



Influences and Controls: The National Curriculum in England and Turkey

Hülya Gür

Assist. Prof.Dr., Balıkesir University, Necatibey Faculty of Education, Dep. of Sec.Sci. Edu., Balıkesir

Received: 30.09.2005

Revised: 22.08.2006

Accepted: 14.12.2006

ABSTRACT

This study is organized as follows: the definition of curriculum and the type of curriculum; who are the decision makers and which curriculum decisions made by the decision makers, who should control the curriculum, what are the controlling bodies, their roles and responsibilities, what is the balance between internal and external control are they derived; finally recent trends in the school curriculum in England and in Turkey will be examined to in conclude, what kind of changes have occurred up to now and a forward look at differences in Turkey and England and an examination of who is making the curriculum decisions in these countries. The society that makes intelligent decisions about the curriculum of its schools and colleges first should ask: What is our culture like? What are our primary values?, What principles do we hold?. It will be argued, as a basis for this essay that for their guidelines, our decision makers must look at to cultural anthropology, social psychology and sociology, and to statements about who have formulated expressions of the principles that govern a democratic society.

Key words: National Curriculum, type of curriculum, decision makers, recent trends

INTRODUCTION

Social, cultural (ideas, ideologies, beliefs, and values), and economical factors influence the curriculum and cause it to change that time to time. The purpose of curriculum study is to understand these cultural demands, to solve instructional problems, to change people's ways of behaving, and their perceptions, and improve pupil's experiences. On these points, the curriculum differs from country to country. Study and analysis of our society and culture furnishes guides to the school's objectives, content and learning experiences. These are primary sources of information for making decisions as to what goes into a curriculum. The community has a right and an obligation to participate in defining the school's program. Not only does the citizen have a right to participate in curriculum study, but they have an also duty (this is a Turkish perspective) to do so. Where close cooperation exist between school and community there is better understanding of the school program. When the control of the curriculum is genuinely experimental, not much systematic evaluation would be part of it.

The definition of curriculum is very complex, and annoyingly broad. It is defined in different ways. It depends on writers, educators, politicians, and different ideologies. It is clear that the word has many meanings. This topic also is difficult to define because there is a macro and micro political level of decision making according to each curriculum

definition. If we look at the issue of 'control of the curriculum' this depends on the definition and content of what will be taught in the school, who decides that we teach x instead of y. The important issue here is selection of the content, the organization of the content and the provision of effective teaching and learning experiences. There has been different types curriculum definition in the literature. The following are some definitions of curriculum that have been put forward:

"All the learning which is planned or guided by the school" (Kerr, J. F. 1968). "A program of activities designed so that pupils will attain, as far as possible certain educational ends and objectives" (Hirst P. 1968). (cited: Taylor, P.H. and Johnson, M. 1974)

Kerr defines curriculum as all the learning which is planned and guided by the school, whether it is carried on in groups or individually inside or outside the school (Kerr, 1968: 16). Kerr's definition is called the objectives approach. This definition is problematic, as he did not account of the hidden curriculum in the school. In other words Kerr's definition which relates to planned school experiences is based on stating objectives and then linking these objectives to suitable content. For Kerr, this content is derived out from the educational disciplines. Sociology to suggest what society needs psychology to add the implications for teaching and learning, history to set the content in the context, and philosophy to determine the nature of the beliefs which should govern that learning. This view of the curriculum is apolitical and belongs to a liberal age which probably never existed anyway. (This definition is existing in 1960s and 1970s.) Kerr's definition of the curriculum involved four interrelated components in which; curriculum objectives are defined; knowledge to be taught is decided; learning experiences selected for pupil; this process is evaluated whether it is achieved or not. The teachers main aim within this paradigm is to insure that as many pupil as possible attain the curriculum objectives and then the evaluate the degree to which they are achieved.

