductively using content analysis, coupled with the use of ATLAS ti.8 software. The results of this study indicate that most teachers were not satisfied with their involvement, although few were content with it. Furthermore, the results show that these teachers are qualified and experienced, meaning that, they have the necessary skills and knowledge to be integrated into the curriculum. However, none of these teachers was ever involved in curriculum planning. Nevertheless, they were actively involved at implementation phase. Teachers are involved in the curriculum development process to a little extent. Moreover, teachers felt that the curriculum is imposed on them hence they only got the document to implement. This study reveals that it is significant to involve teachers in curriculum planning and development. This significance is because they know the background, learning needs and interest of learners. Involving teachers means that learners’ interests are represented in the curriculum, leading to designing a curriculum which is relevant and meaningful to the learners. Furthermore, it can reduce the gap in knowledge and reduce the content that teachers perceived it as too much. Moreover, the results show that involving teachers in curriculum promotes both professional development school development, hence, schools can only develop when it is run by knowledgeable teachers. Lastly, involving teachers in curriculum development acquaint them with an in-depth understanding of the curriculum which they can use to explicate the content to the learners, to obtain learning objectives. This does not only enhance learners’ performance but attaining objectives of the national curriculum creates a path to the attainment of both national and global goals, of which Namibia’s vision 2030 is to produce a knowledge-based society and to implement Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4). To improve participation of teachers in curriculum development, this study recommends Namibia Institute for Educational Development (NIED) together with the Ministry of Education Arts and Culture (MoEAC) to involve a substantial number of teachers in curriculum planning. Furthermore, the curriculum should be piloted to schools before it gets implemented. Additionally, schools should have school-based curriculum committees.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

There is a call for action to change the world, and the world leaders pledged for the collective action to implement Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Among the SDGs, there is Goal 4 that seeks to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” United Nation General Assembly (UNGA, 2015). Goal 4 stands out specifically for education. Importantly, education is positioned at the heart of development and essential for the success of all proposed SDGs (UNESCO, 2016). Therefore, education sectors have embarked upon the road to implement Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4), to acquaint learners with the knowledge and skills relevant for the pursuit of global development. Basically, a curriculum is a powerful instrument in education, and it is a foundation of any education system. Studies have shown that in order to make education meaningful and relevant to the society, it depends on how the curriculum is developed (Chinyani, 2013; Abudu & Mensah, 2016).

Education will not produce quality open-minded individuals if the curriculum is not well articulated. To start with the definition, the term curriculum has various meanings but originally, is derived from the Latin word 'currere' which means 'run' (Jadhav & Patankar, 2013). Lunenburg and Ornstein (2011) defined it as guiding written document that stipulated methods that could be used to attain intended goals at the end of the programme. This definition is good for this research because it fits with the definition provided in the Namibia national curriculum for basic education. Thus, the curriculum is defined as the official document for teaching, learning and evaluation that provides direction to planning, organising and implementing teaching and learning (Ministry of Education Arts and Culture [MoEAC], 2015). It is imperative to bring to attention the specific curriculum that is used and studied in this study. This study used the overall National curriculum for the basic education system, and not the content or the syllabus of the specific subject or area of study.
The figure below indicates the curriculum under this study.

![Curriculum Diagram]

Figure 1. The indication of curriculum definition under study

Bates, Lewis and Pickard (2011) layout that, the first nationalised curriculum was introduced in the United Kingdom in 1988 and went through a various revision to make the content deliverable. Unfortunately, it was not successfully implemented as it did not contact teachers for their input. Kelly (2009) argues that, if the curriculum is not extensively understood, it does not only diminish the academic standards, at the same time, it wanes the behaviour and the attitude. This realisation is where the importance of involving teachers’ in curriculum planning comes in because teachers are the ones that deliver curriculum content. If teachers are left out in curriculum development and get the curriculum wrong by any chance, then it is presumed that the goal of attaining effective curriculum implementation would be a mirage. Kelly (2009) articulated that, the importance of involving teachers in curriculum design came to be realised after it failed to implement teacher-proof curricular during the curriculum reforms in the 1940-1970s, that is when the academics discussion on the significance of involving teachers in a curriculum designed begun.

It is important to note that, the process of curriculum development should acknowledge the importance of consulting all stakeholders. The list of stakeholders may differ slightly, but mostly it includes learners, teachers, school leaders, school inspectors, textbook publishers, teachers training system and so forth (International Bureau of Education, 2017). It is regarded that, there is always a gap between a formal curriculum and curriculum in use. A study of Shkedi (2009) can be used to substantiate the gap conception that exists between the curricula. However, there is much evidence to support that to implement curriculum effectively and to enhance pedagogy; teachers must be the active participants in curriculum development process. The involvement of teachers in curriculum development is imperative because teachers know the needs of the learners as well as their learning styles (Maphosa & Mutopa, 2012; Abudu & Mensah, 2016). Importantly, the knowledge of knowing the needs of the learners is essential for effective learning. An expert Tyler (1949) has it that, effective
learning happens when learners are offered with learning experience that fits within their capabilities. Alsubaie (2016) stresses that, teachers have more knowledge on delivering the content and have a business of explicating curriculum content in classroom. With the knowledge and skills, they acquired through teachers’ training, and the experience they gained when interacting with the learning environment and learners on daily basis, it is accepted that it makes teachers know the needs of the learners better than any other stakeholder. Scholars such as Carl (2009) advocates for teachers’ empowerment through curriculum development. With all articulated, it indicated the importance of involving teachers in curriculum development process.

In Namibia, Article 20 of the constitution advocates for Education for all, it was stipulated based on the foundation of Education Act (act 16 of 2001). The Namibian education contains the key features of a democratic and educational national curriculum and this is substantiated by the education’s four overall goals which are: access, equity, quality and democracy (the Republic of Namibia, 2007), which are guiding education. The National curriculum for basic education is designed at the National Institute for Education and Development (NIED) which is the directorate within the Ministry of Basic Education, Arts and Culture. NIED is charged with the responsibility to review, revise and develop the curriculum. Hence the Namibian national curriculum for basic education is designed only at NIED; it is centralised. The model of a centralised curriculum is not something new. For instance, California centralised its curriculum policy in the 1990s based on the context of neoliberal education of No Child Left Behind, the reform got implemented as from 2002 (Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012), where under this rule, according to Erss, Kalmus and Autio (2016), teachers are perceived as technicians who implement the system and are paid by results. Presently, Namibia adopted education for a democratic society (MoEAC, 2015). In accordance with Kelly’s (2009) appropriate curriculum for a democratic society should be the one continuing development of knowledge and skills, create an opportunity for the learners to develop their independent thinking. What is noteworthy in this Kelly’s description is that the curriculum for a democratic society should allow teachers to exercise their freedom and make a professional judgement.

Vygotsky’s constructivism learning theory influences the Namibia national curriculum. Vygotsky’s idea of learning stresses the importance of overcoming the Zone of Proximal Development also known as ZDP through scaffolding. Hence scaffolding acts as a bridge that helps the learners to move from where they are to where they can be with help, Vygotsky advocates that instructions are only imperative when they move ahead of development (Smidt, 2013). The above statement is outlined and link it to the Namibia National curriculum for basic education because Namibian curriculum is a Learner-Centred Curriculum. Learner Centred curriculum requires teachers to use learner-centred
teaching strategies and monitor learners’ performance through continuous assessment methods (MoEAC, 2015). One more evidence on why I ground that Namibian national curriculum for basic education is based on Social Constructivism theory of learning is deduced from the emphasis of Illeris (2009) that highlight that, in social learning; interpersonal relations of modelling and imitation are involved. To add, social interaction is considered. On a similar note, the Namibian curriculum lay down that, the ability to create new knowledge and acquire new skills do not happen in isolation (MoEAC, 2015, p. 37).

Change is inevitable, and the speed at which the society is changing is very rapid. Since education needs to meet the demand of the society, the Namibian curriculum gets reformed after every 5th year to keep up with the societal change and to instil learners with knowledge, skills, value and attitude needed to function in the globalisation world of 21st century. The teachers should accept an educational policy proposed for effective implementation. According to Huizinga, Handelzalts, Nieveen and Voogt (2014), the success of curriculum reform largely relies on teachers; hence they are the one who put reformed idea to practice. The theorist Kelly (2009) presented the vision of the curriculum suitable for the democratic society, which is to promote freedom and autonomous thinking of social and political empowerment as well to value others regardless of their ability, ethnic groups, or social status. Moreover, Kelly’s democratic curriculum is denoted as the one that exposes learners to the culture of their own and that of not their own. It is on this referral the researcher believes that the Namibian National curriculum for basic education is in line with Kelly’s vision of curriculum, this is because it is conspicuously noted in the curriculum that it is made to empower the learners to become autonomous, innovative, compassionate and productive members of the society (MoEAC, 2015). The national curriculum for basic education that was reformed in 2010 preceded the current National curriculum for basic education which was revised in 2015 and got implemented in 2016.

The Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture brought its policies with an advocate to inclusivity in the education sector, it is addressing the issues of inclusive education and lifelong learning. National Institute for Education and Development (NIED, 2018) stipulated that the revised curriculum is aligned to objectives of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) that stresses on “ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. The alignment of the curriculum to SDG4 is evident because the new curriculum is supplemented by The Inclusive Education Curriculum Framework (MoEAC, 2015). Therefore, it is evident to maintain that, the national curriculum for basic education in Namibia stands behind the implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 4-Education. In Namibia, basic education is the amount of time of schooling, required for a child to acquire skills such as Numeracy, Communication, Information and
Communication Technology, learning to learn, Personal skills and Cognitive. Previously, the basic education had 5 phases, which are: 1 year of Pre-Primary, 4 years of Lower Primary, 3 years of Upper Primary, 3 years of Junior Secondary and 2 years of Senior Secondary. At the time of writing this thesis, the curriculum has only 4 phases of education which are: 4 years of Junior Primary, 4 years of Senior Primary, 2 years of Junior Secondary and 3 years of Senior Secondary. The figure below (figure 1) show some adjustment the new curriculum made on the structure of basic education.
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Figure 2. The structure of basic education (MoEAC, 2015, p.4)

Teachers in Namibia who are responsible for the basic education have the various qualification, and they are trained from different institutions. Some have obtained their qualification within the country, from institutions such as the College of Education which had reformed and articulated with the University of Namibia (UNAM) which is a public institution. Other institutions that produce teachers are International University of Management (IUM) and Institutes of Open Learning (IOL) which are both private institutions. Some teachers had got their qualification from institutions outside the
country. Teachers education/training programme has gone under several changes in Namibian, and this led to teachers being in possession of different qualifications such as certificate, diplomas, degrees and honours degree in education. Institutes such as UNAM have a module called Curriculum Studies, where student teachers are acquainted with the notion of curriculum planning and development, not only that, teachers are as well trained on pedagogy. However, there is an experience that some teachers at schools do not have the professional qualification. This is to say teachers might have different knowledge about the curriculum that leads to different perception, hence different understanding.

A considerable amount of research on teachers’ involvement in curriculum development has been studied worldwide, but no research on this topic is done in Namibia. In addition, studies have tended to focus more on the extent of teachers’ involvement in curriculum development, but little attention has been paid on how teachers’ involvement in curriculum development relates to their professional development. Therefore, it is worth to scrutinise the involvement of teachers in the planning and development of the National curriculum for basic education in Namibia. To investigate how teachers are involved and their perceptions of the effect that their involvement has on the effectiveness of the curriculum. In the literature review, teachers’ involvement in the curriculum development process globally and in Namibia is considered.

1.2 Significance of the research

This study is highly significant, first and foremost, education is paramount in transforming our world, and the curriculum is a foundation of any education system, therefore, this makes this research imperative in a way that it provides literature, new knowledge and suggestions for possible improvement in the area that is highly significant for global transformation. Secondly, this research scrutinises the teachers’ involvement in the overall Namibian national curriculum for basic education, and not the syllabus of specific subjects, because the entire curriculum is the umbrella of the others. Therefore, if the national curriculum is well articulated, then what falls under it such as syllabus of various subjects would be up to standard too, in short, this single study provided solutions to multiple problems.

To proceed, the centrality of teachers’ perception in curriculum development in recent literature is more available in quantitative study and not sufficiently available in qualitative. Therefore, it is important to study this phenomenon from another worldview which is qualitative research. In addition, the Ministry of Education, Arts and Culture of Namibia wants to play its part on contributing to national Vision 2030 by producing the “knowledge-based society” (MoEAC, p.8, 2015). This aim
will only be achieved if the curriculum is well designed, well understood by the teachers and well implemented. In other words, it is through the curriculum itself that this objective will be reached. Therefore, this study presents the educators’ perception and suggestions to the reduction of obstacles that might hinder the attainment of this vision from the educational side.

Again, this study is significant because its’ results determined whether Namibian teachers are involved in the development of the National curriculum for basic education or not. Having the Namibian curriculum stipulated that teachers are one of the pre-conditions to the successful implementation of curriculum and provision for quality education (MoEAC, 2015, p.6). Thus, the finding would serve as a source for further action. Again, this research would create awareness and new knowledge about the significance of involving teachers in the curriculum development in the Namibian context. Considering that, the findings would be shared with the Ministry of Education Arts and Culture, National Institute for Educational Development, policymakers, curriculum developers, schools and individual teachers. Lastly, the Namibian national curriculum for basic education articulated that, the great challenge of curriculum reform is in the implementation of the curriculum and urge teachers to take ownership and implement it with commitment (MoEAC, 2015, p.6). Therefore, this research provides the insight perception of how involving teachers in the development of curriculum could contribute to the effectiveness of curriculum implementation in Namibia and narrow a gap that might exist between a prescribed curriculum and actual classroom practice. Moreover, it provides future researchers with areas they might research further emerged from this research.
2. Curriculum as a guiding document and teachers’ involvement.

A curriculum as a guiding document at a National level can be viewed as a course of learning ordinarily, concentrate on purpose and needs for changing the curriculum (Van dan Akker 2003). Based on this description, (see figure 2 below which is adopted from Van dan Akker, 2003 and used again in the recent article of Nieveen and Kuiper, 2012) the curriculum focuses on the fundamental purpose that instigated its formation, what to be taught, as well as what to be achieved at the end of schooling measured using what activities. Furthermore, the curriculum comes with necessary materials where ideas are specified and needed to support the attainment of its objectives. Moreover, it allocates a period a certain content should be taught to learners at a certain level. Equally important, it involves how a teacher should facilitate learning. A National Curriculum initially emerged from Education Reform Act in 1988 (Moon, Mayes & Hutchinson, 2002; Kelly, 2009) that was introduced in England, Whales and Northern Ireland set out the content and subjects to be covered. Mathematics, Physical Science, Biology, Arts, Humanity and Social science (Kelly, 2009) are six core area of the curriculum that was recommended. Additionally, Moon et al. (2002) presented that: English, mathematics and science, distinct as core subjects, together with other subjects such as: art, history, modern languages, music, physical education and technology which makes it ten subjects in total comprises the National Curriculum.

![Figure 3. Curriculum as a guiding document (Van dan Akker, 2003; Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012)](image_url)

Moon et al. (2002) stipulated that there has been gradually unwillingness to leave the decision about curriculum to teachers. Tyler’s (1949) advocacy for curriculum to be designed by curriculum experts at local level can be used as an example to authenticate Moon et al. (2002) revelation. However, Taba
(1962) turned down Tyler’s advocacy and urged curriculum development to start at the grassroots level, where teachers are at the centre of curriculum development.

2.1 Curriculum development and teachers’ involvement

Curriculum development is the process of creating planned syllabus, teaching, training, and exhibition modes (Patankar & Jadhav, 2013). Correspondingly, curriculum development is considered as an umbrella and ongoing process ranging from design to evaluation; it is characterised by phases such as initiation, design, dissemination, implementation and evaluation (Carl, 2009). It is a continuous process of constructing and modifying; therefore, it is not a fixed thing. Bilgin, Alev, Yigit and Akdeniz (2011) encouraged that, during curriculum development process of planning, developing, renewing and evaluating, anyone who is influential to it should actively be involved. Different stakeholders make up this process, and this includes government, publishers, parents, teachers and learners and so forth. However, each party influences curriculum development differently. This is to say, some parties are potent enough while others have a small effect (Lau, 2001). Above all, teachers are perceived as the paramount chiefs in the curriculum development process. To begin with, (Alsubaie, 2016; Bilgin et al. 2011; or, Kärnerb & Krullb, 2016; Abudu & Mensah 2016) asserted that teachers are the appliers of the curriculum, for that, their inputs are very much of significance. Correspondingly, Konokman, Yelken, Karasolak, and Sesur (2017) highlighted that the process of curriculum development continues to the classroom where teachers implement the designed curriculum, it begins with formulating the instruction and ends with giving feedback and suggestion. In some countries, teachers are involved in the process of curriculum development. Particularly in Finland: teachers, learners, member of the community are among the curriculum panel that design the curriculum, (Finnish National Board of Education, 2014). Notably, as indicated by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2014; OECD, 2016) Finland has been among the top countries in the Programme for International Student Assessment. To specify, OECD (2014) and OECD (2016) indicated that, most learners in Finland master the baseline level of proficiency in subjects that are measured by PISA such as Science, Reading and Mathematics. Therefore, the researcher presumes that, teachers’ involvement in the process of curriculum development has a positive impact on the academic performance of the learners. Similarly, Scotland has reformed its’ curriculum to curriculum for excellence (CfE), from the previous practice of top-down curriculum to the combination of both top-down and bottom-up curricula (Priestley, Minty & Eager, 2014). The same authors articulated that CfE was implemented in 2010 driven by the prominence of perceiving teachers as the agents of change and as curriculum developers. Therefore, teachers are perceived as curriculum developers in Scotland.
Although few studies indicated that teachers are involved in the process of curriculum development, numerous studies have shown that, teachers especially in Africa, are left out in the process of curriculum development (Oloruntegbe, 2011; Maphosa & Mutopa 2012), despite the imperative ideas, teachers could bring on board in the process of curriculum planning and development. In South Africa, teachers are omitted from the curriculum decision making process and experienced curriculum to be inflicted on them (Carl, 2005). While in Nigeria teachers were rarely involved in the process of curriculum development (Oloruntegbe, 2011). Similarly, in Kenya, the experiences and talents of teachers were merely used during the curriculum development process, and most teachers were only involved during the implementation stage (Kobiah, 2016). This subtopic revealed the literature of teachers’ involvement in curriculum development process, it is articulated based on four stages of curriculum development process which are: curriculum planning, curriculum development, curriculum implementation and curriculum evaluation.

