



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_AIR_17697
Title of the Manuscript:	THE MULTIPLE STREAMS FRAMEWORK AND THE 1996 AND 2007 EDUCATIONAL REFORMS IN GHANA
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Re: THE MULTIPLE STREAM FRAMEWORK AND THE 1996 AND 2007 EDUCATIONAL REFORMS IN GHANA</p> <p>The paper is an interesting read. It may be published provided the author/s pay attention to some concerns I have. First of all, the entire discussion needs to be tightened a bit to make the paper make three contributions to knowledge: a) add to the existing knowledge on the role and importance of social policy in educational change b) our understanding as to why educational policies fail/succeed in Africa; and c), the broader implications for counter- visioning African-centred education.</p> <p>The examination of Ghana's FCUBE and the Kufour led educational reforms on the mid 1990s and late 2000s must proceed with an intellectual situatedness for readers on some vital fronts : first, the reader must have good understanding of the basic ideas/principles of FCUBE and, second, offered a historical accounting of the key aspects of the educational reforms that have been carried out in Ghana over the years. How does Kufour's reforms fit into the general direction of other reforms in Ghana. What are the points of convergence and divergence? This later point will help respond to my earlier question of understanding why educational policies fail or succeed in the African context.</p> <p>I am surprised that the author has not engaged the</p>	Corrections effected in the manuscript



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>writings of Jophus Anamuah-Mensah in this paper.</p> <p>I would ask: were there other external/exogenous, as well as internal factors and conditions within the broader socio-political contexts of Ghana under the Kufour administration that drove the necessity for these reforms?</p> <p>Notwithstanding the assertion of Meyer 2001 (see page 5) I believe this paper offers food for thought in the general knowledge garnered from a single case study that could lead us to think through ideas relating to a counter-vision of schooling and education in African context. How does the study inform on-going debates about counter-visioning schooling and education in Ghana and Africa?</p> <p>Are there important lessons of educational change that help us to begin to [re] imagine schooling and education in ways that is not yet imagined? And, through educational policy how do school administrators and policy workers work with educators, students, parents and local communities to organize collectively for what could be?</p> <p>I find the discussion of the MSF under policy and political streams and the liberal use of these subheadings difficult to understand , and frankly, intellectually confusing. I think the whole section from pp. 11-24 needs to a bit more succinct and concise</p> <p>On page 20 it will be useful for readers to know how exactly did the educational reforms pursued under the Kufour regime help address these challenges that have been highlighted with the educational system at the</p>	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>time. I came out of this section wondered just what is the “multiple stream framework”?</p> <p>Finally, I see the personal subject[ive] location as critical in terms of what brings the author/s to the topic. The contextualization of writer/self as a discursive feature of the paper and the discussion is significant. It helps the reader to understand the perspective from which one is conducting the discussion and analysis. And by perspective, I do not mean just ideology or analytical framework, but a personal accounting of why one writes about what one doe</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		