In contrast Stenhouse (1975) viewed the curriculum like a cooking recipe, as a process. However, the notion of a process model extends the decision making because, as suggested here, it involves aspects of the hidden curriculum which to a certain extent can be anticipated as general effects even if the precise results are a matter of particular individual pupils in particular schools. Stenhouse suggested a more open definition of a curriculum as 'an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective translation into practice (Stenhouse, 1975, p.4). According to Stenhouse, curriculum is about knowledge and understanding but knowledge from this standpoint is regarded as provisional; the curriculum therefore should be regarded as a proposal to be questioned, tested and improved in the classroom. Kerr and Stenhouse's definitions of curriculum respectively are well known as representing 'objectives' versus 'process' models. Kerr's approach is called a top-down or objectives model. In an objectives approach, experts define the objectives, select content and produce materials. Firstly, all materials are tried in pilot schools after that they improved and send to other schools. Stenhouse's model, in contrast, is called a process model or bottom-up approach such as Dutch model (Galton & Blyth, 1989). Sarason (1990) argues that the **weakness of** the bottom-up approach is that it is very complex and time-consuming. It also argues that there is weakness in the top-down approach. For these reasons Vandenberghe (1988) has pointed out the **strengths of** a mixed approach where both top-down and bottom-up approaches are combined or he calls this mixed approach 'backward mapping' which "emphasizes the importance of including the perspective of local level decision makers in the development of a policy" (1988, p.152). Teacher plays a crucial role in this approach. Like Sarason, Vandenberghe concluded that neither top-down models of curriculum

development (e.g. the English and Welsh curriculum) nor bottom-up models of curriculum developments (e.g. the English LEA model prior to the National Curriculum) could be guaranteed to bring about successful implementation. Both of these models have limitations and fail due to either over prescription or under prescription. Vandenberghe recommended, instead, a combination of both approaches. The successful model of curriculum development implemented in the Netherlands is based on Vandenberghe's ideas, and to some degree, is similar to the model implemented in Australia (Galton, 1995).

Something of the flavor of the approach can be seen in the document supplied by the Netherlands' Ministry of Education and Science to parents, with the title, 'Going to school in the Netherlands'. Under the section 'textbook and teaching', it is explained to parents that: 'The school draws up its own curriculum. The subjects a school is obliged to teacher are laid down by law but the manner chosen and the textbooks used are decided by the school itself.' (Galton, 1995, p.49)

Lawton (1983) offers a third important contribution to the debate. He argues that curriculum is a selection from a culture defined as a way of life of a society. This general definition of curriculum raises a number of issues: First, who should select those aspects or elements of culture for the school curriculum; Second, how should such a selection be made and justified; Third, how should this knowledge be organized; Fourth, how is the culture of a society to be conceived, especially given the contradictory trends in many societies towards cultural pluralism, cultural maintenance and the globalization of culture; Fifth, how should the effects of particular expressions of culture be identified and, then how that selection is made, the values it promotes and how it is mediated by the school become important evaluative questions. Curriculum consists of those experiences which adults value collectively and want to pass on the younger members of the community for whom they have a responsibility. This may be a reason why one of the aims of the curriculum is to transmit cultural values from one generation to another. Often a curriculum is thought of as various components: aims, objectives; content, teaching methods; evaluation, assessment. A definition that will help us to study curriculum in a manageable and coherent way is required, which is consistent and a relatively specific concept of curriculum. With respect to definitions of curriculum selection from culture, developers concentrate on what are planned and anticipated outcomes. They present a view of knowledge in contrast to other definitions.

In summary, we may conceive of three kind of curriculum that; on the paper (official, written national curriculum) that taught by a teacher, and that received by a pupil (also a child learns from other children in the school which is not a part of the curriculum nor of the official real curriculum and the other child learns through its own experience of child teacher relationship). The last two aspects (the teacher and the pupils) are called the hidden curriculum. The term hidden curriculum has been widely adopted in the schools and can mean virtually anything. Galton and Moon (1994) refer to the classroom as a "black box" and argue that it needs to change to a "glass box" in which those parts of the curriculum which are hidden become transparent. This requires all learning contexts to be standardized and uniform. So that the ways in which ideology and school knowledge might be link to each other are made transparent to get rid of the effects of hidden curriculum. Everyday school practices are linked to social, economic and ideological structure. Michael Apple maintains, for example, that "Teachers teach a hidden curriculum that seems uniquely suited to maintain the ideological hegemony of the most powerful classes in this society" (Apple, 1979, p.43). At this point, hidden curriculum plays a central role. If we adapted Lawton's idea to the curriculum, the hidden curriculum might be diminished. The curriculum might be defined using obscure concepts as all activities,

