Uptake of Adaptive Learning (R8292)

Results of the pre-testing of the Adaptive Learning Guidelines.

May 2005

Robert Arthur

Table of Contents

1   Summary

This document contains details of the pre-testing of the adaptive learning guidelines (Garaway and Arthur 2002) developed in the Fisheries Science Management Programme (FMSP) project R7335. These guidelines have been refined and improved through the FMSP R8292 "Uptake of Adaptive Learning approaches for enhancement fisheries" project. The report outlines the background to the development of the guidelines, provides details of the pre-testing methods and describes how the guidelines were improved on the basis of stakeholder suggestions and review.

Initial findings during the development of the project communications strategy indicated that, for the target stakeholders, the guidelines should be made available as both written materials and electronically via a website. Pre-testing of the existing guidelines was undertaken using a standardized questionnaire completed by various target stakeholders. This has provided initial feedback on the legibility, readability, level of comprehension and appearance of the guidelines. A critical review of guidelines content has also been undertaken by the original authors and key stakeholders to identify improvements making them more accessible and, ultimately, of more use to the target stakeholders.

This report details the findings from all these pre-testing activities and details the changes that were made to the guidelines as a result.

2 Introduction

The uptake of Adaptive Learning for enhancement fisheries project is funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) through the Fisheries Management Science Programme (FMSP). The project contributes towards the overall aim of the FMSP (Livelihoods of poor people improved through sustainably enhanced production and productivity of land / water interface systems) as well as the objective (Benefits for poor people generated by application of new knowledge to fisheries management systems) through the refinement and promotion of the adaptive learning approach. The purpose of this project, as stated in the project logical framework (logframe), is to increase uptake, by identified organisations and resource users, of the adaptive learning approach, management tools and fisheries enhancement strategies.

Increasing uptake has been achieved primarily through the development and promotion of the adaptive learning guidelines (Garaway and Arthur 2002 – see Appendix 1), which will be maximised if efforts are made to ensure that these guidelines are more relevant to the needs of development practitioners. In addition to the core effort on the guidelines, additional efforts have been on-going, using a variety of means (including project briefs, one-to-one meetings, web-based promotion and presentations) to raise awareness of the approach and the project activities and outcomes as well as the guidelines.

The development of the guidelines has been based on two elements. The first is the further testing of the approach in both India and the countries of the Mekong Basin in different resource systems and institutional settings and using contacts with other practitioners to build on the experiences of all and improve the relevance and scope of the guidelines content (the testing of the guidelines and some of the contributions to the content can be seen in the sections of the final technical report and annexes relating to Output 2). The second is the testing of the existing guidelines and improvement in the presentation and readability of the guidelines, making them responsive and applicable to the needs of potential users. It is this second element that is the focus of this report and this report details the revisions made to the existing guidelines together with the process of testing the revised guidelines.

2.1 Background to the project

The project is a follow on from FMSP project R7335, which tested the Adaptive Learning approach in small, village managed 'community fisheries' in southern Lao PDR (the final technical report and project products from R7335 available on-line at www.fmsp.org.uk). This project has tested the adaptive learning approach through implementation of the approach using the existing adaptive learning guidelines, frameworks and methodologies in different resource and institutional settings in India and the Mekong Basin (see Annex 2). This will provide a better understanding of the transferability of the approach and highlight the refinements that are required to increase its potential for transfer. In addition, the project will seek to incorporate knowledge relating to the approach that currently exists in the region.

After refining the existing adaptive learning guidelines, the revised guidelines will be actively promoted through the project communication strategy, developed in order to effectively scale up the research products (see Annex 1). It is anticipated that the communications strategy will raise awareness of the project activities and products, including the guidelines, and enable an on-going dialogue about the process and outputs of the project with relevant stakeholders in the region and beyond.

3 Pre-testing the guidelines

As part of the Adaptive Learning project (R7335) much effort was placed on identifying the stakeholder groups that would be involved in and affected by the implementation of the process (extension staff and resource users), understanding their communications needs and developing appropriate ways to improve communication. This was essential as the whole approach is concerned with researchers, extension workers and resource users generating, sharing and utilizing knowledge together, with the resource users actively participating in determining the type of knowledge to be generated. As part of this process a communications network was developed that allowed information to flow within and between these stakeholder groups.