2.1.1 Curriculum Planning

Curriculum planning is considered as the action where the formulation of goals, classification of content and situation analysis happens (Carl, 2009). Teachers are professionals, and they are trained and enriched with knowledge regarding their profession; their knowledge should not be undermined. While Government of regional offices prescribed the skills covered by the curriculum, a teacher can provide insight into the types of materials, activities and specific skills that need to be included (Etim & Okey, 2015).

Scholars such as Etim and Okey (2015), Albilehi, Han and Desmit (2013) advocate for teachers’ involvement in curriculum development, and Oluruntegbe (2011) specified that teachers should be involved in all stages of curriculum development. However, did advocates pay attention to if the teachers are capable? Do they have knowledge? These questions can be asked in a Namibian context too. High policy makers in Australia as reported by Gerrard and Farrell (2014) gave a reason why Australian teachers were left out in curriculum planning. These authors revealed that policymakers believed the teachers did not know how to develop a curriculum because teachers were not trained for curriculum planning. Not always teachers are side-lined in curriculum planning, there are few cases they were involved. For instance, the study of, L.D. Fusarelli and Fusarelli (2015) indicated teachers’ participation in curriculum planning which should align to the Common core curriculum, the results revealed that teachers found it challenging to develop the curriculum materials, they further expressed that it consumed much of their time and energy. Maphosa and Mutopa (2012) urged that teachers need to be empowered in curriculum planning so that effective implementation is assured.
Teachers might not be knowledgeable about curriculum planning, but their involvement is very crucial. Therefore, if teachers are not knowledgeable in formulating the curriculum, they should be trained and guided, to plan a great curriculum autonomously. In the past years, there had been many scholars (Shawer, 2010; Voogt et al., 2011; Albilehi et al., 2013) advocating for curriculum design projects to be part of teachers training. The advocacy for enriching teachers’ knowledge with and through the curriculum is still evident in recent years. For instance, Alsubaie (2016) stated that, because teachers should be involved in curriculum development, hence they are experienced in teaching, and they are responsible for implementing the curriculum in classes, they need training and workshops that will enhance their professional development and led to effective curriculum contribution. In cases of where teachers had received their teacher's training, in time of renovation, still, they need additional support.

2.1.2 Curriculum Development

Curriculum development is a phase where the learning content and course objectives are identified. In addition, it is stipulated that teaching and learning materials are developed at this stage (Carl, 2009). Since teachers apply the curriculum, they should participate in curriculum development (Etim & Okey, 2015)

Teachers feel that, most of the times they are not counted in for developing the curriculum. Turkey’s teachers expressed that before implementing the curriculum, none of their contributions was inquired (Saracaloğlu et al., 2010). Equivalently, the research titled basic school teachers’ perception about curriculum design in Ghana reported that teachers are not consulted in the designing process (Abudu & Mensah, 2016). Furthermore, the same authors reported that, teachers made an utterance that, policymakers did not take teachers views because they think teachers are many and all their views cannot be considered. In addition, teachers did not have a curriculum representative at schools where their views can be submitted. Oloruntegbe (2011) claimed that, curriculum implementation could only succeed if teachers and communities partake in development and implementation of curriculum and structural changes. When teachers are part of development, only little in-service training is needed because they are already aware of what curriculum entails when they were formulating it. Except when teachers are not involved in the curriculum; then enough in-service training is needed to acquaint teachers fully with the innovation. However, studies that reveal that teachers are excluded in curriculum development conjointly showed that teachers receive inadequate orientations (Bilgin et al., 2011).
2.1.3 Curriculum Implementation

According to Carl (2009), to implement is to put a new curriculum to practice. Teachers believe that they are the curriculum implementers, therefore, they see it imperative to participate in curriculum planning to make implementation easier and smoothly (Abudu & Mensah, 2016). According to Porter et al., (2015) effective implementation includes intuiting, interpreting, integrating, and assimilating the change as an individual, as a team as well as at the organisational level. Teachers who graduated recently might have new knowledge of curriculum related issues. However, some teachers might lack an in-depth understanding of the curriculum. This can be caused by lack of induction training at higher institutions or determined by an area of interests. In the same manner, teachers who left institutions years ago might have outdated information on curriculum development. Therefore, regular in-service training on a new curriculum is needed to update both the experienced teachers and new graduates who did not specialise in curriculum studies to implement the curriculum effectively. Even though teachers are the implementers of curriculum, teachers experience a lack of orientation on innovation (El-Okda, 2005; Oloruntegbe, 2011).

The study that examined teachers experience in implementing the core curriculum standards reported that, majority of teachers found it challenging to implement the curriculum (Porter et al., 2015). In addition, teachers felt rushed to complete much work within a short period of time. Some teachers in Estonia, Finland and Germany in like manner felt the curriculum content was too much (Erss et al., 2016). Porter et al. (2015) reported that, ineffective communication and constant reinterpretation of instruction from the top officials could be the cause of placing effective implementation in jeopardy as uttered by the teachers. After the curriculum is implemented, it needs to be evaluated to confirm if it reaches its objectives.

2.1.4 Curriculum Evaluation

During curriculum evaluation, data on strengths, weakness and preference is gathered. This phase comprises the evaluation of teachers, learners, material, assessment and methods (Jadhav & Patankar, 2013). Teachers are perceived as not only the active curriculum implementers but also the main components that give feedback on the current curriculum to make it better (Konokman et al. 2017). After the evaluation, if the curriculum is not accepted as suitable, then it can be reformed. Although teachers evaluate the curriculum, their suggestions to make it better are not put into account. Saracaloğlu et al. (2010) unveiled that, in Turkey, teachers know that their ideas are not put into account, neither did they received feedback on the previous curriculum they evaluated. Furthermore, the same author reported the dismay teachers had against the books because they were not edited based on teachers’ contribution; thus, these teachers just evaluate the curriculum as a routine and
therefore prompted to perceive themselves as only implementers. The similar case of teachers evaluating the curriculum and their suggestion not considered happened in Jordan in 2007, the slight difference is that, according to Al-Daami and Wallace (2007), Jordan teachers got feedback on the evaluation, but only the page orders of the teaching and learning books were changed, the content was still the same.

Not taking teachers contribution can daunt the teachers to make a critical reflection on their work, and no reflection, no great performance. The survey study carried by Bilgin et al. (2011) to determine the teachers’ opinion on planning, applying and evaluating Primary Curriculum (PC) and the difference between those who attended in-service training and those who did not, in Turkey found out that firstly, teachers had negative views regarding the evaluation of Primary Curriculum. This could be because their evaluation views were not considered as stated in earlier research. Back to the results, it again showed that those teachers who attended in-service training and those who did not attend, did not have common points of views on curriculum development. Lastly, yet importantly, Al-Daami and Wallace (2007) revealed that, the in-service training was not enough. In brief, teachers were involved in this phase of curriculum development, they got the papers to fill in and evaluate, but their ideas were not considered. Therefore, the evaluation process appeared to be a case for formality.

2.2 Different approaches to curriculum and involvement of teachers

The process of curriculum planning and development differs from country to country. According to Carl (2009) curriculum designed can be planned at a Macro level which is equally known as National level, Meso level which is Provincial or departmental level and Micro level which is referred as School level. Planning can be central or decentral, curriculum planned at a national level is centralised. A centralised curriculum uses a top-down approach where the implementation starts with the government and continues to school (Eunitah, Chindedza, Makaye and Mapetere, 2013). By contrast, decentralised curriculum works in the opposite flows as centralised curriculum. Eunitah et al. (2013) remark that it begins at the grassroots level which is schools and elevate to the top. The last level in this study which is a mixed approach is a combination of both top-down and bottom-up approaches. Regarding this approach, both central and subordinated stakeholders are granted power. Teachers´ involvement in curriculum development gets less as it moves towards the broader level. However, Carl (2009, p.65) stressed that teachers´ involvement in curriculum development is the heart of successful curriculum development.
2.2.1 Top-down (Centralised model)

Most of the Arab countries use a top-down model in which teachers’ involvement in curriculum development is restricted and mostly participate only at the implementation stage (El-Okda 2005). The top-down model is accountable for the failure of the Rolling Project of a reformed curriculum carried out at China’s College English Department, that intended to bring the co-operation that was destroyed by the previous model (one-teacher-package-class) between teachers and the students (Wang & Cheng, 2005). Although the project strengthens the learning experience of the learners, Wang and Cheng’s (2005) study showed that, teachers had no clue how to implement the new curriculum, this is because teachers were neither part of the committee of curriculum innovation, nor did they receive in-service training. Consequently, the model reduced the proficiency and ignited chaos than the previous one, which results in the model discontinued.

The mixed method study that focused on views of teachers’ involvement in planning and developing the curriculum, the actual level of their participation as well as their willingness to participate in Jordan shows that 72.9% of 525 teachers participated in the study were not involved in curriculum planning and development (Al-Daami & Wallace 2007). Furthermore, 71.6% of teachers were not involved in the recommendation of changes to the textbook. The same study explored teachers view through a semi-structured interview of ten teachers; teachers expressed that, their participation was limited by lack of opportunity because of the way the system operates. Despite the limited involvement of teachers, more than 90% of the teachers indicated a willingness to be involved in curriculum planning and development and only 2.5 % were not willing to participate (Al-Daami & Wallace 2007). In addition. The same authors reported that teachers claimed that, textbooks were not up to standard and there was a mismatch between curriculum content and local environment. Furthermore, they stressed that they get insufficient pedagogical resources from the ministry, although they made efforts by supplementing own designed materials, there was still restriction because materials had to be in line with the ministry of education.

Maphosa and Mutopa (2012) urged the development of textbooks to be taken at a macro level where teachers write textbooks for their learners. Teachers desired to have more in-service training, to have the ministry to pay attention to the evaluation form and to discuss the curriculum first before it is implemented. Saracaloğlu et al. (2010) stated that teachers were given a pilot curriculum for comments but before their suggestion was published, they already had received the curriculum to implement. These findings are not in line with the argument for pilot made by Eunitah et al. (2013) when they urged that pilot testing is an essential exercise before implementation, because it ensures if innovation is practicable to all schools.
The qualitative research studied in Turkey to determine teachers’ perception, and their involvement level in curriculum development found out that, teachers’ views were not taken into consideration and this decreased the motivation of the teachers, (Saracaloğlu et al., 2010). A teacher who is not motivated will not deliver effectively, and ineffective delivery harvest low performance. According to Ozturk (2011), Turkey is ranked at the bottom of the list of international assessment programme such as PISA and PIRLS emphasising on the OECD and European Union countries. The curriculum is designed at the central authority, and teachers get the curriculum only to implement. Despite their cry to actively get involved in the curriculum development process (Saracaloğlu et al. 2010). The scenario of teachers getting curriculum to implement made the teachers see themselves as passive receiver rather than active agents in the profession. Consequently, the recent study that was conducted in Turkey in 2017 to determine teachers’ perception in curriculum development competence found out that, teachers perceived themselves incompetent in curriculum development (Konokman et al., 2017). Altogether, not considering teachers’ contribution to curriculum development causes the teachers to undermine their knowledge.

In most developing countries such as Ghana, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, and Kenya, the curriculum is centralised (Abudu & Mensah, 2016; Wadesango, 2010) and imposed on the teachers to implement. The mixed study method that concentrated on teachers’ perceptions about curriculum design and barriers to their participation in Ghana found out that, 90 % of teachers expressed that they are not involved in curriculum designing, some did not even have an idea when is the curriculum developed (Abudu & Mensah, 2016). However, the same teachers recognised the importance of their involvement in curriculum development process; they stated that, they have practical knowledge on what learners perceive usable. Teachers’ recognition of their importance can be confirmed using Clayton’s (2007) results that reported that teachers discovered learners’ interest in the class and put it to use in the curriculum. Furthermore, teachers can get to know learner trough having the learners write about themselves (Clayton, 2007). Not only that, teachers know better the challenges they encounter in class when implementing the curriculum, and if their views are incorporated in curriculum, it can help to rectify such problems.

The Ministry of Education in Zimbabwe had granted schools power and authority to choose practical subjects and optional subjects from the provided list, in addition to the compulsory subjects that are selected by the Ministry of Education. The study that was conducted by Wadesango (2010), to determine the extent of teacher participation in decision making in secondary schools in Zimbabwe, where involvement in curriculum choices was one of the components that were studied, reported that, four of five schools whose teachers were interviewed were not involved. The same author reported
that, decisions on curriculum choice is only made by the heads of school and their deputy's heads. Furthermore, respondent teachers who were left out in curriculum decision felt their opinions were not valued in curriculum even though most of them specialized in curriculum and perceived themselves best qualified to make decisions in the curriculum. The same author mentioned that teachers might resist the change and the learners on receiving end might fail the modules and the end of the day. Wadesango’s study recommended teachers empowerment in decision making.

In Kenya, the curriculum is centralised as they use a top-down model of a curriculum designed by Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD, 2014; Kobiah 2016). Similarly, Nigeria, Curriculum is developed centrally by the Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC) (Oloruntegbe, 2011). The quantitative study carried out to investigate teachers’ participation in curriculum conceptualization, and effective implementation of secondary school curriculum in Kenya found the statistically significant relationship between teachers’ participation in curriculum conceptualization and effective implementation of secondary school curriculum in Kenya, not only that, teachers have strongly agreed that their involvement will improve pedagogy (Kobiah, Barchok, Njagi, Kobia, 2015). Unpleasantly, the same results show the small extent to which teachers participate in curriculum development. The following year after this study, Kobiah (2016) explored teachers’ perspective towards their involvement in selection and organisation of learning experiences and implementation of secondary school curriculum in Kenya. The findings were similar. Kobiah (2016) reported that teachers were involved in the selection and organisation of learning skills, attitudes and values during curriculum development to a small extent. Furthermore, the overall mean was 2.28 out of 5 points; this little involvement is due to top-down model the education system is using. Deducing from the results, I can say the top-down model does not fully allow teachers to participate in curriculum development, it undermines teachers’ knowledge and experience. This type of method can lead to pedagogical dogmatism (El-Okda, 2005), and implemented in a way different from the intended curriculum (Wang & Cheng, 2005; Kobiah, 2016) and therefore diminish educational goals. El-Okda (2005) argues that neither a top-down curriculum nor a bottom is best suitable for educational reform. Several studies such as (Abudu & Mensah, 2016: Kobiah 2016) recommended that the appropriate model to increase the level of teachers’ participation in curriculum development is to decentralise the curriculum.
2.2.3 Bottom-up (Decentralised model)

Various countries such as Finland, Australia, Great Britain, Netherlands and Sweden used a decentralised curriculum (Mølstad, 2015; Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012). A decentralised curriculum has benefits of producing variations in framing teacher autonomy and licence of the teaching profession (Molstad, 2015). Thus, it is significant for the teachers to be autonomous, because they comprehend what is going on, and tend to implement the curriculum better. In Finland the National core curriculum for basic education implemented from 2006 onwards (Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012) is the support where local curricula are designed (Niemi, Toom & Kallioniemi, 2016), local curriculum work can be created in variation guided by the national curriculum. The system of localising curriculum creates an ample opportunity for teachers to participate in curriculum and it makes teachers feel that they are efficient. Finnish teachers felt that the influence they exert on the content is potent, particularly in foreign languages where more room for interpretation is allowed (Erss et al., 2016). Teachers decide on the content of the curriculum, provided that, the National Core curriculum guides them.

In almost all the countries mentioned above, teachers in schools or region are entrusted with designing the school or municipality curricula (El-Okda, 2005). Molstad (2015) stated that, Estonian curriculum reform of 1996 promised the school autonomy and the empowerment of the teachers, however, the recent study conducted by Erss et al. (2016) showed that, this promise was not fulfilled, as Estonian teachers expressed their dissatisfaction against the top down curriculum model where their knowledge was not utilised. The figure below (figure 3) indicated the types of the curriculum model for some countries whose data were collected, it illustrated curriculum policy of where the countries shifted from, in 2004, where the countries were positioned in 2004 and where the countries were anticipated to head as from 2004. California and England had long shifted from decentralised to centralised curriculum policy, at present they are centralised. Sweden shifted from centralised to decentralise, and it was heading to centralise again. Finland has moved from centralised to decentralise, and at the time this data was captured, it was subtle to determine if it was moving towards centralised or decentralised. Netherland had been decentralised, and it was foreseen that it was slowly moving towards the centralised curriculum policy.
Figure 4. Characterisation of curriculum policies in the past, present and future (source: Kuiper et al. 2008)

Note: CAL = California; ENG = England; B/FL = Belgium Flanders; FIN = Finland; NET = Netherlands; SWE = Sweden.

A comparative study made by Mølstad (2015) investigated how Norway and Finland designed the national curriculum to provide guidelines for local curriculum in municipalities and schools. Mølstad (2015) found out that, the local Norwegian curriculum is deliberate to deliver the national curriculum, while for Finnish, local curriculum work is designed as a pedagogical process for developing local curriculum. What is worth taking from this article in connection with this research is that, the report found that teachers in Finland are provided with extensive autonomy in local curriculum work (Mølstad, 2015). To add, Vitikka, Krokfors, and Hurmerinta (2012); Erss et al. (2016) stated that teachers and schools in Finland are highly trusted. High trust of teachers implies that the teaching profession is acknowledged. In Estonia, Mikser et al. (2016) reported that although the Estonian curriculum policy theoretically appeared to develop the school curriculum (SC), it was about delivering the national curriculum which did not fulfil the promise of enhancing teachers’ curriculum ownership. The same author mentioned the importance of curriculum ownership which is essential for motivating teachers for effective curriculum implementation and problem-solving. Regarding that, curriculum ownership does not recognise teachers only as the implementers of the curriculum but as curriculum designers as well. In other words, teachers should be involved in other phases of curriculum development should it be said that they have curriculum ownership. Regarding Estonia,
there is a lack of trust in teachers and schools by society (Erss et al. 2016). Alsubaie, (2016) believed that there is a positive influence between teachers’ involvement in curriculum development and the academic performance of the learners. Therefore, it is not surprising that countries whose curriculum is decentralised such as Finland has a successful education system.