formal or informal, planned or unplanned that create changes in a student behavior which acceptable for society and appropriate for the culture. Then, the definition of curriculum is open to debate. Galton asserts, for example, that there is an urgent need to the study of both the theory and practice of curriculum development within the context of rapid technological advance (Galton in Moyles and Hargraves, 1997, p.79). A national curriculum could be adapted to suit local context, thereby ensuring maximum curriculum interest for students. Thus, national statements and curriculum profiles offer a combination of 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' models of curriculum development, allowing for flexibility, but also for continuity in curriculum across states, systems, schools and grades.

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This section has reflected on the contemporary curriculum change process and demonstrates the ability of different forces to exercise curriculum control. As illustration of the process we will look at the consequences of the introduction of a national curriculum in England. Firstly we ask how can schools in England and Wales meet the demands of this National Curriculum and secondly, who influence and control the National Curriculum?

METHODOLOGY

In this study, the document analysis method that is one of the qualitative data analysis methods, have been used in order to collect the data. The document analysis method often has been used recently in the social sciences. It has been generally used in history, sociology and anthropology. In addition it has been begun to use in education (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 1990: 150). In the study because of there is a determination of the case, a descriptive method has been used. The researcher has implemented the application of the study by reviewing the literature.

a-The National Curriculum in the UK

In England and Wales, the National Curriculum, was established as a result of the 1988 Educational Reform Act, which introduced a curriculum consisting of specific subjects and associated national assessments. This Act was divided into five categories: **Local management of schools, competition (open enrollment), national curriculum, inspection, governing body changes.**

The answer to who controls the curriculum is very complex, however too difficult to find one single response. Prior to the introduction of the National Curriculum with the implementation of the 1988 Educational Reform Act. The curriculum was moved as a secret garden. One beneficial effect of the 1988 Educational Reform Act therefore has to be that governors, teachers, and LEA are aware that the "secret garden" era of education is over. Until decade ago decisions about curriculum in the UK were the result of a compromise between central and local government. Central government produces broad policy initiatives, for example TVEI. These arose either as required outputs of government policy or arose out curriculum development initiatives such as science projects in 70s. But the way in which policy initiatives were implemented was largely left to LEA who in turn in many cases left it to schools. Thus, for example, when Galton et al did school observation studies, there was greater variation between teachers than between schools (Galton 1989). Power gradually evolved out. Partly for that reason it was considered that children were, for example, with Benett et al. (1990), Bassey (1998) showed wide variations in the amounts of the cleared to mathematics in primary schools.

It might be useful to consider the question of who controls the curriculum in relation to before and after the implementation of the 1988 Educational Reform Act.

Before ERA, for example, central initiatives such as TVEI for example were administered by local educational authorities, with a number of checks and balances involving local evaluation. Once the central initiative was announced, LEAs could bid for funding, but with a greater degree of freedom to interpret and implement the initiative in local schools according to local needs, and using the Educational advisory services. After the 1979, according to Helsby and Saunders (1993) TVEI itself was seen as "an explicit attempt by the government to influence the curriculum (p.45). In terms of the implementation of the curriculum policy, TVEI also broke new ground. In the case of TVEI it proved to be an extremely effective mechanism for encouraging participation, coming as it did at a period of cash starvation in the first recession of the Thatcher Government. The task with which developers struggled was to integrate into the curriculum the central messages of TVEI with the emerging form of the 1988 Educational Act. It is interesting to note that this struggle was being enacted at all levels of the service. The trouble was that the pieces came from different jigsaws. The national curriculum was born out of an entirely different culture focusing on a 'back to basics' preoccupation with the traditional curriculum. When the original list of core subjects was published it is not surprising that TVEI activists wondered where they might fit in, having been encouraged for the previous five years to construct integrated curricula, to teach across subjects, to collaborate with colleagues from other disciplines and other institutions and encourage students to explore and investigate problems set (Helsby, 1993) (Table 1.).