While it was felt that communication with this first set of stakeholders was crucial in contributing to the success of the approach in R7335 using this network, there was much less communication with a second set of stakeholders: those stakeholders that might implement the approach, those who are able to create or influence change, to promote the approach and the products of the research. The adaptive learning guidelines were developed based on the perceived needs of this group but with little input from them. This pre-testing activity seeks to change this and ensure that the guidelines can better reflect the requirements of this group in terms of both content and format.

3.1 Development of the adaptive learning guidelines.

The pre-testing of the guidelines forms a part of the development of the adaptive learning guidelines. The objectives of this development process are broadly as follows:

- Planning the production of the guidelines. Defining who will be the targets of the guidelines, what their needs are (including considering the language and tone that will be used), and how the guidelines can best be used to promote uptake of the approach within this group.
- Developing the guidelines. Ensuring that both style and content match the needs of the target group. Identifying sections of the guidelines that need to be developed in terms of content, either through improving existing parts or through the inclusion of new material as required. The style of the guidelines is also important including: tone, contrast, font size, diagrams and document size.
- Structuring the process. Allocating responsibility for contributions, reviewing, ensuring that the product is tested and feedback is incorporated.
- Pre-testing and refining the product to ensure that it effectively meets stakeholder needs.

3.2 Objectives of pre-testing

Within the process of developing the guidelines, the objectives of the pre-testing component include:

- Identification of target stakeholders. The needs and wants of the target group must be understood if a useful product is to be developed to meet them.

- Assessment of the existing guidelines produced in R7335, identifying areas associated with both the style and content to be included, modified or excluded.

3.3 Identification of target stakeholders

The first place to start in the pre-testing process was with an assessment of who the main stakeholders are and how they have been involved in the research and the promotion of the research products (Norrish, 2001). Such an assessment helped to identify gaps in communication, communications needs, with whom research findings should be communicated and when findings should be communicated. The target stakeholders in this case are identified as being primarily those people and organisations involved in renewable natural resources management in a development context. In particular, organisations that are already involved, or who intend to be involved, in assisting communities to learn about and improve the management of their resources. The guidelines should also be of use to those with an education or training remit who may wish to incorporate parts of the guidelines into teaching and training materials. Other potential users are donor organisations, project managers and policymakers requiring relevant information for setting program agenda and priorities. It is acknowledged that in order to make the guidelines as accessible as possible producing them in local languages including Vietnamese and Khmer, (and Lao?) may be required.

3.4 Assessment of products from R7335

These guidelines produced as part of R7335 are intended to be easy to read, provide an understanding of the approach and raise awareness about the approach amongst development practitioners. The guidelines are hosted on the FMSP website from which they can be downloaded and a number of links on relevant websites (such as OneFish and MekongInfo) have been created to increase the chances of this happening (see Annex 1 for further details of hosting of the guidelines and weblinks).

As with many natural resources projects, R7335 did not have a communications strategy for the promotion of products to relevant stakeholders. However, links had been made by the project team with some key organizations in Southeast Asia (including AIT, RDC, Department of Livestock and Fisheries, STREAM, World Vision, MRRF, Australian Mekong Centre) but there had been no systematic stakeholder analysis to identify the needs of this group. Development of the guidelines was based on assumptions about stakeholders who might be interested in the approach and what their needs and wants were. The guidelines were written and produced entirely by the project team and during this process there was no systematic pre-testing of the guidelines.

Assessment of the guidelines (Garaway and Arthur 2002) was conducted in two ways. In the first place, the guidelines were pre-tested by a representative sample of target stakeholders. This helped to establish who the guidelines should be aimed at and the extent to which the existing guidelines were successful in achieving the intentions.

The second assessment was focused on the content. Critical reflection on the existing guidelines was undertaken by the project team in order to address identified gaps and strengthen sections that were considered weak. This assessment was undertaken by both the authors of the original guidelines and by a sample of target stakeholders.

3.5 Stakeholder pre-testing

Copies of the guidelines and pre-testing forms (see Appendix 2) were given to a number of stakeholders identified in section 3.3 and the completed forms returned. The results from these completed forms are summarized below in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1 Summary of responses to questions the pre-testing of the existing Adaptive Learning guidelines (brackets indicate number of similar responses).