Every curriculum model has its strengths and weaknesses. Eunitah et al. (2013) stated that decentralised curriculum is expensive because schools are supposed to meet all cost. Although decentralised curriculum model tends to work well in some countries, it failed in Hong Kong and China. According to (Li 2005) China and Hong Kong attempted to implement decentralised curriculum model of School-Based Curriculum Development (SBCD) in schools and kindergarten a decade ago. Unfortunately, it was futile due to lack of qualified teachers incapable of designing effective curriculum as well as weak teacher qualification in both Hong Kong and China. The curriculum will be easier to implement if it is developed by knowledgeable teachers (Konokman et al., 2017). To rectify the failed model, the same author stated that China and Hong Kong diverged away from SBCD model to quasi-SBCD which is neither nor entirely school-based.

A similar case happened in England decades ago. As reported by Kelly (2009), the system’s curriculum and policy were more practised and influenced by schools between 1960-1970s, until people realised that, the system produced low education standard and needed the state to intervene. The same author articulated that, it gave rise to development of a national statutory curriculum for learners aged 5-16 which was designed in England in 1989. With all these said, it can confirm that teachers in some countries were involved in curriculum development; hence schools were trusted to formulate the curriculum and that it, however, did not produce desired results. According to Alsubaie (2016), the curriculum should be able to produce the intended results and meet the demand of the society, or else it should be changed. Overall, it can be said that when the school and the teachers are entrusted with the development of the curriculum, teachers tend to feel the ownership of the curriculum and they utilise their knowledge and experience to find ways on how to achieve the intended goals. In support is Nieveen and Kuiper (2012) who concurred that the curriculum would only be effective if teachers feel responsible for it. However, the same authors criticised the model that, it brings inconsistency as well as differences in education policy. For example, Gerrard and Farrell (2014) observed, that a learner in one school could have a well-formulated curriculum while another has a weak one depending on schools or teachers who formulated that curriculum.
2.2.4 Mixed (Top down-bottom up) approach

The development of the new breed of the curriculum has been observed for the last 17 years when the curricula tried to merge what is claimed to be the best features of top-down and bottom-up approaches to curriculum planning (Priestley, 2011). According to Kelly (2009), this approach emerged after the failure of external attempts at the dissemination of innovation whereby the school council used to offer ‘‘teacher-proof packages ‘‘and the teacher would accept it, use it and apply it in the accurate form the planner had in mind. Thereafter, the same author further emphasised that, the School Council endorsed a policy of supporting school-based -curriculum development. Furthermore, it recommended the appointment of teachers to be curriculum coordinators and develop their curriculum to meet some of the problems of the individual schools. Scotland curriculum for Excellence (CfE) is a fair example of this model (Priestley, 2011).

In Netherland, there had been merely input or output at the national level (Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012), leaving all the responsibility regarding the curriculum for secondary and primary education to schools and teachers. However, due to politics such as the change of the parliament in 2010, and international academic competitions such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and PISA, Netherland shifted the model to mixed approach curriculum (results-oriented model). With the mixed approach, the trust in teachers and schools to formulate curriculum still exists but with regulations, and now standards that resemble Finland’s ‘‘description of good performance‘‘ was formulated (Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012). Therefore, teachers are involved in curriculum development in Netherland so the government. Politics and international academic competition are driving forces behind curriculum reform.

Scotland is the only exception in the United Kingdom which does not have a centralised national curriculum but a school-based curriculum (Kelly, 2009). According to Priestley et al. (2014), Scottish new Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) was implemented in 2010-2011, the distinctiveness of this curriculum is that, it stressed the importance of teachers as agents of change and professional developer of the curriculum. Despite the development of curriculum at the school level where teachers’ ideas were taken into consideration, the implementation of this curriculum was not free from challenges. (Priestley & Minty, 2012) who conducted the study in Scotland to discover teachers’ perception on the new curriculum (CfE) found out that teachers are highly professional and motivated, however, teachers were anxious too about CfE, and the document that guided implementation was neither clear nor consistent.
Although it is imperative to involve teachers in curriculum development with the advantage that it motivates them and keep their profession up to standards, it does not guarantee smooth implementation. The main arguments for school-based curriculum development in favour of teachers are that, it ensures teachers autonomy which is the part of teachers’ profession. Additionally, School-Based Curriculum Development realised that curriculum development and teacher’s professional development are interdependent (El-Okda, 2005).

As the literature has revealed the different experience of teachers in curriculum involvement, so as teachers perceptions vary. As we have seen in the literature that teachers are willing to be involved in curriculum development, e.g. in (Al-Daami & Wallace 2007), on the other hand, there are few cases that some teachers are reluctant about taking responsibility about curricula issues. These cases of unwillingness are reported in Eastern European countries, particularly in Estonia that has a mixed approach (Erss et al, 2016.), and in countries that follow a top-down curriculum approach such as China and Hong Kongo (El-Okda, 2005). Similarly, unwillingness is reported in countries with a custom of decentralised curriculum approach in the past such as Netherland (Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012), and then in Zimbabwe (Chinyani, 2013). Some few reasons behind the unwillingness to partake in curriculum development are that teachers feel the workload is too much and overwhelming (Wong, 2008; Erss et al., 2016; Chinyani, 2013). In short, most of teachers desired to be involved in curriculum development while the minority did not.

2.3 Types of Curriculum and teachers’ involvement

A study conducted by Shkedi, (2009) to investigate how the external curriculum was implemented in a classroom indicated that, 80% of teachers who were interviewed and observed for the study did not consistently obey the formal curriculum. Moreover, the same author reported that 80% of the activities that were analysed did not come from a curriculum document, hence the teachers perceived that, the activities suggested by curriculum developers are non-obligatory. Curriculum designed externally without involving teachers made teachers devise their activities based on individual understanding. These activities might not be of standards, the way they would be if a group of teachers created it, should they have been involved in the curriculum design. Even though curriculum writers may ensure consistency in a formal curriculum, teachers do not understand the curriculum in the same consistency Shkedi (2009). Curriculum designed externally without involving teachers create a gap between formal curriculum and actual curriculum. According to Gerrard & Farrell (2014), teachers animate, ordain, construe, neglect, and disregard the curriculum policy imposed on them. It is better to involve the teachers in curriculum development process because even if they are not involved for
the sake of consistency, the curriculum is inevitably ambiguous, and every teacher would interpret it from the individual point of view.

The study conducted by Oloruntegbe (2011) reported that, most teachers did not implement the national curriculum which is designed centrally by the Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC). Besides, the same author reported that Nigerian teachers implemented the versions prepared by examination bodies such as West African Examination Council (WAEC), National Examination Council (NECO) and National Board for Technical Education (NABTEB) that engaged teachers during the development of curriculum. This article revealed that, if teachers are excluded in curriculum development, there is a possibility that they might not implement the official planned curriculum. Not implementing the national curriculum can impede the attainment of educational goals.

2.4 Teachers’ involvement in curriculum development and their professional development.
Professional development is essential for improving teachers’ skills (Balyer Özcan and Yildiz, 2017). Eventually, the world is changing, so as teaching approaches. Thus, when teachers are well developed professionally, they can react to change. Elliott (1994) constructed a theory that claims that there can be no curriculum development without professional development. This theory has been used by recent studies such as Oloruntegbe (2011). Oloruntegbe stated that curriculum development is about teachers’ development and teachers should participate in all stage. Kimwarey, Chirure, and Omondi (2014) reported that teacher’s participation in decision-making improves their problem-solving skills. Participating in decision-making includes participating in curriculum planning, this is because, at the initial stage of curriculum development, curriculum developers make decisions; they initiate curriculum content, outcomes and teaching methods.

Teachers should have the opportunity to provide inputs during initial idea generation so that they can internalised changes (Carl, 2009). Internalising curriculum reform enriches teachers’ professional growth because they incorporate knowledge related to their profession within themselves. Therefore, allowing teachers to participate in curriculum plannings improve their professional development. Additionally, involving teachers in initiatives responsibility does not only improve their professional development, but it empowers teachers (Maphosa & Mutopa, 2012; In ám 2015), give them a sense of self–efficacy (Maphosa & Mutopa, 2012) and develops their autonomy (Balyer et al., 2017).

Regarding empowerment, it has the importance of transforming teachers to strive towards the attainment of school objectives (Kimware et al., 2014). A school can develop if its´s targets are achieved. Thus, involving teachers in curriculum development is of significance because it empowers them, which leads to the development of schools. Furthermore, involving teachers in curriculum
develops them professionally as well as their autonomy. Hence there is little availability of studies about teachers who experienced involvement in the actual curriculum planning as shown in the literature; it affected this topic in a way that it may not give a more detailed review of teachers’ experience of their professional growth through curriculum development. However, teachers’ experience deduced from available studies are discussed shortly.

Tronsmo and Nerland (2018) investigate teachers´ local curriculum development by analysing it as a process of objection construction. Teachers used previous curriculum materials to construct the new subject curriculum that the school was mandated to do. The study revealed that the teachers’ detected inconsistency and omission related to the overall requirements during the engagement. Not only that, teachers materialised their experience and ideas on explicating content and teaching methods; as a result, they designed a better systematic curriculum (Tronsmo & Nerland, 2018).

From my point of view, professional development in this case was deepened in such a way that when teachers materialised their experience and ideas, they learned how to develop critical thoughts that were carefully examined before they were expressed. Besides, during the collaboration, teachers were sharing knowledge, in other words, teachers´ knowledge connection was extended through curriculum development. Notably, Voogt et al. (2011) stated that the collaboration of teachers with others and with experts gives teachers an opportunity to consider the content from interdisciplinary view. In another study, Clayton (2007) investigated an effort to promote curriculum making as professional development to novice teachers. The study reported notable shifts observed in teachers who participated in the project. To start with, the process helped teachers recognised learners´ feeling and made teachers aware of learners’ interest and motivation. As a result, teachers put learners´ interest to use in the curriculum, this act moulded the teachers in nurturing learner authorship in creativity and built interest in the subject and simultaneously reduced the disciplinary issue. Furthermore, the case revealed that, before teachers were engaged in this process; a specific teacher used to be a subject expert that feed information and resources to learners but after the process, the teacher became an expert in assisting learners to learn through their discovery.

Another study conducted by Albilehi et al. (2013) to determine how the pre and in-service teachers became more prepaid to face challenges of course development by outlining the experience designing a curriculum for English for art purpose reported that, apart from teachers felt empowered, teachers had gained field experience and internalised the theories applied to the curriculum. Furthermore, teachers expressed that, the process extended their understanding of the meaning of curriculum development and they would use the knowledge they have obtained to design effective lesson plans.
and materials that are in line with curriculum for effective pedagogy. Combining field experience and theory gives teachers a deep insight into the phenomenon. Equally important, having an extensive understanding of the content can boost teachers’ confidence and this can lead to better lessons. Mikser et al. (2016) revealed that teachers experienced both personal and professional growth as well as an additional understanding of the curriculum through curriculum planning. Not only that, the teachers equally experienced opportunity to reflect critically on their professional understanding of the curriculum and of teaching and learning. This is similar experience teachers might feel when they are empowered. Balyer et al. (2017) recognised that, by empowering teachers, they reflect on their work and identify their strength and weakness for themselves as well as developing competence in their profession. Therefore, this validates the interconnection of curriculum development, teachers’ empowerment and professional development.

Shawer, Gilmore and Banks-Joseph (2008), expressed that curriculum development and professional development are interdependent. Correspondingly, El-Okda (2005) stated that these two processes cannot be separated. Hence these two processes are connected, one influence the other, which means when teachers partake in curriculum development, their professional development get deepened so as their effectiveness. According to Alsubaie (2016), it positively influences academic achievement of the learners. This argument can be reinforced by looking at the most top three performing countries in PISA such as Singapore, Finland and South Korea. According to Auguste, Kihn and Miller (2010), the teachers are granted professional working environment; moreover, teachers perceived that professional development is imperative and it helped them to be effective in their responsibilities. Teachers are learners as well, and just as learners need to be actively involved in their learning to acquire skills and knowledge, teachers equally need active involvement in the curriculum if need to gain an in-depth understanding in that area.

The consequence that is likely to come when teachers are not empowered through curriculum but imposed with the curriculum is that, teachers may autonomously select activities, but their initiative may be limited by both centralised control and time caused by the content of the curriculum (Erss et al., 2016). In Hong Kong most of the Pre-primary teachers only had a sub-degree qualification (Ho, 2010). The study carried out in preschools of Hong Kong for school-based curriculum points out that, teachers are merely involved in curriculum development and decision making be it on a practical level or designed level (Li 2006). Teachers might be less confident due to low qualification and thus jeopardise their eagerness to participate in curriculum and pedagogical decision. Ho (2010) remarked that knowledge-wise, they were unfit to make a well-informed decision. This is to say, if teachers training education is not of the quality that gives teacher high accredited qualification, teachers will
be reluctant in exercising their professional right such as getting involved in curriculum development and consequently decrease their professional growth.
3. Summary of literature review

A curriculum as a guiding document at the national level focuses on the rationale and motives behind the formation of the curriculum (Van dan Akker, 2003). From the history, the Nationalised curriculum is an outcome of Education Reformed Act of 1988 introduced in the United Kingdom except in Scotland; it indicated that, earlier on, there was a hesitation of involving teachers in curriculum planning (Kelly, 2009). Later, the importance of involving teachers in curriculum planning was later realised. To support this, studies advocated for teachers to be involved in curriculum development in all stages (Oluruntegbe, 2011). This similarly includes active involvement in curriculum planning (Carl, 2009; Alsubaie, 2016), this is because teachers are the ones who put reformed ideas to use (Handelzalts et al., 2014). In addition, teacher’s participation in curriculum planning made teachers to gain interdisciplinary understanding (Voogt et al., 2011), teachers made sense of theories and internalised them as well as make use of the field experience to design effective lesson plan (Albilehi et al., 2013). Carl (2009) advised that teachers should not only be curriculum implementers, but they should further be empowered through curriculum development. Currently, teachers are viewed as agents of change. Some countries reform their curriculum to give autonomy and curriculum ownership to the teachers. Scotland reformed its’ curriculum with the motives that perceive teachers as agents of change and as curriculum developers (Priestley et al., 2014). Similarly, Finnish teachers have extensive autonomy in curriculum development (Molstad, 2015).

Even though few studies revealed that teachers were involved in curriculum planning, numerous studies have it that, teachers are not included in curriculum planning. Teachers in Turkey (Saracaloğlu et al., 2010) and those in Ghana (Abudu & Mensah, 2016) expressed the exclusion in curriculum development. Considering the curriculum development process, teachers are involved to a little extent; they are more involved at implementation stage. This is indicated by the studies of (Oloruntegbe 2011; Kobia et al., 2015) to mention a few. Teachers are not only left out in curriculum development, but they also lack information of when the curriculum is developed. Teachers indicated that they are not aware of when the curriculum was formulated (Abudu & Mensah, 2016). This is not constructive because according to Porter et al. (2015), teachers expressed that, ineffective communication can hinder effective implementation. There is another scenario where teachers’ views were collected, but they were not integrated into the curriculum. Teachers in Estonia and Turkey expressed this dismay where their ideas were asked but never utilised (Saracaloğlu et al., 2010; Erss et al., 2016). Consequently, it decreased teachers’ motivation (Saracaloğlu et al., 2010). In my opinion, utilising teachers’ ideas in curriculum development is very imperative to the learners. This argument can be supported by Clayton (2007) who indicated that teachers integrated learners’ interest
in the curriculum. The integration of learners’ interest could help in developing the curriculum relevant to the learners.

Lack of expertise for curriculum design and low teacher qualification are some of the factors behind teacher’s exclusion in the curriculum. Gerrard and Farrell (2014) reported that policymakers excluded teachers in the curriculum because they believed teachers did not have knowledge of how to design the curriculum. If teachers lack knowledge on formulating curriculum, then high authorities might be hesitant to let curriculum development in teachers’ hands as it might pose a threat to the validity of the curriculum. Regarding the expertise, the study conducted by Li (2006) reported that there was a failure to implement the school-based curriculum in Hong Kong and China that was developed by teachers, due to lack of qualified teachers and low teacher qualification not capable of designing effective curriculum. However, teachers’ involvement in curriculum development is very crucial. Thus, studies advocated for the inclusion of curriculum planning projects in teacher’s education (Shawer, 2010; Voogt et al., 2011) and offering of in-service training and workshop Alsubaie (2016).

Studies reported that majority of teachers are willing to participate in curriculum development Al-Daaami and Wallece (2007). However, there are few reports where teachers were not willing to participate. Unwillingness to engage in the curriculum was expressed by some teachers in Estonia (Erss et al., 2016), Netherland (Nieveen & Kuiper, 2012) and Zimbabwe (Chinani, 2013), their justification against participation was too much workload. Noticeably, teachers are yearning for effective in-service training. Studies have shown that teachers expressed the in-service training they received was not enough (Bilgin et al., 2011). However, some revealed that it was somehow helpful but did not match their practical needs (Porter et al., 2015).

Studies have indicated that teachers’ involvement in curriculum is beneficial. This is because teachers know the needs of the learners (Abudu & Mensah, 2016), they can provide the relevant materials and activities needed (Etim & Okey, 2015). Activities that best suit the need of their learners hence they are the ones who know their needs better. Furthermore, it is reported that teachers implement the curriculum (Konokman et al., 2017). It is better to enforce your own opinion instead of made to implement strange ideas. According to Gerrard & Farrell (2014), teachers reject, and neglect curriculum policy imposed on them. This can negatively affect the performance of the learners as Wadesango (2010) reported that the resistance of teachers to change might cause learners to fail at the end of the term. Therefore, involving teachers in curriculum minimise this predicament. Overall, allowing teachers to participate in curriculum development empowers them. Subsequently, empowerment drives teachers’ transformation to achieve the objectives of school (Kimwarey et al.,
In the same manner, involving teachers in curriculum development gave them a sense of self-efficacy (Maphosa and Mutopa, 2012), motivated them (Priestley & Minty, 2012) and made them gain an additional understanding of the content (Miksera et al., 2016). Possessing a deep understanding of curriculum nurtures professional growth. Professional development has a positive relationship with learners’ academic achievement (Alsubaie, 2016).