Table 1. National Curriculum

	BEFORE	PRESENT
LEA (Local Educational Authority)	After 1979 LEA powers were diminished on the curriculum control over by funds according to local schools needs	Their role as monitoring standards in schools has been taken over by OFSTED. school budget devoted
Governors	Access to the process of education and educational decision making.	Responsible use of money for hiring and firing teachers. (This role taken away from the LEAs). Be able to determine whether a teacher was teaching key stage 1 correctly or not.
Parent	Little control over to choice school or curriculum.	Free to choose school, right to make a selection. Parents have duty to secure a good education for their children. Education Act of 1980 (also 1981, 1986, 1988) has highlighted parents' right to be more closely involvement in decisions relating to their children's education. The Educational Reform Act of 1989 appeared to give parents a voice as 'consumers' of education. However, the imposition of a centrally determined NC drowns out any parental voice.
Inspection	HMI AND LEA. HMI inspected some schools as a check. LEA controlled the funding; checked and controlled the every local need.	The Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) works closely with the department for Education and Employment and is responsible for running a system whereby schools are inspected every 4 years to monitor the quality of education and identify areas where schools can and should improve. This is part of a range of government strategies for improving schools. Centralized curriculum control is the price to be paid for the local management of schools.

Table I. *Continue...*

Development Of Curriculum And Assessment	APU and School Council: One of the hidden aims of the APU was to change the way teachers teach because it was argued that if you change the nature of the tests, then the backwash effect would be beneficial. They spend huge money on what ought to be a relatively low priority. The work of the APU has a serious dangers such as; backwash effects on the curriculum, the disclosure of results and misinterpretation of results, the over emphasis on tests concerned with standards when there is a greater need for tests which will improve teaching and learning. Also some problems occur using the particular model chosen for the APU. However, school council was criticized for two reasons in the 1970s: for being too progressive, for being teacher dominated	Replaced by NCC and SEAC. With statutory requirement to schools to follow to guidelines. Council done by central government
DES	DES has called the eyes and ears of the Secretary of State. It had little formal control over the curriculum. DES often appeared to be responding to external forces when they initiate those forces during the 1970s. Subsequently to these 'committee reports', the strategy of DES has often to set up and fund a body (separate organization) to carry out the proposals.	Replaced by DfEE
Head-Teacher	Prime role was as a curriculum manager. No say on the budget etc. little say on number of pupils and budget.	They have gained financial control of their own budgets. They have become less concerned with the curriculum and more bureaucratic, either because some control of the curriculum is now centrally determined, or because they have given responsibility for particular aspects of curriculum to subject coordinators. Either way they now have less control over the curriculum.

According to Helsby (1993) and Jamison (1993), it was, however, an unequal contest. For many school and colleges TVEI resources were often used as an adjunct or additional fund with which to carry out government policy on the national curriculum. If TVEI resources were used to support national curriculum development, this was fine because that was what TVEI was all about i.e. supporting a national curriculum. The introduction of the national curriculum therefore represents a transition from localized to central control. Governorship from industry, sponsorship, work experience outside education for students and teachers and an enterprise culture, including local competition between schools and colleges, are all 'work related' dimensions of educational life, unencumbered by the uncomfortable and difficult task of building a new curriculum. This was now set to be totally displaced by the national curriculum and its traditional elitist curriculum. Saunders (1986) explores the culture clash between TVEI and the national curriculum, and draws attention to the underlying incompatibility between curricular forms which attempt an explicit connection with work and those which are based on the traditional, largely 'text based' school subjects. It is useful to distinguish between two kinds of control over the curriculum that might be employed to help implementation before and after the National Curriculum. Table 1 show that how some institutions are / were involved before and after the national curriculum.