Question	Responses
Who should read the guidelines?	Local level government staff (who speak English) (x5), researchers (x6), communication agency, co-managers, development experts and extension staff (x8)
In what formats should the guidelines be produced?	Booklet (x4), A4 Booklet (x6) CD-ROM (x3), video (x3) and on website (x5). Possibly not CD-Rom (x5), poster
After reading the guidelines, do you understand what adaptive learning is?	Yes (x11) Would like to believe so… Should simplify the language
Do you know why people should use the adaptive learning approach?	Yes (x8)
After reading the guidelines, do you understand how adaptive learning might be implemented?	Yes (x7) Yes (theoretically) (x3) – what if necessary conditions are not present? No – hard to follow process and in particular evaluation section needs to improve. Quite complicated, could do with simple short overview
Who would you contact to find out more about the approach?	Dr Garaway and Mr Arthur (x11), RDC, cited references (x2) and other practitioners with practical experience in application (x2).
Other comments	Booklet should include bullet point summary of main points. Broad guidelines do not help in individual cases, early interaction with target groups important. Guidelines provide well reasoned approach for sustained improvements in NRM. May also improve communication between grass roots and policy makers (x2). Implementation requires skilled smart people (who may be hard to find/build and sustain in the long run. Unsure as to when adaptive management can be done – is there a checklist of conditions?

Table 2 Responses to aspects of the guidelines (brackets indicate number of similar responses).

Aspect	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Comments
Overall appearance of the guidelines (e.g. layout, colour, photographs)	7	4	1	Text too dense (x4). Two columns of text better than three (x7). Sections could be split into parts with simpler, shorter text, instructions and longer one covering all angles (like the draft).
Use of language – are the guidelines clear and easy to understand?	9	3		Sometimes too wordy. Could be simplified, appears targeted at academic audience (x6). A bit overwhelmed by the layout.
Use of colour – too much, too little, etc.	1	9	1	Print a bit faded, more contrast needed. Some charts have unpleasant colours. Table on page 9 difficult to read (x2). Many potential users do not have access to colour printers and guidelines should also withstand photocopying several times (x2).
Diagrams – are the diagrams clear and do they help you to understand the text?	6	6		Some better than others (x5). Could be improved and possibly simplified (x5). Quite academic, may not be intuitive for some readers. Learning cycle on p7 does not mean anything. Adaptive learning diagram complex and lacks dynamism.
Photos – are they appropriate to the text?	10	2		They liven up the text Needs more pictures Pictures should relate more closely to the text.
Text – font size, type and colour.		3	6	More contrast needed (x4). In some places font should be larger (x7). Larger pages, wider columns with smaller text (x2). Excessive hyphenation can make it difficult for those with lower language skills.

The guidelines were generally well received and it was reassuring that they appeared successful in describing the approach, those who it was relevant to, and the context in which it would be of most use. The guidelines were therefore considered to be a useful starting point for the development of a more refined product. Common suggestions regarding the appearance of the guidelines related to the contrast in colours in diagrams and tables, the font size in a number of the diagrams and the number of columns on a page. In the last of these it was suggested the number should be reduced from three to two, making the text easier to scan, particularly to those less familiar with English language.

For national and regional stakeholders, written materials were considered to be the most appropriate and likely to have the greatest impact. Further assessment of the most promising pathways for each of the levels will be explored in order to determine both the comparative advantage and cost-effectiveness of each for the promotion and uptake of project products.

While the guidelines appeared to be able to explain what adaptive learning was, they were not as successful in describing how the approach might be implemented. There were a number of areas in the guidelines that did not provide sufficient information or detail to be wholly useful. In a review of the guidelines content it was found that there were a number of ways in which the guidelines could be improved to address this, and the other comments received from the pre-testing, and these were as follows:

- Format should be changed to A4 to ensure that text size would not be too small.
- Ensure that there is sufficient contrast and that this is still the case if the guidelines are photocopied.
- Bring some life into the guidelines by including more examples from practitioners' experiences, quotes from stakeholders involved and 'catchphrases'.
- Separate the methodologies and tools used (e.g. stakeholder analysis) from the process, perhaps by putting these in boxes. Also need to recognise in the guidelines that there may be alternative tools so perhaps not be too prescriptive.
- The methodology for selecting the learning strategy, a crucial step, needs to be more clearly explained.
- Include a list of useful websites, organisations, references and contacts that could help those wishing to implement the approach
- Increase the content and ensure that the guidelines are more effective in explaining how each stage of the process might be undertaken.
- Explain more clearly the types of learning (learning from doing versus doing to learn) that exist and how these are incorporated into the approach. Also crucial to stress the learning + management aspect of the approach.
- It needs to be clearly indicated that the data collection is directly dependent on the learning strategy and that collecting information is not in itself learning. The decisions about which indicators to select and what data to collect could possibly do with being more clearly explained as well as the fact that data collection should be as cheap, simple and diverse as possible. Perhaps should make clear that it may be possible to use qualitative indicators – not all data needs to be scientific quantitative data.
- The guidelines should indicate that the approach is suitable for a wide range of situations (perhaps with examples?) and resource systems and that an important aspect is being prepared to 'give it a go' even when the outcome may be uncertain.
- The guidelines have a 'project mentality' in that they give the impression that the process starts from nothing rather than acknowledging that managing and learning will no doubt already be occurring and that traditional information sharing mechanisms will exist.
- There are important areas that are not covered in the guidelines that could be included in the revised guidelines. These include: a) issues concerning what is required to start implementing the approach are important for those considering the approach; b) organisational learning, organisational culture and existing power structures and how these might affect implementation and resource users; c) potential conflict, e.g. concerning information that resource users may not want to share with other stakeholders.
- Having the guidelines in a step-by-step format perhaps gives an impression of rigidity to a flexible approach but may be more suitable for certain mentalities.
- Make the title more informative as it is not clear at present what the guidelines are about from the title alone. A possible alternative could be something along

the lines of: Adaptive learning: a practical framework for the implementation of adaptive co-management.

This feedback was used as a starting point for the development of the guidelines in terms of both style and content. As a result of this pre-testing it was decided that the existing guidelines could form the basis for a revised set of guidelines. It was agreed that the revisions would be undertaken by the original authors and that project collaborators and other development practitioners would provide input through the review process. In addition, in order to meet the needs of users in the target region, it was agreed that the revised guidelines would be translated into Khmer, Lao, Vietnamese and Bengali/Bangla by translators working in the STREAM initiative. We are most grateful for their assistance in this.

3.6 Changes made to the existing guidelines (Garaway and Arthur, 2002).

Based on the results of the pre-testing described above, the following revisions were made to the guidelines structure and content (see also the example in Appendix 3):

Structure:

- Format changed from two page spread on a single A4 page to two page spread over two A4 pages. It had been noted that with two pages on a single A4 page the text was too small making it difficult to read.
- Format changed to two columns per page from the previous three. This made the text easier to scan. Trouble was taken to ensure as far as possible that words did not break (hyphenate) across lines so that the guidelines were easier to read for readers with English as a second language.
- The guidelines were split into sections based on the adaptive learning cycle in order to make the guidelines easier to navigate. At each section a summary was included in order to reinforce the key points of the section and a case study was included to illustrate some of the points made.
- In order to ensure that there is sufficient contrast (an important factor if the guidelines are printed in black and white or photocopied), instances of dark text on a dark background and light text on a light background were avoided.
- The number of case studies was increased to provide a more 'real' setting for the guidelines and to illustrate the application of the tools and methodologies.
- The colours used in the guidelines were changed from only blue and orange to full colour but with blue and orange as base colours. It was felt that this would make the guidelines more attractive and make the pictures easier to look at.
- Diagrams were simplified where possible, e.g. the adaptive learning cycle.

Content:

- The title of the guidelines was not considered to be very informative and the title was therefore changed to the previously suggested 'adaptive learning: a practical framework for the implementation of adaptive co-management'.
- It had been felt that the original guidelines did not always effectively explain each stage of the process. The second part of the assessment had also highlighted areas that needed to be improved, such as the diagram illustrating the learning strategy selection process, as well as particular areas, such as the topic of evaluation, and the characteristics of the implementing agency

that needed more emphasis. In order to address this, it was necessary to not only utilize the space afforded but to also increase the length of the guidelines to 44 pages (including covers). This was an important trade-off (see next point).

- Greater attention was given to the resources section of the guidelines. There was a tradeoff to be made as to whether the guidelines should be comprehensive and include all the materials or whether it should merely describe the approach and outline the process. Given the context specific differences between co-management systems, it was decided that the latter approach would be better to avoid being prescriptive and also to make the guidelines more approachable and more likely to be read. At the same time this meant including links to resources that the reader could follow up on for more detail on methods and tools and to useful organizations that might be able to assist with implementation. In order to make this as useful as possible, STREAM have been asked to help with a section on extending research links that would be specific to each language edition. Full contact details for all collaborators (including those involved in R7335) have been provided on the cover of the guidelines.

- It was felt with the existing guidelines that the main feature of adaptive learning, i.e., how we can, together with other stakeholders, experiment with management actions and place 'learning as an objective of doing' was sometimes lost. Readers appeared to see it as a process primarily of learning from doing which, although an element of the approach, was not the main innovation. An attempt has been made to distinguish the types of learning and also provide a summary of why adaptive learning is different from other approaches.