Not to get carried away by the positive side, involving teachers in the curriculum does not always assure effective implementation. Evidently, the study of Priestly and Minty (2012) reported that the implementation of the curriculum that was planned with the help of teachers was not free from challenges. To be specific, the curriculum document lacked clarity and coherence. However, involving teachers in curriculum development process has more benefits than not involving them.
4. Research task and research questions

This research tries to discover the perceptions of teachers regarding their involvement in curriculum development process by seeking for meanings and understanding directly from the teachers. It explores why it is important that teachers participate in all stages of the curriculum development process and how effective their participation in curriculum planning is on curriculum implementation. Besides, the research fills the gap in literature as this phenomenon is not explored yet in Namibia at the time of writing and publishing this thesis. Furthermore, looking from the literature, many studies are quantitative studies, and only few are qualitative; this study would increase the availability of this phenomenon from the qualitative point of view. Most of the questions of this researcher are ´´How´´ questions which seek to understand and explain the phenomenon under study (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). Moreover, these ´´How`` questions drive the participants to construct their perceptions and give more details. Hence, they are open-ended questions; they do not limit the participant.

In short, this study ceases to address three main research questions below:

1. How do teachers in Namibia perceive their involvement in the planning and development of the National curriculum?
   1.1 How they perceive the significance of teachers’ involvement in curriculum planning?
   1.2 How are the teachers consulted in the development process of the curriculum?

   This question tries to capture in what manner teachers in Namibia regard their involvement in all stages of the curriculum development process which are: curriculum planning, curriculum development, and curriculum implementing and curriculum evaluation. Moreover, the same question desires to find out how teachers are consulted regarding the process of curriculum development, how many times are they consulted and for what purpose.

2. How broadly are Namibian teachers involved in the curriculum planning and development?
   2.1 How regularly are they involved in curriculum development?
   2.2 Which phase of curriculum development has they been involved?
   2.3 How are teachers’ opportunities to participate in curriculum planning created?

   The second research question tries to discover if the representation of teachers in curriculum development is substantial, considering the population of teachers that implement the curriculum. In addition, the question seeks to find out if there are chances created for the teachers to have access to
curriculum development. Lastly, the question intends to unfold if teachers are included in curriculum planning and development throughout, or if their (teachers’) involvement is only in some stage/s.

3. How do teachers perceive the effectiveness of their involvement in curriculum development?
   3.1 How do teachers see the relationship between the involvement of teachers in curriculum development and the academic performance of the learners?
   3.2 How do teachers see the relationship between the involvement of teachers in curriculum development and their professional development?
   3.3 Would teachers like to be involved? Why? / Why not?

The third research question tries to explore how the teachers see the effectiveness of their involvement and the academic performance of the learners as well as their professional development. In addition, it seeks to explore how teachers perceive their participation in curriculum planning and development influence the implementation. Within this question, the researcher asked the participants whether they want to be involved or not with the aim to discover if teachers are willing to be part of the curriculum development process.
5. Methodology.
In this chapter, research designs and research paradigm of the study are presented. The chapter still entails research strategy chosen for this study, in addition to the participants, the tools used to capture data as well as the process of how the data was collected. Justifications on the choices of methodologies are stated too. Lastly, the chapter gave details on how data was analysed from raw data to meaningful data.

5.1. Research design: Qualitative study
This study followed a qualitative research approach, because the qualitative research study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interprets phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them (Flick, 2007). Qualitative researchers try to extract meaning from their data (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). This is the most compatible approach for this study because this study is interested in generating an in-depth understanding of teachers’ involvement in the planning and development of curriculum, by capturing teachers’ perceptions. The researcher interpreted data generated through interaction between the individual teachers and the researcher regarding the phenomenon studied. Qualitative research collects data in the field where participants experience the issue under study (Creswell, 2009). In this regard, the researcher went to conduct the study at schools where curricula activities take place. Qualitative research is a form of interpretive inquiry in which researchers make an interpretation of what they see, hear and understand (Creswell, 2009, p.176). Regarding this, at schools, the researcher got engaged with the participants, face to face of which a privilege to hear perception directly from teachers themselves was had. The researcher perceived their emotions, captured their facial expression and body movement as they gave their experience. This study presents and interpreted teachers’ perceptions.

5.2. Research paradigm: Interpretivism
Creswell and Poth (2018) classified four interpretive frameworks which they also call research paradigms for qualitative research which are: post-positivism, social constructivism (which can be called interpretivism), transformation and postmodern. Researchers such as Lincoln, Lyneham and Guba (2011) call them research paradigm, while Creswell (2009) calls them worldviews. Creswell and Poth (2018) defined an interpretive framework as a theory that guides the research. This study follows an interpretive framework called Social Constructivism which is often described as interpretivism: which means gaining understanding by interpreting subjects’ perception (Lincoln et al. 2011). The researcher perceived this paradigm approach as best suitable for this study because this research seeks to understand teachers ‘participation in curriculum planning and development, by interpreted teachers’ perceptions and described their views. To employ this interpretivism pattern, for
instance, the researcher asked how a teacher perceive their involvement in curriculum planning, and the teacher answered that: teachers who are at schools are not mainly involved in planning, only few teachers go to NIED to design the curriculum, but that is fine because NIED has curriculum experts. In the interpretation, the researcher would state that this teacher felt that their level of involvement in curriculum planning is very low, yet the teacher was contented with it because the teacher trust that NIED curriculum planners are knowledgeable about curriculum. Teachers uttered different words for instance (we only need few teachers to add NIED experts and NIED officials are experts why should we get involved) but if they have the same meaning after interpretation, then they are placed under the common theme.

In interpretivism, the researcher relies much on the participant's views (Creswell, 2009). The data which analysed for this study is not based on any other source except for the perception of the teachers. Thus, the researcher interpreted and described them to generate the understanding. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2007), interpretive is mainly characterised with understanding the subjective world of human experience, whereby researcher gets inside the person and generate an understanding of issue under study from within. In this study, it achieved this characteristic through interviews, where the researcher approached teachers individually, and they expressed their views from the within, about their involvement in curriculum planning development. In other words, data collected tool used depended on the subjective affiliation between the participant and the researcher.

Another reason why this paradigm is right for this study among them all is because at the end of data analysis, when the teachers’ perceptions are described, interpreted and made sense of, this study presents the results which are the theories that have emerged from the research. As Creswell and Poth (2018) acknowledged that, rather than beginning with the theory (like postpositivism) interpretivists inductively creates theories or pattern of meaning. Atkins and Wallace (2012) highlighted the degree of subjectivity of interpretivist. This was put this into consideration by reviewing the researcher’s experience carefully before articulating and sentence in this study, the researcher took the personal experience into account so that it does not contaminate the data. Actions that the researcher took not to influence the data of this study are discussed in the validity topic of this research.
5.3. Research strategy: A case study

Creswell and Poth (2018) defined a case study as a qualitative approach in which the researcher inquire into real life, current bounded system or multiple bounded systems over time via using multiple in-depth sources of data and report a case description or case themes. Notably, Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011) pointed out that, education is one of the disciplines that commonly use a case study. Correspondingly, this research focused on the issue in education. There are three variations of case studies such as intrinsic case study, instrumental cases study and multiple case study (Stake 2005; Creswell & Poth 2018). This study employed an intrinsic case study, because from the description of intrinsic case study, Stake (2005) stated that, intrinsic case fascinates researchers towards comprehending what is imperative about the case, not only that, it intends to develop what is detected to be the case´s own issues, contexts and interpret its “thick description”. The study wants to understand and provide detailed insight into the case of teachers´ involvement in curriculum development. To draw towards this, the study describes own teachers´ sense of reality; hence it is a descriptive case study (Yin, 2014). The case in this study is bounded, as recommended by Creswell and Poth (2018). The boundaries set for this study are time to collect data, participants that are only qualified and having teaching experience that starts from five years and above, as well as the location, hence this study collected data only in Khomas region.

A case study is useful when exploring questions that are more complex than merely ´´what´´? Alternatively, ´´how many´´? (Atkins & Wallace, 2012). Thus, this research strategy is most suitable for this study because the study seeks to generate a holistic understanding of teacher´s involvement in curriculum planning and development. By finding answers to the sorts of the questions, it has of: ´´how´´ teachers in Namibia perceive their involvement as well as their effectiveness in curriculum development?

According to Gay, Mills and Airasian (2009), a case study permits the researcher to study phenomena that are not studied by other researchers. In addition, it allows the researcher to understand the issue and make a recommendation. Hence, this study is never researched in Namibia, the case study method is appropriate for this study. Moreover, this research will comprehend the issue and recommend changes. Case studies are a step to action, they start in the world of action and contribute to it (Cohen et al., 2007). As it was mentioned already that this study is not yet researched in Namibia, it will contribute knowledge to the area studied. Cohen et al. (2007) stated that, it is imperative in a case study for events and situation to be allowed to speak for themselves instead of being interpreted and evaluated by the researcher. Hence, participants in this study spoke for themselves during the interview. Therefore, the researcher can say this study allpied the rules for case study effectively.
5.4. Sampling

Creswell (2012, p.206) suggested that, the researcher can deliberately choose the participants or site to study and perceive the central phenomenon. Therefore, the researcher purposefully chose 8 qualified teachers who have teaching experience of 5 years and above. These teachers had been in the teaching field for sometimes and experienced curriculum reform hence the Namibia national curriculum get reform every fifth year. For this, the researcher utilised their experience in contributing to the understanding of the extent of their participation in curriculum planning. The researcher did not choose beginning teachers because they did not experience the National curriculum reform, otherwise, a no will be an obvious answer to the question that seeks if they have ever participated in curriculum planning. This choice of sampling again emerged from Cohen et al. (2007), who stressed that purposive sampling is used to get access to knowledgeable participants. Hesse-Baker and Leavy (2011) stated that, qualitative research usually works with a small sample. Thus, the researcher can claim that 8 teachers in Namibia that were selected are enough for this study. Namibia Basic Education is sub-divided into four phases: Junior Primary (Pre-primary and Grades 1-3), Senior Primary (Grades 4-7), Junior Secondary (Grades 8-9), and Senior Secondary (Grades 10-12), (MoEAC, 2015, P.4). To ensure a holistic overview and evenness, 2 teachers from each phase were conducted for an interview.

Equally important, the participants form a homogeneous group, hence the participants are all qualified teachers for basic education in Khomas region which is an urban area, and they are all using the same National curriculum document for basic education. According to Creswell (2012, p. 208), in homogeneous sampling, the researcher purposefully samples individuals or sites based on membership in a subgroup that has defining characteristics. This is what the researcher did regarding this case, the researcher purposefully chose 8 teachers, who have experience of 5 years and above. To add, this study chose convenience sampling. According to Bertram and Christiansen (2014, p. 61), convenience sampling means choosing a sample which is easy for the researcher to reach. Teachers in Namibia are scattered countrywide, but due to financial constraints and limited time frame the researcher had to complete the study, the researcher could not afford transport fare to conduct research in the various regions of the country. Neither did the searcher have adequate time to collect data, therefore the researcher chose Khomas region which was convenient for the researcher in such a way that it is the city where the researcher was living at the time of data collection, and it was more comfortable for the researcher to move from one place to another to conduct the study. Although convenience and purposive samples chosen satisfied the researchers need, the researcher is aware that
its’ generalisation is negligible, since they do not represent the broader population. Nevertheless, this is not a concern, as the interest of the research is to get the in-depth knowledge.

5.5. Semi-structured interviews as data collection method
The type of interviews that were used are semi-structured interviews, which relies on specific research questions devised by the researcher to direct the interview yet allow it to be more loosely on the questions (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). In this research, the questions that the researcher asked the teachers were guided by the research questions. Creswell (2012) stated that, the interviewer could ask specific questions to stimulate this information. The researcher had an interview guide to guide in anticipation that my brain goes blank. The interview guide is a set of topical areas and questions that the researcher brings to the interview (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). Interviews’ sorts of questions in an interview guide for this study are provided in the interview protocol (Appendix 1.) Although the interview is guided by specific questions, Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011) highlight that, semi-structured interviews grant freedom to participants to express what interests them and what of their importance. In this study, semi-structured individual interviews were then appropriate in such a way that the teachers and the researcher cleared up a misunderstanding. In addition, teachers expressed their perceptions without limitation, this could not have been achieved if other methods such as questionnaire have been used.

The study chose face-to-face interviews as it allowed the researcher to get the information and detailed perceptions directly from the participant. The researcher went to schools to collect data that was used. This data collection tool was useful as the researcher had detected feelings and values that might not have been discovered using other methods. Creswell (2012) highlights that individual interview takes much time. Similarly, Cohen et al. (2013) agreed on time consumption more specifically at transcribing. The researcher handled all these concerns carefully by allocating enough time for each stage of thesis during the research plan. The researcher was aware of weaknesses that come with interviews such as that the presence of the researcher may bias the response and that the participants might give what the researchers want to hear (Creswell, 2009). The researcher jeopardized these flaws in a way that the researcher did not give many details about the research and did not ask leading questions. Interviews conducted were 8, and they were enough. Many interviews do not guarantee quality or better understanding of the phenomenon (Gaskell, 2002), in other words “more data is not necessarily better” (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011, p. 257), in fact, the study is interpretive as it was stated before, which deals with small-scale and focuses on understanding or seeking meaning. (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011).
5.6. Data collection process

In the research plan, the researcher set dates that would conduct the interviews, but the researcher did not indicate time as it had to be agreed upon with the participants. When the researcher went to schools to give the authorisation and consent letters to the principal and teachers respectively, it was at a hectic time hence school had just commenced from holiday and teachers were busy with administrative work. At school A, the researcher and the teacher could not decide the time for interviews to be conducted by that time because teachers were busy, but they promised to revert to the researcher by the end of the day on when the researcher should go for interviews. Later, Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 called the researcher individually to interview them on the same day at 13:00 pm and 13:30 pm respectively. These teachers were eager to participate in the study, but that was the only time they found convenient for the interviews. Since the researcher is a novice researcher, and that was the first interview, the researcher was a bit nervous. However, the researcher found confidence in how the researcher has prepared for the interview in anticipation. The researcher had all the essentials research tools ready, and the researcher conducted the interviews, one participant per time. The duration for each interview varies, some interviews were recorded short but some participants (Teacher 4 and 5) had stated some useful information during the discussion when the tape was put off. The researcher noted down the ideas with a pen. Before the interview commenced, Teacher 4 commented that teachers were very busy with sports and administration work at that moment and they did not have enough free time, thus, the interview with this participant was the shortest.

The six interviews at other three schools went as planned, six interviews’ schedules were set by the researcher and the participants individually, and all participants were informed about the purpose of the study. Interviews occurred one season per participant (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). All participants participated willingly, hence it was a semi-structured interview, it felt like a normal conversation. The researcher had the role of asking questions, but at the same time listened attentively when the participants were talking. At the end of every interview, the researcher thanked the participant for participating in the study. At one school, the teacher agreed for an interview to be conducted at 12:00. That was the time best convenient for the teacher. However, it was the term that schools conduct athletics. Although there was silence in the class where the interview was held, the noise of learners at the field exhorting others (in sports spirit) could be heard in the background. Nevertheless, the researcher asked the teacher’s permission to close windows that were facing the field. The teacher agreed, the windows were closed the noise reduced, and the interview proceeded successfully.
The researcher interviewed 8 teachers, 3 males and 5 females. All participants have more than five years of teaching experience of which three participants have 10 years and above. All participants are qualified teachers, 3 hold Basic Education Teachers Diploma (BETD), 1 holds Advance Diploma, another 3 poses a bachelor’s degree in education and 1 with Bachelor of Education Honours Degree. All participants taught at various regions before and not only in Khomas region. This means that information can shed light on teacher’s involvement in curriculum development in different regions.

The table below indicates the interview process and academics´ demographics (table 1)

Table 1. The interview process and academics´ demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>qualification</th>
<th>Teaching experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>13.01.2018</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>13 minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>13.01.2018</td>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>13 minutes</td>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
<td>Honours degree</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>16.01.2018</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>27 minutes</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Advanced diploma</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>16.01.2018</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>17.01.2018</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>8, 9, 12</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>17.01.2018</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>9, 12</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>18.01.2018</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>6 minutes</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>18.01.2018</td>
<td>10:25</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>13 minutes</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>8 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviews were conducted between 12.01.2018 - 18.01.2018 in four schools (junior primary school, upper primary school, junior secondary and senior secondary school respectively. Each interview’s time and location were explicitly arranged for each interviewer’s preference to ensure the convenience of attendance and convenient locations free from disturbance (Creswell 2012, p. 221). All the interviews were carried out in English. The researcher first asked teachers’ questions of which
grade they are teachings and the number of years they have been teaching just to put them at ease. The interviews were audio-recorded as `recording captures the entire interview and allows for careful review of data, makes a complete transcription possible` (Atkins & Wallace, 2012, p.90). On top of that, Crestwell (2012) recommended audio recording and the researcher perceived it as the best method of recording data. Due to the fact that it allowed the researcher to concentrate and pay attention only to the conversation while the audio is just recording. In addition, this method was effective because while the researcher was listening attentively, the researcher could trigger where to make a follow-up question and where to ask for clarity. This could not have been effective with for instance the note-taking method, because the researcher would have divided her attention, listening to the teachers and taking note at the same time could be distracting. Lastly, the researcher preferred audio taking because, after each interview session, the researcher played the audio for the individual participant to verify the information they uttered. This might increase the trust between participants and the researcher, as participants are assured that what would be analysed is an accurate reflection of their opinion. However, the researcher anticipated some disadvantages that come with audio recording such as technical error (Atkins & Wallace, 2012; Creswell, 2012) or that the participants might be intimidated (Rapley, 2007). The researcher had a computer as a backup and requested participants permission to tape record the sessions. All the participants were at ease with a tape recording, and none of them rejected it. However, the researcher had a pen and a notebook in case they were ones who were intimidated by the tape recording, then the researcher could use note taking.