As seen Table 2, the implementation of the national curriculum was enforced in law through responsibilities placed on head-teachers, governing bodies, and OFSTED. Between 1989 and 1993 progress in its implementation was monitored by HM inspectors, by LEA advisers/ inspectors, by officers of the national curriculum council and by a pitifully small number of research teams. From 1994 onwards the inspection of all primary schools over a four-year period by independent inspectors operated under the auspices of the Office for Standards in Education (OFSTED) and helped to ensure compliance through the publication of inspection reports which commented in some detail on the curriculum followed in specific schools. Schools are now inspected by the national inspectorate to check that they are following instructions issued by the Ministry of Education, and this is school to safeguards the independence of teachers from local authority influences. According to Whitty (1990), it is the DfEE and OFSTED who should be signal out for attention. The inspectorates can be very powerful controllers. Nevertheless, in its prescriptions regarding the curriculum, HMI provided support for the bid by the DES to establish more central control over the education system (Maw, 1988). but have now been, replaced by OFSTED and DfEE (Table 2).

Table 2. *Changing Shifts in Power and Control*

INFLUENCE OF NATIONAL CURRICULUM	CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT	ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION	MONITORING
APU AND SCHOOL COUNCIL	√		
OFSTED	√	√	√
GOVERNORS	(indirectly) √		√
PARENT (influenced on market forces)			√
HEAD TEACHER			(subject co-ordinators) √
TEACHERS (need to pass inspection)	(passively) √	(big control over implementation)	
LEA			very little √
DES	(little) √		
UNIVERSITIES	(indirectly) √		

In the theory, the successful implementation of NC is dependent upon parents having an informed awareness of what happens in the class. Successful implementation also depends on the understanding and cooperation not only of school communities, but of employers and local industry. The replacement of procedures power by **consumer power** (parent, employers, the community) is one of the major planks of the reform act. The consumers have been given the potential to control; however, in practice they may prove unequal to the task, by being either unable or unwilling to control procedures. Parents have right to choose the best schools for child. Parents may arrive at this judgment of the best schools by looking at the regional examinations results in the league tables. In reality, this parent power may be demonstrated in theory rather than in practice. If governors prove unwilling or unable to take over the day to day running of schools from professional teachers it is likely to expose and question the controversial basis on which consumers operate procedures in an arena which is far removed from the economic market place.

For this model to be effective governors need to spend more time in schools and in formal, informal and subgroup meetings of the governing body. It is, however, all the professionals, heads and teachers and ancillary workers, not the lay governors, who spend

all their working days in schools. No governor who is not a teacher, even if they came into school as a voluntary worker, is likely to have the same understanding and knowledge as someone for whom the school is a workplace. Governors are now responsible for hiring and firing teachers, for example, something which did not happen 10 years ago except in private schools. Therefore, in summary it could be argued that certain amounts of control have been taken away from LEAs and distributed both centrally and locally.

It can also be argued that teacher have indirect control because they make the most crucial decisions facing the pupils in the class. However they also seem to free to decide to choose lesson content, teaching methods and strategies but they have to implement national curriculum. Moreover, they are inspected every four years period by the OFSTED. This may be a reason why quality of teaching changes from teacher to teacher. It seems LEA and HMI have been replaced by OFSTED. Another influence on the culture of curriculum is examinations. Examinations have a major influence on the curriculum as they tend to lead the teachers towards certain curricula contents, structures, and styles of teaching. Such power needs to be used with caution as the Secretary of State, at the time of DES, could attempt to replace these bodies of people if they were considered unacceptable. The control of curricula frameworks rested with the government, and a number of independent examining bodies, and research organizations. There are number of organizations which, as well as performing other duties are responsible for the role of complaining and criticizing. These include OFSTED, DfEE, the unions on teachers, governors and so on. These factors tend to conservatism, as any major movement may be opposed, or delayed or compromised because each body may have different perspectives. These various forces on the curriculum and level of curricular decision making are shown in England and in Turkey in fig.1, fig.2, fig.3, fig.4 (e.g. parents -students power to go private....). It seems that the attempt to control of the curriculum gives rise to two questions! First, what is our main expectation of sending each child to school compulsory up to year 11, second what kind of pupil, citizen do we wish to create. All education should be appropriate to the aims of the government, parents, and so on.

b-Comparison of English and Turkish Decision Making

According to Anderson (1965), curriculum improvement is sought by teachers, administrators, scholars, parents and the general public, and all of these groups have a common goal: a better school experience for children. Although they may not agree on what is 'better' they aware that the increase of knowledge alone requires changes in the school curriculum. The degree of changes defines the scope of the curriculum reform. It is necessary to distinguish to five decision making levels in **England** which are responsible for such decisions.