- The section on selecting the learning strategy, a crucial section in the guidelines, was revised in the light of comments received and experiences with applying the selection process in India. It was felt that changing to a clearer flowchart diagram emphasized the process and decision-making nature of this stage.

- Increased use was made of examples from the previous project (R7335) and the field testing in this project to make the guidelines less 'dry' and illustrate to the reader how the tools had been used in a real setting.

3.7 Objectives of testing the revised guidelines.

Having revised the guidelines it was considered important within the development process that the changes made were examined once again by the collaborators and some of those for whom the guidelines were designed to see whether the guidelines better met their needs. The objectives of this testing phase therefore included:

- Assessing the extent to which the revised product that had been developed adequately meets the needs of the target stakeholders and whether there is a need for any additional products to be developed and, if so, what might be required.

- Identifying where modifications need to be made to the content – areas that need to be expanded upon and those that are not deemed to be relevant.

- Identifying further areas associated with the style to be included, modified or excluded.

3.7.1 Meeting the needs of target stakeholders

The target stakeholders had been identified as primarily those people and organisations involved in renewable natural resources management in a development context (see above Annex 1). In particular, the target stakeholder were felt to be mainly organisations that are already involved, or who intend to be involved, in assisting communities to learn about and improve the management of their resources. The guidelines could also be of use to those with an education or training remit who may wish to incorporate parts of the guidelines into teaching and training materials. Other potential users are donor organisations, project managers and policymakers requiring relevant information for setting program agendas and priorities.

3.8 Stakeholder pre-testing

Copies of the guidelines and pre-testing forms (see Appendix 2) were given to nine target stakeholders, including project collaborators, plus two communications resource people. Two of the target stakeholders failed to respond. The results from these completed forms are summarised below in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3 Summary of responses to questions the pre-testing of the existing Adaptive Learning guidelines (brackets indicate number of similar responses).

Question	Responses
Who should read the guidelines?	They should be read by planners (donors, development agencies, GOs and NGOs) to understand use, costs and possible benefits involved, as well as to design programmes that support/include the approach) (x8) and practitioners (who are more on the implementing and coordinating side) (x6). Might expect the reader to have degree level education (x2).
Do you feel that the format of the guidelines is appropriate?	Yes (x6). More or less. Not enough in each section, could be more comprehensive. Too long.
In what additional formats do you think the guidelines should be produced (e.g. website, CD Rom, Video)?	Interactive website for people to share their experiences with the guidelines and the approach. As well as sharing useful tools to be used during training and information sharing (x5). A CD Rom could be more comprehensive and interactive than a printed manual and can contain more of the practical tools you have referred to. A four-page 'Quick Start" (manual type thing). Video sounds interesting. CD ROM better not.
After reading the guidelines, do you understand what adaptive learning is?	Yes (x7) No, text was too dense to be able to absorb and understand it quickly.
Do you know why people should use the adaptive learning approach?	Yes (x9)
After reading the guidelines, do you understand how adaptive learning might be implemented?	Yes (x6) No contrast between print and background makes the frame work diagram difficult to read (x2). I missed the small print at the side the first time around.
Do you feel that the guidelines provide you with sufficient information on the tools and methods that you might use?	Yes (x8). More than enough! Sometimes easy to sort out, but in general it is not easy to see exactly what needs to be done.

Do you feel that the examples and case studies provide good illustrations that support the rest of the text?	Yes (x9). Without the examples I would have had a number of questions.
Who would you contact to find out more about the approach?	MRAG (you and Caroline at University College London), MRC (Wolf Hartmann) and WorldFish Center (especially for concept, planning, design and experiences) and everyone else who is on the contact list for country specific experiences and found or perceived long-term benefits/and uses of the adaptive learning approaches and experiences (x9).
Other comments	

Table 4 Responses to aspects of the guidelines (brackets indicate number of similar responses).