After every interview season, the researcher sent the copy of data to an email that has a secure security password and only known to the researcher. The researcher did this to avoid loss of information and to ensure that the data is not accessible to anyone else but to the researcher. The original data that the researcher recorded with a tape was protected too, the tape recorder was kept in baggage that has a password only known to the researcher. After the researcher transcribed the data, the researcher kept files in a computer protected by the passcode. The researcher transcribed the interviews, and this had drawn the researcher closer to the data and gave the researcher an understanding of the data at an early stage, this could not be achieved, had someone transcribe it. Transcribing is not passive, it engages the researcher with attentive listening, analysing and interpreting data Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011).
5.7. Data analysis
Creswell and Poth (2018) stated that qualitative data analysis involves preparing and organising data for analysis, then code and condense to reduce data into themes and finally present the data in figures, table or discussion. Similarly, Schreier (2014) and Cohen et al. (2013) stated that researcher reduce data and focus on chosen aspects that relate to the overall research questions. The researcher has winnowed some data, based on the research questions. The researcher preferred this method because it is a beneficial method of organising data, as it pulls together all the significant data for the specific issue that fascinates the researcher, maintain the coherence of the material and bring back the reader to the intention of the research Cohen et al. (2013). This study employed content analysis to analyse the data. Schreier (2014) highlight that, the qualitative content analysis applies to a variety of materials of which interviews is one of those materials. Some important characteristic of content analysis includes emergent of themes and testing, development and generating theory (Cohen et al., 2013), this research presents themes that emerged.

Data of this thesis is analysed using an inductive approach. According to Creswell (2009), qualitative data is analysed inductively, building themes from specific to general. The analysis of data of this study relied on Creswell and Poth (2018) which is analysis through the description of case and themes of the case. The researcher then integrated Schreier (2014), which is giving a detailed description of the material under analysis. The researcher analysed data with the assistance of one of the Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CAQDAS) called ATLAS. The researcher chose ATLAS because the software makes organisation of data manageable by enabling the researcher to organise texts, coding, memo and findings into a project, not only that, it enables the researcher to link data and see visual network within the data (Creswell & Poth 2018). The researcher used ATLAS in this research to highlight the chunks and give the codes. Again, the researcher used “list coding” option when the chunk carries the same meaning with other chunks that are already assigned a code. To add, the researcher assigned colours to codes that belong to the same category; this makes it easier for the researcher to categorise the codes and then put them into themes. Afterwards, the researcher created the report from which the researcher selected some quotations to illustrate teachers´ views. Notably, the software does not analyse data. Therefore, the researcher did the analysis.
The study analysed the data according to the guideline provided by Creswell and Poth (2014) in a Spiral form as indicated with the figure 4 below. Notably, step 4 and 5 are not discussed here but they are utilised in the results’ chapter.

Steps used in data analysis

![The Data Analysis Spiral](image)

**Figure 5. The Data Analysis Spiral (Creswell and Poth 2018, p.186)**

Putting step 1 in few words, what the researcher is recommended to do based on the guidelines it to organise data into files and develop a filing system (Creswell & Poth (2018). In this study, after the researcher transcribed, data was arranged by creating a file for each interview which led to 8 files. The files are named for instance Teacher1, Teacher 2 and so forth. Some files were kept in the computer yet printed out some for convenience. Secondly, the researcher has started reading the data repeatedly and carefully to make sense of it and noted down ideas emerged from data. Writing notes in the margin of the transcript is helpful at an early stage of data exploration (Creswell & Poth 2018).

The heart of this data analysis was step 3 which is describing and classifying codes into themes. In this step, the researcher describes, classify and interpret the data (Creswell & Poth 2018). For this study, data was coded. Coding is described as a process of identifying meaningful chunks in the data and assign each of this a label (Cohen et al., 2013). Similarly, Schreier (2014) stated that “a process of assigning units of meaning to the categories of the coding frame is termed ‘coding’”. Both descriptions are relevant to this study because the researcher used them interchangeably. For instance, when themes were generated based on the research questions, the researcher looked for the segments that have evidence related to the research question, employed Schreier’s description. At the same
time, through reading the transcription carefully, the researcher encountered chunks that gave meanings, and here the researcher applied Cohen et al. (2013) ´s description.

At the beginning data was open-coded. Open coding developed 30 codes. The researcher identified concepts by giving each chunk a code, put the codes that are similar in meaning in categories via axial coding (Cohen et al., 2013) and later identified the core categories and merged into themes using selective coding (Cohen et al., 2013). Two techniques that the researcher used are: in vivo codes; codes that appear in the text as well as interpretive codes; codes that are not appearing in the text exactly but rely on the researcher’s insight for drawing out interpretation (Cohen et al., 2013). 

Curriculum developers are experts (figure 5) is an example of one of the in vivo codes that was taken from the participants’ own words, while contentment (figure 5) is an interpretive code. The researcher grouped the codes that have the same properties to obtain sub categories. For instance (figure 5) show the codes: contentment and curriculum developers are experts formed Positive perceptions subcategory. In a procession to form categories, which is also called main themes at the same time, linked subcategories were used, for instance (figure 5) show that the subcategories positive perceptions and negative perceptions formed Teachers’ perception about their involvement theme. This process led to an emergence of both descriptive themes from data, as well as a few interpretive themes.

Figure 6. Example of data analysis codes, subcategories and theme
5.8. Ethical Issues

In this study before the researcher had carried on with data collection, the researcher had obtained the approval letter to go and conduct the research from the relevant authorities such as University of Eastern Finland (Appendix 2) and Directorate of Ministry of Education, Khomas region (Appendix 3).

According to Cousin (2009), an interview entails the interviewer to inform the participant about the study and use of data for research purpose. All the consideration mentioned above has been applied to, and the researcher has beforehand informed the participant about their right to voluntary participation (see Appendix 4 for a letter of consent). Furthermore, the researcher did not force the participants to participate in this study. To add, the researcher had informed the participant how the findings could be beneficial to them but did not say many details of the study to avoid being bias. Seale (2007) ensured confidentiality and anonymity nature of participants´ participation. All the participants had been assured that the information they had provided is confidential and it will not be exposed to anyone. Furthermore, Teacher 1, Teacher 2 etc. have been used to code the participants instead of using their real names to protect the identities.

Although the teachers had signed the first consent letter, at the beginning of every interview, the researcher had asked the teachers again if they were still willing to participate. This is done to ensure that the teachers are willing to participate, and they do not have a reservation about having signed the consent form (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2009). In the same fashion, the teachers were told about their right not to answer questions that they feel uncomfortable with. Not only that, participants were made aware of their right to withdraw at any time (Seale, Gobo, Gubrium, & Silverman, 2011). This is done to do away with the discomfort that might have come during the interview (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2011). All the teachers have answered all questions. After the end of the interview, the researcher provided the teachers with the researcher’s contact details in case they had some reservation about data (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). Until the stage of data analysis and the publication of this thesis, none of the teachers has contacted the researcher to withdraw the data. Therefore, the researcher can confidentially say that the participants authorise data analysed in this study and research ethics have adhered.

5.9 Validity

Validity is defined as accuracy with which a method measures what is deliberate to measure (O’Connor & Gibson, 2003). The sample that was selected matches the research questions (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). This is to say the right questions had been asked to the right source of data. The researcher saw no other data collection tool or participants that can be used to generate teachers´
views better than interviewing teachers themselves. Therefore, the researcher can claim that the data collected is valid because the right questions had been asked to the right people. To add to the assurance of the validity of this study, the researcher conducted a pilot interview two weeks before data collection date. The researcher piloted to ensure that the questions measure what the study intended to measure. The pilot participant is a teacher who has been teaching for more than ten years. The researcher recorded the pilot on a laptop and adjusted only two minor changes to some questions where the pilot teacher could not understand the questions clearly.

In addition, to suppress threats to validity, the researcher distance herself from subjectivity, this is to say the researcher have been conscious of self-criticism to avoid researcher’s experience from influencing data. The researcher acknowledged the positionality that the researcher is a teacher and that the researcher’s experience might influence the interpretation of this study or influence the teachers. Regarding the influence of the teachers, they knew the researcher as a student teacher hence it was not revealed that the researcher was a teacher. Therefore they saw the researcher as a student and not as a teacher. The personal influence was prevented by the awareness the researcher obtained through regular reading of research methodology books written by researchers such as Creswell and Poth (2018), Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2011), to mention a few. The influences (experience and the relationship with the participants) the researcher had it written somewhere and every time the researcher write this study, the researcher used to look at those influences, therefore in this study, reflexivity had been exercised. Reflexivity is described as the process which claims the researcher to reflect, evaluate and quest in what manner their own influence, attitude, values, and experience influence the research (Atkins & Wallace, 2012). Lastly, technology software called ALTAS ti 8 had been used to identify categories and recurring themes with a degree of objectivity which would be otherwise impossible (Atkins & Wallace, 2012).

To ensure the consistency of data, tape record was used and played to the responded after the interview to confirm if it is reflecting their genuine utterance. Moreover, the data analysis of this study happened by looking for themes that came from several sources, that means the research put the weight of evidence into consideration (Atkins & Wallace, 2012).

5.10 Summary of Methodology
This study employed a qualitative research approach because qualitative research study phenomenon in their natural setting attempts to make sense of the phenomenon people brings to them (Flick 2007). This study is interested to study how teachers in Namibia perceive their participation in curriculum development process, describe and interpret teachers’ views and make meanings of their perception. There could be no better design than qualitative that would allow teachers to construct their
perceptions freely without getting ideas embedded into their heads. The research minimally followed social constructivism which is also called interpretivism paradigm, as it is believed that the researcher inductively creates meaning from data captured (Crestwell, 2009) and interpret participants views (Lincoln et al., 2011). This study seeks to capture teacher’s perceptions regarding their involvement in curriculum development. In addition, the study is interested in determining the level of teachers’ involvement, the significance of their involvement. Therefore, teachers’ perceptions are studied carefully, interpreted where it was necessary in order to make sense. After the data is analysed, the researcher described the teachers’ take, looked for connections between the themes and synthesised the data.

The study used a case study approached, as it intends to get an in-depth understanding of the case. Moreover, the study wants to capture the participant’s sense of reality (Yin, 2014), and report case description and case themes (Creswell & Poth 2018). The study used semi-structured interviews that grant participants the freedom to express their perceptions they have about the case and give a profound reflection on the phenomena. All interviews were conducted between 12.01.2018 - 18.01.2018 in four schools in the Khomas region. The interview guide (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011, P. 103) was prepared in advance to guide the interviewer. All the interviews were 9 in total which included 1 piloting. Although the interviews were 9 only 8 were analysed for this study, excluding the piloting. This is because, from the 8 interviews generated from the field, the study has generated enough data and understanding needed for the study. In fact, Hesse-biber and Leavy (2011) stated that many interviews do not necessarily imply a better understanding. All interviews were audio recorded, however, 2 participants have mentioned details after the audio was put off and the researcher noted down the details.

In this study, it is essential to note that the study is analytically and not statistically generalizable. The study is analysed guided by the principle of data analysis, integrating content analysis laid down by Creswell and Poth (2018) Cohen et al. (2013) and Schreier (2014). The coding data is the central step for data analysis in this study. The study used interviews question to generate the themes (Schreier, 2014) such as Teachers’ perception about their involvement in curriculum development, the broadness of teachers’ involvement in the curriculum development as well as teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their involvement in curriculum development. The researcher open-coded the results, group them in sub-categories through axial coding and merged the sub-categories into themes using selective coding. From data, three themes emerged. Before the researcher embarked on conducting the study, the researcher first gained a letter from respective authorities to go and conduct the research. Secondly, the researcher informed the teachers beforehand and presented the teachers
with a consent letter. Furthermore, the researcher informed the participants about voluntary, trust and confidentiality of their participation. At the same time, the teachers were given the researcher’s contact details in case they have a reservation after data collection to withdraw their participation. Until the point of publishing this thesis, none of the teachers contacted the researcher to withdraw or change their views. To increase validity, the study was beforehand. Not only that, the researcher was reflexive throughout the study by recognising the position the researcher held in the study so that it does not influence data. Additionally, ATLAS. ti 8 was used to code.
6. Results and Discussion

The data of this study is analysed repeatedly to identify utterances and quotes that can give answers to research questions. The findings entailed presenting the themes and illustrate them in the form of quotation Schreier (2014) which are translational and anonymised. The quotations are exact words used, this is preferred because the researcher believed that direct words do not only illuminate truth, but they are concurrently rich in data and details (Cohen et al. 2013).

6.1 Namibian teachers’ perceptions about their involvement in the planning and development of curriculum

The results indicate that teachers had different perceptions of the involvement of curriculum planning and development. Few of the teachers were optimistic about their current involvement in curriculum development, and most of the teachers had negative perceptions about their involvement in curriculum development.
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Figure 7. The distribution of teachers’ positive and negative perceptions of the involvement in planning and developing curriculum.

6.1.1 Positive perception of the teachers on the involvement of curriculum planning and development

Teachers who had positive perception felt that only a few Namibian teachers were involved in curriculum development and they were satisfied with the involvement, whether they were personally involved or not involved. These teachers were contented with the involvement because they maintained that, the people who formulate the curriculum have the knowledge and they see no need to get teachers from schools to be involved. Although they had positive perception, none of these
teachers was ever involved in curriculum planning. Here follow the quotations made by the 2 teachers who are optimistic about this

“I think, we have experts that are really trained for this, why would we get involved?” (Teacher 4)

“we cannot put all the teachers, but we are taking out expert, and as we have those officials at NIED who are responsible for curriculum, they are experts, and they might only just need few teachers, few individuals they are calling to help them” (Teacher 7).

Teachers have indicated that although they had never been involved individually, the curriculum designers’ committee which is mostly comprised of NIED officials are experts and there was no need to get teachers who are in the field. Furthermore, they have expressed that not every teacher would be accommodated in the curriculum planning. Therefore, only a few teachers were needed to complement the NIED officials. These 2 teachers perceived this satisfactory enough. Therefore, these participants were content with the extent of their involvement. The figure below (figure 8) is an illustration of the 2 codes: “contentment” and “curriculum planners are experts” emerged under a sub-category “positive perception”. It indicates that some teachers had positive perception, they are satisfied with their involvement, and they perceived that curriculum planners are experts as discussed above.

![Figure 8](image)

Figure 8. The reasons for teachers for their positive perceptions regarding curriculum development.

The result of this study is in line with the suggestion made in early years by the educator Tyler (1949), who suggested that, curriculum specialists should develop the curriculum. However, Taba (1962) rejected this assumption and advocated curriculum development to be a process where teachers are at the centre for development and leadership. Putting in mind that the first nationalised curriculum introduced in the United Kingdom in 1988 failed as it did not contact teachers for their inputs (Bates et al., 2011), and the similar situation that happened in China (Wang & Cheng, 2005). It implies that, curriculum development should involve both teachers and experts, or it should be ensured that teachers are well acquainted with curricula issue first before the curriculum design mandated to teachers alone. Failure to include both experts and teachers is that, the former would risk the
development of an up to standard curriculum. As it is revealed in the literature that there was a case of failure to implement a curriculum that was designed by teachers, unfortunately, teachers were not knowledgeable about curriculum development and they failed to design an applicable curriculum. This case is reported in the literature by Li (2005). On the other hand, if teachers (the latter) are not conducted in curriculum planning, they would not extensively understand the curriculum well, hence it is not easy to explicate others’ ideas. Moreover, if teachers do not extensively understand a proposed innovation, it might not be successful (Kelly, 2009). This innovation includes curriculum and whether if experts design it. Therefore, it is crucial for both teachers and curriculum experts to be involved in curriculum development to avoid the inconvenience.

6.1.2 Negative perception of the teachers on the involvement of curriculum planning and development

Some teachers felt that their involvement in curriculum development is not satisfactory, they felt that it is very low, and they see the need to involve more teachers in curriculum development at all stages. Teachers expressed that curriculum developers mostly consist of inspectors and NIED officials whom some of them were teachers before, but teachers who are in the field are rarely involved. Four teachers each indicated that they know one of the teachers who was involved in curriculum planning, but each did not know how teachers (the ones were involved) were selected, neither do teachers had ever received feedback from the involved ones. Notably, few teachers indicated that they did not have enough information on when the curriculum is developed. Here are few quotations from the interviews

“I don’t really think that a.a.. They are involved because I see, most of the stakeholders are from...people from... the inspectors, people from NIED and... people that are not in the teaching field, so they are not really aware of the situation that is happening in the class, that's why there is a gap. I don’t think involvement is really that much “(Teacher 2).

“and I wish you can ask the politicians, the ministerial people, why, for what reason why they do not involve teachers because teachers are the implementers and they were supposed to be the pioneers of the curriculum development ” (Teacher 3).

“People tend to use certain, only same people that are doing this, so it is not often to come to the teachers on the ground, they are only doing it at the NIED where they have the full-time employee who is doing this. The teachers who are actively working with the learners on a daily basis they are left out, they are not the one doing this” (Teacher 5).
Teachers indicated that they were not involved in curriculum development despite the perception they had that they were supposed to be the first people in curriculum development. The results suggest that external stakeholders develop the curriculum. Teachers who apply the curriculum in the class every day feel left out. This result of teachers felt excluded in the curriculum is consistent with that was discovered by Wadesango (2010) in a developing country Zimbabwe. Excluding teachers in curriculum development suggest that teachers’ inputs are not asked. Consequently, not consulting teachers for their contribution to curriculum planning can block insightful ideas teachers could bring on board. This is because even if teachers have ideas, a path is not widely opened to them, in the end, the knowledge they possess remain unused, and if the knowledge is not applied or practised sometimes, it might fade away gradually.

Turning to the results, they suggest that there was ineffective communication to made teachers aware about curriculum development. Teachers were not certain of when the curriculum planning takes place and who the actual participants were. This was revealed in their expressions when teachers used the words “not sure” if Namibian teachers were involved in the curriculum or not, and 2 teachers said, they did not know how a selection was made for a teacher who was involved. This result of teachers lacking information on when the curriculum planning took place is consistent with those of Abudu and Mensah (2016) founded in Ghana. Moreover, Porter et al. (2015) again corroborated ineffective communication and it was perceived as having the capability of blocking effective implementation. However, teachers assured that they (participants) had never been involved even though, they have been teaching for so long. Majority of teachers had taught in different regions of the country, they could have gotten a chance to participate in curriculum design, but they were never part of it even when they were at those regions. This can shed light on what might be the case in other regions.