- national: Guidelines by curriculum councils, assessed by OFSTED.(including central government, Parliament, ministers and civil servants, national pressure groups and quasi-government agencies)
- regional (OFSTED): national guidelines co-ordinated and implemented by OFSTED and governors and assessed by regional standards. (local government, including the council and its committees, councilors, officers and advisors,...)
- institutional (school):whole curriculum worked out by the academic board of the school reporting to governors. Head teachers give responsibility to implement curriculum to subject co-ordinators. (schools and colleges, including governing bodies, principles, teachers and students, and pressure groups such as parents, employers and the local community)
- departmental: Syllabus agreed by all teachers in departments. (faculties, departments or

other sub-units which have a functional responsibility for a specific subject or other defined element of curriculum. These include heads of department or faculty, subject co-ordinators, specialist staff, and subject-specific pressure groups)

- **individual** (teacher in the class): Class teacher seem to free to decide on lessons and appropriate methods (according to 10 key stages subjects). Teacher has to apply national curriculum requirements in the class. What the teacher does and what the pupils do in working together in the classroom do control and evaluate goals and activities. The classroom is first spot for all national, state, system wide, and local school curriculum. It is the place where control becomes visible. (Teacher and lecturers in the classroom, laboratories or workshops. Their responsibility to deliver curriculum. They may be subject to pressure from parents and others concerned about the impact on particular students.). English teachers are follow the national curriculum and attainment targets to decide the lesson content and appropriate teaching methods.

The analysis of curriculum control involves both a consideration of levels and an assessment of the relative significance of lay and professional interests at each level.

c-The Latest and Future Position of NC in England

- The assessment arrangements associated with the NC continue to be an area of controversy. The assessment has been changed twice within five years. This change has required teachers to revise both their schemes of work and record-keeping systems. The Standard Assessment Tasks (SATs) has been replaced by national 'paper and pencil' tests at 7, 11, and 14.
- Key Stage 4 and GCSE Examination have also included new reforms. The new criteria for GCSE from 1996 (SCAA, 1995) followed closely the requirements of the 1995 Statutory Order for Key Stages 3 and 4 and define the grades available at each tier.
- OFSTED inspections have focused on differentiation and quality of learning. .
- Teacher assessment procedures have changed. (It is now based on level descriptions for Key Stages1, 2, and 3 from 1995).
- Calculators have been recently in the news with the spotlight on their overuse at the expense of facility in mental and written calculations. OFSTED (1995) findings and SAT results (SCAA, 1995) show that concern about using calculators in Key Stages 2 and 3. The Non-Statutory Guidance (NCC, 1989) covered a discussion of methods of calculating.
- Teachers are key factor in future curriculum.
- The media has also have a powerful role to play, as shown by the extent of coverage of the case of the headmaster Honeyford of Bradford (YTV 1985).
- Educational systems have to take into account new technological tools such as: graphical calculators, microcomputers, Internet so on. How can these tools used to enrich the curriculum (e.g. maths curriculum) Internet has huge amount of knowledge and is easy to reach in everywhere the world. It is therefore a world problem not just a national problem. It is not easy to find whatever on geography but easy to find pollution in web sites. Who controls it? What is role of the NC's in these new circumstances? This is still a big issue.

d-National Curriculum In Turkey

Turkish educational system depends on the Ministry of Education's Law of 1739 and number 222 (Demirel, 1994). Primary and secondary education is compulsory and free of charge in public schools. There are also these schools are under the state control.

There are 180 school days a year and five hours of instruction per day. There is a national curriculum. National programs are prepared by special expert committees appointed by the Ministry of National Education. The committee comprises subject matter experts and teachers from both universities and schools. The draft curricula are reviewed by the Ministry and when approved, textbooks are written and introduced to the schools on an experimental basis to begin with. The textbooks used at all levels are either produced or approved by the ministry. It is thus a 'top-down' model.