Aspect	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Comments
Overall appearance of the guidelines (e.g. layout, colour, photographs)	5		2	Like the appearance a lot. Lack of consistency in layout, placing of diagrams, captions etc. Line length is short for the kind of text you are presenting. Overall OK.
Use of language – are the guidelines clear and easy to understand?	5	3	2	It differs; some is very easy to understand. And at times the language is far to complex in the sentence structure, to be easily understood. Though you managed to avoid development slang as much as possible. Too densely worded, too many sentences with several subordinate clauses, sentences with double negatives, etc etc. Clear and easy to understand, but too wordy.
Use of colour – too much, too little, etc.	6	2		Poor contrast between print and background colour is the main issue.
Diagrams – are the diagrams clear and do they help you to understand the text?	6	2		Yes, they make it very clear and are a good support for decision-making and planning. Poor contrast between print and background colour is the main issue. Some of the diagrams don't print out clearly (p. 18; p. 19). P. 7: the diagram (which I like) somehow breaks the narrative on the right column.
Photos – are they appropriate to the text?	7	1		Yes, and I like the reference to them, what, who and where by whom - there are so many publications that overlook this. Sometimes, but they are so small that you have to look at some of them very carefully to see what they are about.

				Maybe too many? What is the aim of having photos? To add visual information or to embellish?
Text – font size, type and colour.	6	4		The font size could be larger in the flowcharts. Very nice combination of colours indeed (positive and lively). Main text size is good, headings clear on the whole. In principle OK. But: Black font on dark blue background mainly in diagrams) is difficult to read. Box titles: better white, than orange. Some of the watermarks may be problematic, making reading more difficult, and what is the point of it?

Overall, it was felt that the revised guidelines constituted a useful practical resource and that it was clear who the guidelines were aimed at and how the approach might be implemented within a field setting. Readers seemed to appreciate the case studies. Where we had been less successful has been in the appearance of some of the sections with suggestions on the appearance of the guidelines related to the contrast in colours in diagrams and headings.

There were, as is to be expected, comments on the length of the guidelines that covered the spectrum with some readers felt there should be more detail in each section, some felt that the guidelines could be shorter or a brief developed from it and others, thankfully the majority, felt that the guidelines were an appropriate length. It was decided that the content would not be increased and felt that the content was sufficient for understanding and further detail and assistance on implementation is provided through the resources section as well as the final technical reports for R7335 and R8292 together with the other outputs such as book chapters and peer reviewed papers and other project report (many of which are available on the adaptive learning (www.adaptivelearning.info) and FMSP (www.fmsp.org.uk) websites. The adaptive learning website has also been developed to provide a resource in its own right and 'live' support for practitioners who wish to implement the approach with both adaptive learning resources and outputs from other projects together with links to other sites that may be useful and a forum where they can discuss and share experiences with the approach.

4 Further changes to the guidelines

The results of this second pre-testing phase, together with additional comments received were used to make changes to the guidelines as follows (see Annex 4 for the final guidelines and Appendices 1 and 3 to see how these changes together with the earlier development have contributed to improving the guidelines):

Structure:

- The sections covering the methods and case studies were consistently coloured (method = orange; case study = grey) throughout to make it easier for the reader.
- More use was made of the adaptive learning logo throughout the guidelines. It was felt that this was a useful 'brand identifier'.

- Captions for photographs and other text was moved from the sidebar to under the photo or into the main body of the text so that it wouldn't be missed and was easier to read.
- Some diagrams, e.g. the evaluation process, were re-drawn to increase the contrast and font size and generally make the diagram easier to read. The diagrams on pages 7 and 17 were moved so that they no longer break up the text on these pages.
- A number of the watermarks were removed to make the pages concerned easier to read.
- The headings in the boxes were made easier to read by choosing text colour that increases the contrast with the background colour.

Content:

- Practitioners in the region were asked, through STREAM, for a list of what they considered useful contacts that could help those wishing to implement the approach i.e. useful websites, organisations and references. These were included in the reference section.
- To make the process clearer, the key section on the stages of the adaptive learning process (pages 12 and 13) were rewritten.

5 Conclusions

It is felt that the process of pre-testing and revising the guidelines, together with the additional revisions and content that has been generated by implementing the approach in the case studies has greatly enhanced the presentation and content of the guidelines. It is hoped that the changes made will increase the likelihood of uptake of the approach and the guidelines will provide a much more useful tool for those wishing to implement the approach or use some of the tools.

6 References

Garaway, C.J & Arthur, R.I (2002) Adaptive Learning: Lessons Learned from Southern Lao PDR. Available online at: http://www.fmsp.org.uk

MRAG (2003) Uptake of Adaptive Learning (R8292): Communications Strategy. Project report. MRAG Ltd. Available online at: http://www.adaptivelearning.info

Norrish, P. 2001. PD93: Study of the impact of selected NRSP project communication activities and media products. Report to NRSP.