The result reveals that most of the teachers in Namibia who participated in the interview were not happy with their involvement in the curriculum development. The National Curriculum for Basic Education in Namibia is designed elsewhere by the body called National Institute of Educational Development, and teachers felt that this body did not consult the teachers for their input. Thus, it made the teachers feel left out in the process which they perceived was rightfully theirs. All teachers from four schools perceived that their involvement in curriculum development was very low, however, 2 of the teachers were contented with it while six teachers expressed dissatisfaction against the portion of teachers which was involved. These result of little involvement of teachers in curriculum development is consistent with that of Maphosa & Mutopa (2012), Oloruntegbe (2011), Kobia (2016) and Saracalouglu et al. (2010). Those results were discovered in Africa except for Saracalough (2010) which was discovered in Turkey. Nevertheless, these findings are all united by
the curriculum model they use which is a top-down model. As it was stated by (El-Okda, 2005 and Eunitah et al., 2013) that a top-down model restricts teachers’ involvement in curriculum, the result of this study concurs with the above-stated claim. Therefore, this study supports a claim that the top-down model does not widen up the scope for more teachers to participate in curriculum development.

Just as teachers who showed the positive perception of the involvement in curriculum planning and development were asked the reason behind their satisfaction, teachers with negative perceptions were similarly asked the reasons behind their dissatisfaction. Codes that emerged based on teachers’ perception against their involvement were, impose, restriction and widen up the scope as illustrated in figure 9 below.
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**Figure 9. The reasons of teachers behind the negative perceptions regarding curriculum development.**

Teachers expressed that they are professional that possess useful ideas they would like to integrate into curriculum and teaching, but they do not apply it hence they felt restricted.

“*there is a lot of qualified good teachers with good ideas that can really want to build up the school as well, but we are so limited because there is this rule against it, there is this...we cannot do this, we cannot do that... we need this permission before we can do that and there is actually a lot we can do”*(Teacher 1).

Teachers felt that they are creative and have useful inputs, but they are so restricted by how the system works. The restriction was revealed when teachers expressed that they are bounded and needed the approval to do many things. This result of teachers feeling restricted is corresponding with the results of Al-Daami and Wallece (2007). If teachers rarely participate in curriculum planning and development, yet they feel restricted by the system, then teachers are not freely exercising their
professional freedom as per Kelly’s (2009) description of curriculum for a democratic society that advocates for teachers to exercise their rights and make professional judgements.

Another dismay the teachers expressed was that they follow the curriculum to implement. Moreover, some felt that the curriculum is imposed on them hence they get the curriculum document to implement regardless of whether they have accepted it or not. Furthermore, few teachers further uttered that, sometimes they did not understand the curriculum, but hence it should be implemented, they followed it. Here are some quotations

“the politician and the ministerial level they just put up the curriculum and then they throw it to the table, for the teacher to implement sometimes without even understanding what really the curriculum content is. Then you just created a curricula that you just let it be implemented by force, whether they like it or not, whether they accept it or not, they have to do it, and that is what is happening today” (Teacher 3).

“You are only told “implement this”, but you do not even know how to approach it” (Teacher 5).

“In the end, you get something which is already planned, and you have to implement it” (Teacher 8).

However, one of the teachers indicated that in case they do not understand the curriculum, they call the advisory teacher for clarification.

“In a case that we do not understand we have what we call adversary teachers at our regional office, usually we are in line with, we can call them, we can ask them to come to schools to explain certain questions, we have advisors here, advisory teachers” (Teacher 4).

Teachers felt that the curriculum is imposed on them as teachers expressed that they just get the document to implement. The feelings of curriculum imposed on teachers gave a sense that teachers felt they do not own the curriculum because individuals cannot feel they own something when it is forced on them. As according to Mikser et al. (2016) curriculum ownership is not only when teachers are curriculum implementers but when they are also curriculum developers, and teachers’ ownership of the curriculum is essential for effective implementation. This is hazardous because the Namibian curriculum urged teachers to take ownership of the curriculum and implement it with commitment (MoEAC, 2015). Unfavourably, this urge is not materialised, and this can jeopardise the effective curriculum implementation. The results of teachers felt that the curriculum is imposed on them is consistent with those of Abudu & Mensah (2016) and Wadesango (2010). Teachers reject the curriculum policy impose on them Gerrard and Farrell (2014). If teachers do not accept the
curriculum, they might implement a different version of the curriculum as it happened in Nigeria as revealed by the results of Oloruntegbe (2011). Implementing a different curriculum can hinder the attainment of National goals, hence the curriculum that would be implemented might not be in line with the National goals. Not only national goals would be affected, but the implementation of SDG 4 would be affected too. Because Namibia aligned the curriculum to the objectives of SDG 4 (NIED, 2018) and that the world is called to embarked upon the implementation of SDG4 (UNGA, 2015). If curriculum is imposed on teachers it can cause frustration hence teachers might fail to interpret it correctly. Failure in interpreting the content in a correct way can result in learning objectives not obtained. If the curriculum does not reach its objectives, it did not serve its purpose. In contrast of teachers who expressed lack of curriculum understanding at sometimes, one teacher stated that they get assistance from advisory teachers. This indicates that teachers are assisted, however, the assistance can be said it is not widely available or teachers do not seek for it hence only one teacher who uttered that she calls an advisory teacher in case of not obtaining an understanding of the curriculum.

As it was stated before from the indication of the results that teachers felt that their involvement in curriculum planning and development is very rare, teachers who have positive perception reasoned that not all the teachers can be included in the curriculum planning. Similarly, teachers who have negative perceptions about their involvement have expressed the same. However, teachers with negative perceptions felt that most of the teachers should be involved in curriculum planning rather than involving few teachers as they experienced. Here are some quotes selected from teachers with positive perceptions

“*not all the teachers but at least they can take some few teachers to be part of those...a... to be part of the ...the...group that is developing curriculum*” (Teacher 6).

“*so perhaps they can even increase the number of teachers which might help*” (Teacher 8).

All teachers were aware that not all of them could be included in curriculum planning and development. This awareness is the same as the utterance made by teachers as reported by Abudu and Mensah (2016). However, teachers with negative perception felt that a substantial number of teachers should be involved, in other words, teachers should be added to the few teachers who are already part of curriculum development to increase the numbers.
Below is a figure that shows the overview of question one results for both teachers with positive perceptions (on the left) and those with negative perceptions (on the right), indicating where they differ as well as the common perception (the middle circle) regarding this phenomenon.
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**Figure 10.** An indication of teachers with negative perceptions and positive perceptions respectively

### 6.1.3 Justification of teachers for the significance of their involvement in curriculum planning and development.

All teachers who participated in this study felt that it is very imperative to involve teachers in curriculum development, even the few teachers who were contented with the little involvement of teachers in curriculum development saw the necessity of involving teachers in general, in curriculum planning and development. Alsubaie (2016)’s remark reinforces this result of seeing significance in involving teachers in curriculum development process. The participants gave many perceptions to justify why they thought it is essential for teachers to partake in curriculum planning and development, the views that clearly emerged were categorised into six subcategories as illustrated by the figure below.
Knowing the needs of the learners

Most of the teachers expressed that they know the needs of the learners. Teachers expressed that they work with the learners and they have identified different learners the education system has. Working with learners makes teachers discover their needs. One teacher spoke about learners ‘differences and their needs, for instance, a gifted learner might not have the same learning needs as slow learners, hence teachers know what types of learners they teach, they know their needs. These are some of the quotes taken from the interviews:

“teachers are the one who knows the needs of the learners, what learners needs because sometimes yes, you can see it is well developed, but something somewhere is not right, But I think teachers can be involved, that ones who are on the ground, are people on the ground, I think it will be much better” (Teacher 6).

“we have gifted children in the education system; we have slow learners in the education system” (Teacher 3).

Teachers expressed that people have different backgrounds, different learning needs as well as interest, they are the ones who work with the learners daily. In addition, teachers expressed that they are the intermediates between the learners and the parents, but this position is not respected during the curriculum development process, they perceived that NIED/MOEAC substituted their position. Here is the quote that best represents this view:

“A teacher forms a triangle between parents, teachers on top, parents on the left and then a learner on the right side, so this triangle should be respected, even the curriculum is “developed; it should be done in that way. So, we put up the ministerial on top as...as. the government, but, the teacher should be on top of the triangle, he is a key person, or she is a key person” (Teacher 3).
This quote fits at learners’ need category because if the teacher is on top of the triangle that means the teacher reaches both to the learners and the parents, and through this reach, they can discuss the learners need with their parents or directly with the learners themselves.

Namibia is multi-racial country with different tribes which makes the learners come from different backgrounds; this makes the learners to have different needs and different interest. Additionally, some parents might not want their children to be educated on specific topics, for instance, Teacher 3 noted “sex education”. Therefore, since teachers are the intermediated between the parent and the learners, teachers reach out to the parents to discuss things concerning learners, this includes topics that parents are not comfortable getting their children acquainted to. The exclusion of teachers in curriculum planning made them feel that their position as intermediates was not respected during curriculum planning and thus perceived that NIED/MoEAC substituted them. The figure below illustrates how teachers perceive the triangle should be verse how they see it in curriculum development.

![Figure 12. Teachers as intermediate between learners and parents.](image)

Teachers have expressed that the background of the learners is one of the paramount issues that was supposed to be looked at carefully. However, they felt that little attention is paid to it in the curriculum, this concern was revealed when teachers express that the emphasis is placed more on the learners in the city and less on the learners from other regions. Here are the quotes

“sometimes the way they design their curriculum it disadvantages learners that are maybe in Rundu or Opuwo, you know. The emphasis more in learners that are in cities or in a town like in Khomas region, so they need to have branches all over the country that can represent the whole nation” (Teacher 2).

“you have to devise the content of the curricular and before you have come up with the content, you have to look at who are the beneficiaries of that curriculum. Is it people in the rural area, is it people in the urban area, its poor people? Or it’s marginalised people? So when the curriculum is developed, many of this issue is not really looked at” (Teacher 3).

The curriculum is relevant and meaningful if it serves the needs of the society and meaningful to the learners, hence the curriculum would be effective if teachers partake in the planning because they know the background of the learners. Teachers expressed that, they need to be involved in order for
the curriculum to be relevant to the learners and relevant to the society. Since the teachers interact with the learners on a daily basis, they know their interest and what learners want to become in future or what they want to do in their lifetime. For this reason, involving teachers incorporates the ideas that present the interest of the learners in curriculum development as it was reported in Clayton (2007) study. Not only that, knowing the needs of the learners, place teachers in a better position to know what remedial activities they would give to different learners with different learning needs, this is inclusivity. These activities can be intergraded in the curriculum, and this can support the implementation of SDG4 that specifies assurance of inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all, of which Namibia and countries around the world have embarked upon its’ implementation (NIED, 2018). The integration of remedial activities does not only catch learners’ attention it conjointly makes the curriculum meaningful to the learners.

**Curriculum Content**

Teachers expressed that they are experienced, and their experience could be utilised in curriculum reform to improve the content, teachers have stated that this can be because they are dealing with the content every day and they know it much better. Furthermore, teachers stated that sometimes the content is too much and is assigned a short time to be completed. In other respect, some felt the content which is relevant is omitted in the curriculum and include the content which is not relevant. What is more, teachers have expressed that, sometimes the content sequence is not appropriate some topics are left out for different levels when it is supposed to be started early.

“say for instance there are 17 themes for the year or more than, too many themes...we, maybe the teacher has experience that the themes are way too many and ...thus, we cannot go, we cannot keep check with these themes. it is quite difficult to really lay the foundation with a certain topic if you only have one week for a topic for instance” (Teacher1).

“I think there is a big gap and it causes these learners to work very with a-a... difficult because they have to memorise the thing but if we can start with these topics from grade8 to grade 12, then it will be easier for the learners ” (Teacher 6).

“Some topics are just not needed, or some topics are left out on a different level where they were supposed to be started early” (Teacher 8).

The results indicated that teachers had expressed dismay against content selection. Besides, the indicated that their involvement would improve the content, this is consistent with the results of Kobiiah et al. (2015). They perceived that the content is too much and there is a time restriction allocated for the content. If the content is much and less time is allocated to it, learners might not understand or master the theme, hence the teacher might rush to cover the content within that given
short time frame which might not be convenient for the learners to digest the knowledge. Teachers as well stated that they teach the content and they know it better. Teachers’ experience could be useful in improving the curriculum because they could allocate fair time to teach each theme, since they experienced which themes take more time and which themes takes less time. Teacher’s experience could be more convenient compared to the designers’ who were in class long time ago. Again, the results indicated that teachers have a concern about the validity of the content, as they stated that some topics they find in the curriculum are irrelevant and some of the topics that are relevant are omitted. Involving teachers in curriculum might not pose a threat to the validity of the content hence teachers deal with the content every day.

Mismatch of the curriculum and schools’ environment.

Teachers felt that there is a mismatch between the curriculum and the school environment. They expressed that this could be the results of formulating the curriculum without consulting the teachers at school. Hence, the curriculum would be designed according to the curriculum designers’ views which might not be in line with what is really happening at school. Here are the quotes that present teachers’ perceptions.

“Things that they put in does not match our school” (Teacher 5).

“Some of the things that they design in the programme itself are …Contradicting with the situation within the school environment and the teaching itself” (Teacher 2).

The mismatch of the curriculum and what is happening at the school environment could be a claim that adds weight to the teachers’ claim of not being involved in curriculum planning. If the curriculum is designed by people who are not at school, then a mismatch is expected hence they do not know what is happening at schools. This result of a mismatch between the curriculum and the school environment was similarly expressed by teachers in Al-Daami and Wallace (2007) research.

Teachers as curriculum implementers

Teachers expressed that they are the implementers of the curriculum and they were supposed to be the designers too. Their reason was that, policymakers come up with the ideas of how the curriculum would be, but it is teachers that implement those ideas, it is challenging to implement someone’s ideas, specifically that it was designed by people who are not daily at school and have little actual picture of what is happening in the class. Therefore, teachers felt that they should be consulted in curriculum planning too, to implement the ideas effectively and not just implement people’s ideas. These are typical segments that were quoted from teachers’ voices
“Teachers are the implementers, and they were supposed to be the pioneers of the curriculum development” (Teacher 3).

“I think it is very important, for them to get involved since they are the one implementing it and it will be easier for you to carry out, implement something that you have done, so it could be more much easier for them” (Teacher 5).

“You get something which is already planned, and you must implement it” (Teacher 8).

Teacher’s views denoted that there is a relationship between their involvement and effective implementation. The curriculum is designed for a change or should be reformed if it does not serve its rationale (Alsubaie, 2016). Huizinga et al. (2014) utter that the success of the curriculum reforms depends on the teachers. This implies that it is futile to have a well-designed document if teachers do not understand it because they are the ones who put this idea to practice with the intention of producing intended results. If the curriculum is not understood and accepted by teachers correctly, they will implement it in a wrong way. Consequently, effective implementation is not achieved, and academic performance is diminished (Kelly, 2009). The results of teachers experience as implementers and their voices of perceiving their input significant concur with that of Bilgin et al. (2011), Mikser et al. (2016), Abudu and Mensah (2016) and Konokman et al. (2017).

6.2 Broadness of Namibian teachers’ involvement in the curriculum planning and development.

The four subcategories that emerged are: teachers’ participation, opportunities for participation, in-service training and willingness to participate in curriculum development.

6.2.1 Teachers Participation in curriculum development.

All the teachers expressed that it is very significant for the teachers to be involved, but among all the 8 participants, only one teacher claimed that he was involved in curriculum planning stage. The rest of the teachers indicated that they were never involved in curriculum planning. Teachers further said they were more involved in implementing the curriculum which was already designed. One teacher even perceived that teachers do not plan the curriculum, they are just curriculum implementers. Three teachers indicated that they know of one teacher who is involved in curriculum planning, another teacher expressed that she knows 2 teachers who are called in by NIED in connection with curriculum design. However, these four teachers (participants) expressed that they do not get any feedback from the involved teachers regarding curriculum developmental issues. While, the remaining four teachers stated that they have never seen the curriculum planners, their schools have never been approached
to contribute their input, and they only hear that there is such a committee in existence. One teacher that was approached and informed that she will get involved in curriculum planning, but, the teacher never got involved. Hence, those who approached the teacher never got back to the teacher to go and formulate the curriculum. Thus, the teachers claimed that the stage they are more involved is the implementing. Below are some quotes that illustrate teachers’ views:

“so, as I am speaking now, many teachers are only involved at implementation
“(Teacher3).

“I think teachers are more involved in just implementing the curriculum. To them is they get things, the curriculum which was already designed, it just come to them, and they must carry it out. Then you see sometimes you did not get the training to know which areas. How to tackle this type of area because you are not the one who did that” (Teacher 5).

“The teachers are mostly involved with the implementing, because it is the NIED officials that do the planning and then they call in I think they call in the teachers the experts, who are part of the curriculum committee, they go and do the development” (Teacher 7).

From the results, teachers revealed that they are mostly involved in the implementation stage, this is the subcategory that was revealed. The results of teachers perceived that they are only involved in implementing is consistent with that of Kobia (2016). Although one teacher stated that he was involved in curriculum planning, the researcher perceived that this teacher was neither involved in the planning. This is because when the researcher asked how the teacher was involved, the teacher responded that he was called by NIED officials only to be trained on how they are going to train other teachers to implement the curriculum, this is how the teacher perceived that he participated in curriculum planning. So, this teacher was given the training to train others on how to implement the curriculum which was already done designed, and not involved for his contribution to be integrated during the curriculum planning, therefore, in the researcher’s opinion, it is transparent to claim that neither this teacher participated in curriculum planning. Thus, none of the 8 teachers that participated in this study was ever involved in curriculum planning. Here is a quote from the teacher who perceived that he was involved in curriculum planning to substantiate the researcher’s claim.

“The workshop that we had, we were trained how to train other teachers to implement the new curriculum” (Teacher 3).

6.2.2 Opportunities for participation in curriculum development
Teachers have expressed that opportunity is not widening up for them to participate in curriculum development. Teachers indicated that scopes are not made known to every teacher to participate in curriculum development either at school or regional level. When teachers were asked if there were curriculum committees at their schools, all the teachers in four schools have stated that there are no
curriculum committees at their school. What is more, some said neither do they have curriculum committees at the regional level, but some were not sure if there was or not at the regional level.

Here are the quotes that illustrate teachers’ views

“Opportunities..., probably it is not coming forth, to say there is a letter coming saying, you people who want to get involved. It does not really come that way. I think it is more... I do not know whether if it at the regional level where they get teachers, or how they get teachers to be part of. but, it does not come to everybody or made it known, like in the staffroom, for example, to say we are taking this and this teacher to be involved or all of you should take part in the curriculum” (Teacher 5).

“We do not have at the school level, I do not think they have at the regional office as well, or maybe they have that one I am not aware of, but at the school level, we do not have. We do not have a curriculum committee” (Teacher 7).