It is necessary to distinguish between five decision making levels in **Turkey**:

- **national**: Central government sends guidelines (by Ministry of Education, and Talim Terbiye Baskanlyđy) to all schools in Turkey.
- **regional**: every city has an educational committee. It includes inspectors (from Ministry of Education), and one experienced teacher. They check and control the educational system. In Turkey, inspectors has an another role to appraisal teachers. It is effects on the teacher's career. They take into account a report written by an inspector about teachers and head teacher.
- **institutional (school)**: Schools role to implement curriculum. (It is include teachers, head, students, parents association) Students and parent association are not effective the implement and control the curriculum.
- **departmental**: Subject co-ordinators. (It is including head of departments, subject teachers). These are meeting twice a year to decide to which book they follow and so on. There is not any effect on curriculum control.
- **individual (teacher in the classroom, workshops, and laboratories)**: The class teachers main role is to implement and deliver the curriculum in the class. Turkish teachers differ from English teacher in the way they deliver the curriculum in the class. Unlike English teachers, Turkish teachers are mostly free to decide lesson content and appropriate teaching methods.

e-Main Problems In Turkish Education

Unfortunately, Turkish schools face serious and real problems. Indeed, many of those problems are worse today than they were in earlier years, and many are more serious than in other western countries. It is amazing that Turkish Ministry of Education copes as well as they do, that in the face of myriad barriers they manage to educate so many students, and to such a high standards!

But saying this is one thing, and understanding the real problems faced by Turkish schools is something else. Unless they have better understanding of curriculum development, well intentioned Turkish education will be confused about what their schools can and can not accomplish, and they may embrace ineffective or even tragic nostrums for improving education. But once they have able to design and support curriculum development programs that can truly improve schools. For this reason, we now turn to the real problems that Turkish Education faces such as, society problems, income and wealth inequality, growth and stagnation of the economy, racial, ethnic, religious diversity (not too much), suburbs, ghettos and city centers (the same curriculum has been applied whole country but all these factors are not considered), violence (still has been used by some teachers and pupils), the aging of the population (uncontrollable population growth, not enough school, physical capacity, teacher, ...), money (funds), the restructuring of work (Duman, 1991). Effective reforms must begin by taking these problems seriously.

In Turkey, the curriculum is very broad. Teachers do not have enough time to teach

all curriculum subjects. Turkey needs a new curriculum planning and the opportunity to introduce new teaching methods. Since the compulsory subject is theoretical, learning may not be used in real life (M.E.B., 1991; 1992). Lessons are doing just theoretically, and there is not much application. These cause pupils to loose only in the interest to subject but also in school. Parent and pupils think all information which is taught in school is just needed in school, not in the real life.

Turkey, therefore, needs a stable, up-to-date educational reform and curriculum.

f-Overview On Levels of Control in England and Turkish Curriculum

For primary schools in England, for example, it can be argued that the main levels of control are national, institutional, and individual. The introduction of the National Curriculum following the 1988 Educational Reform Act increased power of the center, particularly in respect of aims, content, evaluation and assessment. On the other hand, central and local government is powerful in Turkey since 1923. Local government has a relatively weak role, except in determining resources through LMS budgets. In Turkey, the institutional level is very significant in interpreting the NC, determining priorities through the School Development Plan and deploying resources to support those priorities. The departmental level is represented by subject co-ordinators whose role tends to be ambiguous, sandwiched between the demands of the head teacher and class teacher. Institutional and departmental level is in contrast to England system. The individual level remains central in relation to pedagogy but teachers are bound to be influenced by the national debate about the right balance between individual, group and whole class teaching (Alexander et al., 1992).

In England, national policies have been strongly influenced by political interest before and since the ERA but professionals remain significant in relation to assessment and evaluation. At the local level, politicians have an important role in determining funding patterns but advisers have a reduced influenced on curriculum practice. Political control is much powerful in Turkey than England in this respect.