The views from the teachers that expressed that there are no curriculum committees at their schools support their claim of not involved in curriculum planning; the result shows that there was lack of opportunity where teachers can air their ideas to be integrated into the curriculum. This result is compatible with of those Abudu and Mensah (2016), discovered in Ghana.

Teachers expressed that their ideas are not asked during curriculum planning, this result of teachers’ ideas not requested during curriculum planning is compatible with the results of Saracaloğlu et al. (2010) that was discovered in Turkey. However, one teacher indicated that their ideas were only asked at a later stage. Most of the teachers indicated that the time they are consulted is only when they are called to attend the workshop to be trained on how to implement the curriculum which is already finished designed and need to be implemented. Below follow the quotes:

“we were trained because now we have a new curriculum, we were trained, there were some teachers chosen to represent the other teachers, in the training of a new curriculum to be implemented. ijah. that was only to be told after the curriculum is already designed, but in the first initial process...a...a (shaking the head)” (Teacher 8).

“because what I have noticed is that, they only involve more teachers when it comes to training after the implementation now, like I remember 2016...2015, all the teachers were going to that workshop...training and that was the only time it was more effective it is when they were training teachers on the implementation of the new curriculum but not before. The designing, they were not involved, only after and not all of us were trained even, only a few.” (Teacher 2).

6.2.3 In-service training on curriculum implementation

Some teachers have indicated that teachers got the opportunity to attend in-service training which was devised to train them on how to implement the curriculum. However, some teachers showed their
dissatisfaction regarding in-service training. Teachers have indicated that not all the teachers have attended the in-service training hence only a few teachers from schools were selected to go present other teachers. Furthermore, some teachers referred to the in-service training ineffective because it did not train most of the teachers not only that, even though the teachers who get trained are instructed to train those teachers who remained at schools, they did not have the equipment that they were trained with by the curriculum developers. Therefore, it makes the teachers who were remained at school to be less informed or lack some knowledge and understanding of the reformed curriculum. Moreover, teachers have indicated that the in-service training happened occasionally and not regularly. The last in-service training was carried out in 2015. One teacher stated that they were planning to conduct the in-service training after the year 2015, but it was hindered by financial crisis. To add another teacher expressed that, teachers who began teaching after 2015 were left out on this training about the implementation of the curriculum.

“the new teachers also need the training, that is one of the challenges that they are faced with, only the people that went for training in 2015 got the training, the new teachers they were not trained, so there is a gap of knowledge there...and I think it's something that needs to be done almost every year or after 2 years, something like that.” (Teacher 2).

“That is when you find workshops and in those workshops are not even effective because it is not all teachers that are trained” (Teacher 8).

Selecting few teachers to go and attend in-service training might make some teachers who remain at school to lack some knowledge on effective implementation of the curriculum. Hence, not everyone can transmit what was said at the training effectively or say it in a way that the curriculum developer intended to reach the implementers, this might lead to a gap in knowledge as the teacher expressed.

Not only that, as it was reported that the last in-service training took place in 2015, which means that the teachers who graduated right after 2015 and the beginning teachers, plus those teachers who did not attend the in-service training due to stamping various reason missed the knowledge that could be useful for the effective implementation of the curriculum. Therefore, lack of in-service training can hinder the effective implementation of the curriculum. The results suggest that not all the teachers attended in-service training on implementation. This implies that there is lack of in-service training, this result is consistent with those of Oloruntegbe (2011) and Bilgin et al. (2011) that reported that teachers were not only excluded in curriculum development but most of them were neither given in-service training. If more teachers do not partake in curriculum planning and in-service training is not made available for everyone, then the effective implementation of the curriculum could be in jeopardy. One participant has indicated that the planned in-service could not occur due to financial constraints. This participant’s experience could be the reason for the inadequate availability of in-
service training opportunities. Eventually, compelling policymakers to select only a few teachers to attend the implementation workshop. Inversely, the financial predicament can be avoided if a substantial number of teachers are involved in the curriculum development. Hence, most of them are already acquainted with the curriculum content during the planning phase. This practice can benefit both teachers and the government, as it reduces costs and simultaneously create curriculum awareness among teachers.

Selecting few teachers to go and represent majority of teachers in-service training could be risky in such a way that if few individuals get the information wrong, then they will come to transfer the wrong information to others who have remained at school. In the end, the whole school get the incorrect information, the leaners who are at the receiving hand would be affected as (Kelly 2009) stated that any misinform of the curriculum can deteriorate the attitudes of the learners.

6.2.4 Willingness to participate in curriculum development

Most of the teachers who participated in this study indicated their willingness to partake in curriculum planning and development should they be given opportunity. Here follow some exact words from the teachers:

“I would like to be involved” (Teacher 1).

“Yes. I would love to, because I just want to find out more on how the whole process is and I find it very interesting... and... it’s something I want to be involved...On how they plan and plotting and the arrangement of the whole design and putting it to action” (Teacher 2).

However, there was one teacher who was contented with the curriculum developed elsewhere. Here is the quote.

“I think, we have experts that are really trained for this, why would we get involved?” (Teacher 4).

The results indicated that most of the teachers were willing to engage in curriculum planning and development. This result is the same with that of (Al-Daami & Wallace 2007). However, there is a minor case in this study of one participant who showed hesitancy to participate in curriculum planning. Similarly, this result concurs with the result reported in an Eastern European country which is Estonia (Erss et al., 2016) and the one with a tradition of using decentralised curriculum approach in the past such as Netherland Nieveen & Kupper (2012) and African country such as Zimbabwe, Chinyani (2013). The difference is that, in this study, the reason the participant is not willing to participate was that she is confident that the curriculum planners are experts while in those studies, workload and the act of overwhelming are the reason behind the reluctance.
The figure below illustrates a number of teachers who were not willing to participate in curriculum planning and those who were eager to participate.

In brief, the most of teachers showed that they were eager to participate in curriculum planning and development while a minority were not.
6.3 Teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their involvement in curriculum development.

The three subcategories that emerged for this question is presented in the figure below.

Figure 14. Results of Teachers’ perception on their involvement.

6.3.1 Teachers` involvement in curriculum development enhances learners’ performance.

Teachers expressed that there is a positive relationship between their involvement and the academic performance of the learners. Furthermore, most of the teachers felt that their involvement in curriculum planning and development could enhance learners’ performance. One teacher justified that it is because involved teachers understand why and how the curriculum should be implemented and tend to explicate the content to the learners which makes the learners perform well. Most of the teachers felt that their exclusion in curriculum planning disadvantage the learners. Out of 8 teachers, only one teacher who expressed that teacher’s involvement in curriculum development does not affect the academic performance of the learners, hence knowledgeable people devise the curriculum already. Most of the teachers have expressed that learners are struggling because they are expected
to digest so much knowledge within the short period which teachers felt that it congests their memory. Here are some of the quotes to illustrate teachers’ views

“If the content is too much and the learners are not able to...acquire it within that certain period, it will be congesting them, it will be too much for them to a.....a....remember and ...it means too much work for the teachers, and...ijah its very challenging if...if NIED designed curriculum is not in alignment with the school vision mission, so there will be a big gap if they are not working together” (Teacher 2).

“I think...as I have already said earlier, if teachers are involved, it’s the teachers who know best, who know what is happening in each subject, who knows what to be added, who knows what not to be in the curriculum, so with the involvement of the teachers, I think there is a positive relationship, It will help” (Teacher 7).

The results suggest that teachers perceived there is a positive connection between their involvement in curriculum and the academic performance of the learners. This result concurs with that of Aslubaie (2016). In addition, teachers felt that the academic performance of the learners is affected by the exclusion of the teachers in curriculum planning. Moreover, teachers perceived that the content is too much for the learners. If learners are overwhelmed with content as reflected by participants, this may even cause mental problems in learners. Curriculum designers might be knowledgeable regarding curriculum development as some of the teachers have indicated, but what makes teachers more significant on this is because they engaged with the learners on a daily basis. This daily engagement acquaints teachers with the essence of knowing when the learners are tired or how much of content the learners can absorb at a certain level in a day. Unfortunately, the curriculum designers cannot observe this although they are also trained and knowledgeable because they do not interact with the learners on a regular basis, neither visit schools regularly to experience this change. For the same reason, society is changing rapidly, so as learners, and the person that can detect changes early in learners is a teacher. However, this result of learners getting congested with the content just gave an insight as the teachers expressed it. This is to say; the holistic perception would be obtained from the learners themselves because teachers might perceive that the content is too much for the learners than what the learners really perceive.

Back to the results, teachers have stated that the examples that course book are giving is not really applicable to Namibian situation. This is because teachers felt that curriculum is adopted from different countries and the content that the curriculum has is of the country’s where the curriculum was adopted from, some of the teachers further said that there is a gap of knowledge because the unfamiliar examples makes it difficult for the learners to remember hence they cannot related to themselves and this can hinder their performance. Below are the quotes to illustrate teachers’ views
It does affect them somehow in the sense that the kids, the learners are...I am not, when you teach them, the situation let me say for example it is not applicable to what they know, so “they cannot be related to themselves then that makes them to forget, if you are given an example of another country, you tend to forget but if the example is in the environment then they will always probably know this is this” (Teacher 5).

“I think there is a big gap and it causes these learners to work very with a-a... difficult because they have to memorise the thing but if we can start with these topics from grade 8 to grade 12 then it will be easier for the learners to..., and then they can do well” (Teacher 6).

The results shed light on the course book adaptability. If the examples that are in the course books are taken from where the curriculum was adopted or somewhere else which is not familiar with the learners´ environment as teachers claimed, then it could be said that the curriculum is not independent. If the learners cannot relate to the situation of their own, the curriculum can be meaningless to them. The content could be made more familiar to the learners if more teachers are involved, hence teachers listen to the learners every day. This is done in class in various ways either by having a normal conversation or by having learners write about themselves as indicated by Clayton (2007). This engagement acquaint the teachers with what the learners are familiar with, and if teachers are involved in the curriculum, teachers can integrate learners´ idea, making it relevant to the learners and easier for the learners to remember and master the concept and therefore leads to high performance. However, in the researcher´s opinion, if the curriculum entails only what learners are familiar with, then what are the learners learning? Learners will only know what is within their nutshell and will not get exposed to other cultures. In the end, the country might produce citizens that are not competent for globalisation. On top of that, an expert has it that if learners are only taught about the culture that they already know, then the curriculum is limiting the learners from learning other cultures, and that curriculum is not recognised as a democratic curriculum (Kelly, 2009). This act would contradict the Namibia National Curriculum for Basic Education, because according to MoEAC (2015), the curriculum is designed for a democratic society.

6.3.2 Teachers´ involvement in curriculum development promotes school’s development.

Most of the teachers have expressed that their participation in curriculum planning enhances school development. Their justification was because their participation in curriculum widen up their knowledge and school development can only take place if it is run by well-educated and knowledgeable teachers. Teachers see the connection between their participation in curriculum development, learner’s performance as well as school development. Three teachers expressed that, teachers who partake in curriculum development tend to perform better hence they understand exactly what they are implementing, another 2 teachers said if the performance of the learners is great then the school performance is also high but if the performance of the learners is low then school
development is hindered. Above all, teachers felt that their involvement would not only lead to a good curriculum that can upgrade school development but simultaneously brings a good change in the education system. Here are the quotes.

“if the performance is low, then the school development is hindered, it is not going to work smoothly. Like here at school we are planning to move from a C average to a B grade and for us to do that, we need to be teaching in a certain way, strategies on how we need to teach our learners to perform better” (Teacher 2).

“Those who are involved in the curriculum, those who develop the curriculum; they tend to perform much better. Since when they are implementing it, they exactly know what they are talking about and even thought it will be outlined in the textbook but somebody who knows exactly how to approach this, then they will be able to carry it out very well and learners will tend to understand and they will pass” (Teacher 5).

“A school development can only take place if it is run by well-educated teachers, well-prepared teachers and knowledgeable teachers” (Teacher 3).

From the result, it indicates that there is a positive relationship between teachers’ participation in curriculum development and school development. Teachers who take part in curriculum planning tend to implement effectively, and learners perform well because they understand the curriculum well. This can mean that taking part in curriculum development makes teachers more knowledgeable and gives them a deep understanding of the curriculum thus they tend to carry it out well. When the curriculum is implemented by those who clearly understand it, the receiver which is the learners tend to perform well because it is explicated for them. If the learners at a certain school are performing well, then it can be said the school is performing well. Learner’s performance and the school’s performance is interrelated although not necessarily depend on each other.

Teachers expressed that school can achieve their target when teachers are involved in curriculum development. This result sides with Kimwarey et al. (2014) as stated that by empowering teachers, it induces both their individual and professional efforts to reach the goals of a school. Although the result of this study is not precisely on teacher’s empowerment, it is necessary to use teachers’ empowerment literature to discuss it. Based on the conception that teachers get empowered through curriculum development as revealed in the literature by Carl (2009). One teacher indicated the development of school if its run by well-educated and knowledgeable teachers. This indication suggests that allowing teachers to participate in curriculum planning can enhance school development. Hence, the participation in curriculum supplement teachers’ knowledge received either through teachers training or elsewhere. This can make teachers be more knowledgeable and acquainted with knowledge appropriate for the transformation of schools. To contrast, if teachers are not involved then they are robbed of this necessary knowledge required to develop schools; thus, the development of school is hindered.
6.3.3 Teachers involvement in curriculum development enhance professional development.

Most of the teachers perceived that their involvement in a curriculum developed is vital in deepening their knowledge and expertise them in their field. Teachers believe that they grow professionally if they are involved, it acquaints them with the knowledge that they can utilise to adequately support the learners and familiarise them with the appropriate materials needed for effective implementation in education. Moreover, teachers felt that it creates opportunities for them to plan the useful strategies that teachers can use to facilitate learning for the learners to reach their goals. Furthermore, teachers perceived that the involvement gives them an understanding of the curriculum.

“The teachers involved in curriculum, it increased their professional development. It widening up their knowledge and skills and even to come up with a good approach how the curriculum should be developed and then the content of the curriculum should cover what area. So they have a better understanding of a child in the learning process, and they have a better understanding of the countries development’s needs and again the issues of professional development, the teacher will become professional and again the teacher will be able to gain understanding, a great knowledge on what is a child’s needs in education, what the country needs—a-a--- in terms of a... teachers development, learners development and other issues of developmental issue” (Teacher 3).

“I think, if you get involved as the teacher in the curriculum it means it enhance your knowledge and skills, as I have mentioned earlier on that if you know the pre-scribed book and that makes you go and get those book, that means your skills will not only be limited only to certain book. Then you can have resources that you can look at, not only the book but different resources. So that makes you develop necessary where they will be able to look out the curriculum. I mean teaching effectively at a certain time and you as the person become more knowledgeable” (Teacher 5).

“I think as the subject teacher, being involved in curriculum development it can give you knowledge, at the same time, it gives you ideas and aha. You can as well grow professionally. I think you can move from stage A to B, somehow, somehow (participant laughs)” (Teacher 6).

The results suggest that teachers felt their involvement in curriculum planning enhances their professional knowledge, but they are not adequately assisted in nurturing this knowledge essential to implement the curriculum effectively. It is clear the teachers felt that there is a gap between an official curriculum and a taught curriculum. This gap is recognised by Shkedi (2009) as revealed in the literature. However, teachers felt that professional development could bridge this gap. However, professional development and teacher’s involvement in the curriculum are interdependently (El-Okda 2005, Shawer et al., 2008). This implies that it is through teacher’s involvement in curriculum development would teachers gain in-depth knowledge necessarily needed to bridge the gap that exists between the planned curriculum and the received curriculum. Although none of the participants ever participated in curriculum planning to experience its actual professional growth, this result of participant’s perspectives of comprehending the relationship is backed up by that of Albileli et al.
(2013) whose participants experience the actual participation in the curriculum. Similarly, the perception of teachers feeling that their involvement can help them develop professionally concurs with those of Mikser et al. (2016) in Estonia. When teachers gain skills and knowledge, they are empowered professionally. Notably, it is what Carl (2009) advocate, to empower teachers through curriculum development. When teachers are empowered, they can make critical self-evaluation and develop competence in the profession (Balyer et al., 2017). When professionals are competent and are aware of their weakness and strengths, they become confident and competent, as a result, the countries would have effective and confident teachers.

One teacher gave a comparison of teachers who are involved in curriculum planning and development in other countries. The teacher stated that some countries involve teachers in curriculum planning and those teachers tend to be informed and have knowledge of their curriculum thoroughly, besides, they use advanced materials that can enhance pedagogy compared to the teachers who are not involved. Furthermore, the participant differentiated that teachers in countries that are involved perform better than the ones who are not involved. Below is the quotation from this teacher.

“ijah. Like teachers from different countries, they meet to discuss curriculum development. So, those teachers, they know the curriculum in and out, so they turn to become more advanced, and they tend to implement things much better and proper, plus the materials that they normally have to use such media in the teaching process, Ijah that the difference I foresee” (Teacher 8).

From the quotation, it shed light that participants are aware that countries whose teachers are involved in curriculum planning and development appear to comprehend better implementation strategies compared to those who are not involved. Finland can be used to buttress this argument. Finnish teachers have extensive autonomy in local curriculum work (Molstad, 2015), again Finland has been one of the leading performing countries in PISA (PISA 2016; PISA 2012). Although this may be plausible, it might not always be the case. To be specific, there is a case in Scotland, whose CfE is developed at the school level where teachers participated in curriculum planning. Despite that, the results for Priestly and Minty (2012) indicated that the implementation was not smooth. Hence there was a lack of clarity and coherence in the document that guided implementation. Thus, teacher’s involvement in curriculum planning does not always guarantee effective implementation.

Participants felt that teachers in other countries foster their knowledge even through curriculum hence they meet and discuss the curriculum. In brief, there is little opportunity created for teachers to develop their professional development through curriculum development. This is because the curriculum is mainly developed by external stakeholders, which means curriculum knowledge is defined for the teachers.
Teachers are just like learners, and they need active engagement in the curriculum to internalise the curriculum and acquire extensive understanding. Furthermore, when teachers are involved in curriculum planning, they are learning through collaboration with other teachers. This is evident in Voogt et al. (2011) study which made a report that teachers learned the content of the curriculum from a disciplinary angle when they were designing the curriculum interactively. This process endorses social constructivism learning theory, that emphasises learning as a collaborative process (Smidt, 2013). Involving teachers in curriculum planning can be seen that teachers get acquainted with the curriculum by employing social constructivism. Unfortunately, in this case of teachers who received the curriculum to implement, is of the perception that they study curriculum document individually, not indorsing social constructivism.
7. Conclusion

The aim of this study is to determine basic education teachers’ perceptions about their involvement in national curriculum development for basic education in Namibia. From the teachers’ perceptions, the study aims to discover the significance of involving basic education teachers in curriculum planning, along with determining the extent of their involvement in curriculum development. Equally important, the study is interested to find out how teachers perceive the effectiveness of their involvement in curriculum development. Lastly, the study aims to make recommendations that would improve the involvement of teachers in the curriculum development and that would benefit the entire basic education. According to Abudu and Mensah (2016), the meaning and relevance of education depend on how curriculum is developed. Whilst Kelly (2009) alerts that, if teachers do not get an extensive understanding of the curriculum, the academic standards so as behaviours fall. It is worth to carry out this investigation in Namibia as no research is yet conducted regarding this phenomenon. This chapter presents the summary and major findings, at the same time, it presents the limitation of the study together with the recommendation, contributions, as well as areas to embark for future research.

7.1 Summary and conclusion of major results

The case concludes that most teachers are not satisfied with their involvement in curriculum development although a few show contentment regarding this phenomenon. Few teachers are content with the involvement because they perceived that, curriculum developers are experts. As the literature indicated some cases of failing to implement the curriculum that was designed by teachers who happened not to be well acquainted with curriculum issue (Lau, 2005), It is important to highlight that expertise is significant in curriculum development. Teachers acknowledged that, they are supposed to be the arbiters of the curriculum. However, the curriculum developers mainly include NIED officials of some were teachers before, leaving a small room for the teachers who apply curriculum in class on a daily basis. The study reveals that, the curriculum is imposed on teachers, hence they argued that they just get the curriculum to implement. This can jeopardise the attainment of national goals of education. With reference to Gerrard and Farrell (2014), teachers reject curriculum imposed on them. Few teachers uttered that they do not always have an extensive understanding of the curriculum whilst few aired that they conduct advisory teachers for clarification. This risk the academic standards and behaviours of the learners. It can fall as per Kelly (2009) argument.

It is evident to conclude that it is significant to involve teachers in curriculum planning and development. Firstly, for effective implementation as this study revealed. This argument also
validated Huizinga et al. (2014), as revealed in the literature that the success of curriculum reform relies on teachers. However, it contradicts with Priestly and Minty (2012), where teachers were involved in curriculum development, but curriculum implementation was not free from challenges. Additionally, teachers are the ones who know the learning needs of the learners. They communicate with parents, at the same time, engage with learners on a daily basis; making teachers to be at the position of knowing learners’ interest and background. This is vital in a country with cultural diversity like Namibia in particular. Involving teachers in curriculum planning means that learners interests are represented, resulting in developing the curriculum which is relevant and meaningful to the learners. This study revealed a dismay against the content. Participants revealed that, they deal with the curriculum content, their experience is of the importance in curriculum reforms to improve the amount of the content assigned to grades, and to improve content sequence and content selection should they be involved in the planning. Therefore, involving teachers helps in improving the content.

The evidence from the teachers shows that they are qualified and experienced, meaning that they have necessary skills to be integrated into the curriculum during the planning phase but none of these teachers were neither part of curriculum planning nor asked for their contributions. In other words, their knowledge and experience were not utilised. If knowledge is not used, it might gradually fade away. However, teachers are involved at implementing stage. This gives a sense that teachers have little curriculum ownership. This is because teachers feel ownership of the curriculum when they are involved in curriculum development stage too and not only at implementation Erss et al. (2016). Although this study was conducted in the Khomas region only, most participants had been working in different regions and uttered that most of the teachers in other regions had the same experience. Thus, this study concludes that teachers are involved in curriculum planning and development to a little extent. Majority of teachers wanted to be involved outside the classroom. However, teachers have little information about the opportunities to participate in curriculum planning. Some participants did not know when the curriculum is formulated.

The utterance of teachers not being considered in curriculum development can also be reinforced by the absence of curriculum committees at schools. None of the four schools had a curriculum committee. Teachers were only called in to go and attend the workshops that acquainted them on how the new curriculum would be implemented. However, the in-service training was not effective. Participants voiced that, the training was offered only to few selected teachers who should then train other teachers who remained at schools. This is not effective as teachers did not have equipment that was used during the training to enhance understanding of teachers who remained at school, in the end, most teachers were less informed about the reformed curriculum; this can lead to a gap in
knowledge. To add, in-service training does not occur regularly. Teachers revealed that the last in-service training happened in 2015. This is to say, teachers who graduated or entered the teaching profession after 2015 missed the knowledge that is necessary for effective implementation. There was also a planned in-service training that did not occur due to financial hindrance. Therefore, Alsubaie (2016)´s advocacy for teachers to receive adequate in-service training is not endorsed.

Teachers are conscious that participating in curriculum promote professional growth. Although none of them experienced curriculum planning, they made this inference. They uttered that, involvement in curriculum planning deepens teachers´ knowledge. This study reveals that, teachers are not assisted to nurture this knowledge. Neither are they empowered through curriculum development. Carl (2009) advocates for teachers´ empowerment through curriculum development. Unfortunately, this urge was not put to practice. Balyer et al. (2017) reported that teachers can make critical reflection and develop competence when they are empowered. Not empowering teacher’s gives the possibility of missing reflection skills and those that it takes for an educator to be competent. Not only that, the experience teachers would get from curriculum planning to design effective lesson plan would be missed too. Albilehi et al. (2013) informed that teachers used that experience in designing lessons plan. Moreover, this study concludes that involving teachers in curriculum development enhance school development. Hence participants expressed that school can only develop when it’s run by well-educated and knowledgeable teachers. Bear in mind that, teachers gain knowledge also through curriculum development as discussed in this study.

It is challenging to implement unfamiliar ideas. Teachers acquire in-depth understanding of the curriculum when they are involved in planning. Understanding the curriculum extensively makes it easier for teachers to implement it effectively. This includes explicating the content to learners, making it fair for learners to acquire knowledge. When learners acquire the required knowledge and skills, they have obtained the learning objectives and therefore perform well in school. Alsubaie (2016) reported that, there is a positive relationship between teachers´ involvement and academic performance of the learners, this study agreed with it. Thus, the study concludes that involving teachers in curriculum development enhance their school performance. Conversely, not involving teachers risk the chance of not generating in-depth understanding of the curriculum as expressed by the teachers and consequently have a negative impact on learners´ performance. The curriculum objectives support the attainment of the national goal of basic education that supports vision 2030 whose one of the goals is to produce a knowledge-based society. Similarly, curriculum objectives support the attainment of global goal as the curriculum is aligned to SDG-4. Therefore, involving
teachers in curriculum development creates a path to the attainment of national goals coupled with global goals as shown in figure 15 below.
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Figure 15. Involving teachers in curriculum development creates a path to vision 2030

Lastly, the researcher would like to conclude with the quote from Wang and Cheng (2005), which say “the significant role teachers should play in curriculum reform must not be overlooked if successful implementation and sustainability are to be achieved.”

7.2 Limitation of the study

This study is limited to teachers in four schools in the Khomas region only. Therefore, the results cannot be generalised. Teachers’ perceptions may differ as it moves to other regions. However, participants shed light that some teachers in different regions have the same experience. The time duration during the conducting of this study was inadequate to capture the development process, hence the research was conducted during the implementation stage. It could be greater to conduct this study during the planning phase and employed interview together with observation to observe how teachers are engaged in this process and examine if the teachers’ views correlate with what is observed. However, the curriculum gets reformed every fifth year, which made it impossible to apply this strategy considering the year that I conduct this study and therefore makes it a limitation of this study.

Another limitation is that, the period during which the study was conducted was the beginning of the semester, teachers were busy with administration work and athletics which compelled some, to dedicate a short time for the interview, despite that, the study generated rich data. At school A, the researcher went to give 2 teachers letter of consent and to make an agreement on when the interview should be conducted. Both teachers did not indicate the time convenient for them at that moment, they have told the researcher that they would check on their schedule first and notify the researcher after school. Surprisingly, these two teachers called the researcher after few minutes when the researcher left their school. They have stated that they are willing to participate in the study and the researcher should go and interview them the same day after school, which was at 1:00 pm. Although
this did not affect the interview, it could be a limitation in such a way that it took the researcher by surprise to carry out the interview, on the same day the participants were informed. However, as it was mentioned before that the researcher anticipated this, the researcher was ready to go conduct the interview. Another justification why it did not affect data is that teachers were eager to participate in this study thus they participated voluntarily. The best interviews occur with respondents who want to share their story and knowledge (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). The last limitation came from the interpretation process, although the researcher exercised reflexivity, the researcher should have influenced the results at some points through interpretation.

7.3 Recommendation and contribution of the study
The curriculum for basic education in Namibia gets reformed and the revised curriculum is aligned with the objectives of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (NIED, 2018). Although this is plausible that Namibia is playing a role in promoting sustainable development specifically goal 4 which is a universal goal for education, lack of research might cause problems in implementing. Therefore, this research contributes to the knowledge that is lacking in this area. The results of this study can inform policymakers in making effective curriculum policies that are aligned with both global objectives and informed by evidence to make it more adaptable to the local context. Although the Namibian centralised curriculum involves teachers in curriculum development to a little extent, we cannot do away with it. This is because, it is cost effective. Additionally, curriculum developed by teachers alone tends not to have consistency as revealed in the literature by Nieveen and Kuiper (2012). Therefore, the researcher makes suggestions to make it better, based on the results of this study.

Some teachers in this study revealed the contentment they had with their little involvement, because they believed curriculum developers are experts. This shows that, expertise is significant, and it should be considered in curriculum development. In other words, the curriculum development should not be entirely left on teachers’ hands because they might be experienced but not experts in curricula issue. Therefore, this study recommends policymakers to ensure that, teachers who are selected to be part of curriculum committees that design the curriculum, are experts in curriculum development first before they get involved in curriculum planning. At the same time, the study recommends curriculum developers to ask teachers for their contribution. However, regarding the contribution, it should be asked from teachers, regardless of their expertise or experience. This is because it does not necessary require expertise for teachers to give out their ideas, unlike in actual development stage.

The Namibian national curriculum for basic education articulated that, the great challenge of curriculum reform is in the implementation of the curriculum and urge teachers to take ownership of the curriculum and implement it with commitment (MOEAC, 2015, p.6). However, the literature
reveals that, teachers possess curriculum ownership when they are involved in curriculum development and not only being curriculum implementers Mikser et al. (2016). Considering our results, it indicates that teachers in Namibia are involved in curriculum development to a little extent, this can cause teachers to lack ownership of the curriculum. Therefore, the Ministry of Education Arts and Culture should expand the number of teachers in curriculum development to materialise the urge for curriculum ownership that would contribute to a better implementation. Another result of this study revealed that, the content is exhausting, and its sequence is a concerned issue. As for this reason, the curriculum should urgently be reform to reduce the content and sequence the content accordingly. If the content is not reduced, then the performance of the learners would be affected. The study does not urge the development to be entirely to the teachers, in fact, the results revealed that teachers were aware that not all of them can be catered in curriculum planning. However, considering the little extent teachers are involved in curriculum development with the numbers of teachers that execute the curriculum, teachers’ representation in curriculum planning is not meaningful. This is another reason why MoEAC together with NIED should involve a substantial number of teachers in curriculum planning. Hence they are the ones who implement it.

Creating opportunities to expand the participation of teachers in curriculum development can be done by creating school-based curriculum committees or piloting the curriculum to school before it gets implemented. Eunitah et al. (2013) informed that, piloting is very imperative as it finds out if the curriculum is applicable to all schools before implementing. This can help to adjust the curriculum to meet the needs of schools. On a related note, the results show a mismatch between the curriculum and schools’ environments, in addition, some teachers perceived that curriculum developers do not visit their schools. Regarding this, curriculum developers should visit schools to view different learning environments. The study indicates that, some participants lacked information on the development of the curriculum. Therefore this study recommends regional officers to create a programme that will create awareness about curriculum development. In curriculum development, teachers are the learners, and just like learners need active involvement in their learning, so as the teachers. Teachers should be placed at the centre of the concern should they need to comprehend and understand the curriculum to implement it effectively. As this study reveals that teachers get the curriculum to implement, it protrudes that teachers are learning the curriculum in isolation and not using social constructivism learning theory that embraces learning through collaboration.

The study also reveals that in-service training does not happen regularly and new graduates and beginning teacher are mostly to miss the in-service training of implementation that acquaints teachers with information necessary for effective curriculum implementation. In this case, institutions that
produce basic education teachers such as UNAM, IUM and IOL should prepare student teachers for such an encounter. This can be done by mandating curriculum design projects to be obligatorily part of teachers training, in this way teachers would put theories to practice and gain practical skills. It is discovered that due to the financial predicament the intended in-service training did not take place. Policymakers should allow more teachers to participate in curriculum planning; it is cost effective in such a way that only minimal in-service training on implementation is needed hence many teachers already got an extensive understanding about the curriculum during the planning phase.

7.4 Recommendation for future studies

The results revealed that the content is too much, making it difficult for the learners to acquire knowledge. Teachers made this claim, but, what about the learners? Do they feel congested with the content? To obtain a holistic view, future study should investigate the perception of the students, on whom the curriculum is applied. The second suggestion for the future study was identified after it was found the curriculum is imposed on teachers. Considering that teachers reject policies which are forced on them, future study should investigate the implementation of curriculum in the classrooms. Another suggestion for future research emerged when teachers have indicated that sometimes they do not have an extensive understanding of the curriculum, this might be caused by teachers training they received and not necessarily from not being involved in curriculum planning. To gain certainty, future research should study curriculum innovation for teachers’ education to investigate if teachers are getting well acquainted with curriculum related issues.

In contributing to the attainment of the effective implementation of SDG4 and that of producing a knowledge-based society, it does not solely depend on teachers and the Ministry of Education, Arts and culture, it calls for public contribution. Therefore, future study should investigate the community’s involvement in curriculum development. Lastly, to capture a larger number of teachers’ in-depth views, future study should employ a mixed approach to explore the phenomenon in other regions. Hence, this one was based only in the Khomas region.
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Appendices

Appendix 1- Interview protocol

Personal questions to start with.

➢ What grade are you teaching?
➢ How long have you worked as a teacher?
➢ Have you worked in the same region? School?
➢ What is the highest qualification in teaching are you holding?
➢ Have you ever participated in creating curriculum?

1. How do Namibian teachers perceive their involvement in the planning and development of curriculum?
   ➢ How are the teachers consulted in the planning and development of Curriculum? 
     How often? Why?
   ➢ Is it significant for Namibian Teachers to be involved in the development of curriculum? Why? /why not?
     (a) planning
     (b) developing
     (c) implementing
     (d) evaluating

2. To what extent are Namibian teachers involved in the curriculum planning and development?
   ➢ How regularly are teachers involved in the curriculum development process?
     (a) How are they involved in planning?
     (b) developing
     (c) implementing
     (d) evaluating
   ➢ Are the opportunities for access and participation in the curriculum being created?
     How? By whom?

3. How do teachers perceive the effectiveness of involvement in curriculum development?
   ➢ How do you feel about teachers’ involvement in curriculum development?
   ➢ Would you like to be involved in planning and developing the curriculum? Why?
     follow up questions: if Yes, how would you like to be involved? If NO, why not
   ➢ How do you see the relationship between the involvement of teachers in curriculum development and the (a) academic performance of learners?
     (b) School development?
     (c) Personal development/ teachers’ development
   ➢ A follow-up question if they say teachers are not involved.
What do you think should be done to involve more teachers in the planning and development of curriculum? Who is responsible for the involvement?

What are the consequences if teachers are actively involved / if they are not?
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Khomas Regional Office

Private bag 13236

Windhoek

Re: Request for permission to collect data at schools in Khomas region.

To Whom It May Concern

I am Iyaloo Nalooliwa Nghihalwa, a Namibian student teacher studying Masters´ Degree Programme at University of Eastern Finland. I am conducting my research on Teachers´ Involvement in the Planning and Development of National Curriculum for Basic Education. I would like to interview school teachers in Khomas region. Therefore, I am requesting your good office to grant me permission to carry out my study.

The purpose of this study is to determine the involvement of teachers in curriculum development from teachers´ perceptions. In addition, the study aims to determine to what extent Namibian teachers are involved in curriculum planning and development. This research will create awareness about the importance of involving teachers in curriculum development in the Namibian context. Moreover, findings could influence policy makers and curriculum developers in making effective curriculum policies informed by evidence.

Kindly sign here, to indicate that you have given me permission to carry out my study.

---------------------

Yours faithfully,

Iyaloo Nghihalwa -The researcher
Dear teacher,

I am Iyaloo N. Nghihalwa and I am doing a Masters’ Degree Programme in Education at the University of Eastern Finland. I am conducting my research on Teachers’ Involvement in the Planning and Development of National Curriculum for Basic Education. Therefore, I would like to interview school teachers between 16th and 19th January 2018. The aim of this research is to determine your perceptions regarding the involvement in the planning and development of curriculum, as well as to determine to what extent teachers in Namibia are involved in the planning and development of the curriculum. This research is beneficial to all Namibian teachers at large in such a way that it will create awareness about teachers’ involvement in the curriculum in the Namibian context. Moreover, findings could influence policy makers and curriculum developers in decision making.

The participation is voluntary, and you can withdraw at any time it is necessary. Moreover, have the right not to answer some questions that might appear uncomfortable. We can make arrangement whenever and wherever is convenient for you. To analyse your perception, I kindly ask for permission to record the interviews. The answers will solely be used for this study and will be kept confidential.

Here is a sample of questions we could discuss during the interview:

1. Is it significant for teachers to be involved in curriculum planning? Why? Why not?
2. To what extent are Teachers in Namibia involved in the Curriculum planning and development?
3. How do you see the relationship between the involvement of teachers in curriculum development and the (a) academic performance of learners? (b) Teachers’ professional development?

I will highly appreciate your participation.

Kindly sign below to indicate that you have accepted to participate in this research.

Signature: _____________________

Yours Sincerely

Iyaloo Nghihalwa – The researcher