Within the school, teachers, to share the same characteristics in Turkey and in England, and remain central to most curriculum decisions because lay governors are generally reluctant to intervene in what they regard as professional matters. The governing body has an oversight of aims, content and resources but usually acts on the basis of advice from the head teacher. While the national curriculum locates substantial powers at the national level, notably in respect of aims and assessments, the delivery of the curriculum remains the responsibility of individual professionals in their classrooms. Both countries to share the same expectations on high-quality teaching and learning, and these depend primarily on the quality and motivation of teachers irrespective of the national framework within which they operate.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to offer a framework for the analysis of 'who decides and influences curriculum content and controls, the distribution of 'curriculum changes', and who has more power to control and influence to the NC in England and in Turkey. How these factors are related to the different kinds of educational and political ideologies is still open to discussion.

Of course the curriculum as practical in schools could be integration or an amalgam of all three curriculum paradigms. These paradigms of curriculum change embody different assumptions about the control of the curriculum, and the educational system. The forces which influence and control the curriculum, in the system are complex and many. Due to the dissipation of power throughout the system the curriculum control

process is one of debate and negotiation. Campbell (1989) argues the control of the curriculum is like that:

On the face of it, there has been an enormous shift in power to define the curriculum, away from a de facto decision making at schools or classroom level to a de jure control at central government level . . . The key question is how far decision making over the curriculum at school and classroom level will effectively be controlled by the state, and how much will really remain de facto in the hands of the professionals- the teachers and head teachers (Campbell (1989), p. 70-71)

The head teachers' new role in this process is that of a curriculum manager over the curriculum. After the Educational Reform Act, Heads found themselves with a new, more demanding role, having difficult staff, governor and parent relationships, and a lot of new responsibilities but with little power and freedom. Another point is that all schools are funded primarily in number of students enrolled. This has brought new problems such as class size, school size problem. Parental choice and market schooling provide two avenues for the displacement of the legitimization crisis in education. The state can distance itself from problems in education by blaming parents for making bad or ill-informed choices and by blaming schools for poor self-management, the misuse of their new autonomy. There is a shift within institutions to dealing with what you can control rather than what you cannot. But massive ideological and social control is exercised in the meantime. In summary, the key points of control here can be shared collaboratively by communities of teachers, heads, students, administrators, parents, OFSTED and others. In practice, most effective control has involved only one or two, and occasionally three, of these groups. Ultimately, power is dissipated throughout the system and this makes curriculum control a complex issue.

The dynamics of curriculum control are complex. There must be control over teacher-learner contact, and this means more training and staff development, and less autonomy for the teachers. Control that is external to the school's control of the curricula frameworks, includes the courses structures, content, assessment procedures, etc. The control that is internal to the school is the teacher-learner contact.

The interpretation of regulations depends on OFSTED inspectors and as a matter of fact this is a critical incident control, not a general control. OFSTED, school governors and NCC, heads, and also teachers are all required to play important parts so that schools conform to the expectation of the Secretary of State. All parties will do well to remember that the circular which contains these unprecedented expressions of national policy comes as part of a sequence of events which began some years before the present government took office, and no future change of Ministry is likely to cause them to be forgotten. In contrast, all this is different within the Turkish System.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, R. J. (1984). **Primary Teaching**. London: Holt, Reinhart And Winston.
- Anderson, V. E. (1965). **Principles And Procedures Of Curriculum Improvement**. New York: The Ronald Press.
- Apple M.(1980). **Curricular Form And The Logic Of Technical Control** In Barton L., Barrow R. (1984). *Giving Teaching Back To Teachers: A Critical Introduction To Curriculum Theory*, Wheatsheaf Books, Sussex, The Althouse Press.
- Apple, M. W. (1979). **Ideology And Curriculum**. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Barton L. & Walker S. (1981). **Schools Teachers & Teaching**. The Falmer Press.
- Bassey M.(1978). **Nine Hundred Primary Teachers**. Slough: NFER.
- Baykul Y. (1995). **İlköğretimde Matematik Öğretimi**. Ankara: Pegem.
- Benett S. N. Et Al. (1980). **Open Plan Schools**. Slough: NFER.
- Benett S. N. Et Al. (1991). A Longitudinal Study Of Primary Teachers' Perceived Competence In And Concerns About, The NC Implementation. *Research Papers In Education, 7,1,53-78*.
- Better Schools, DES 1985.
- Binbasioğlu C. (1995). **Öğretmen Yetiştirme Açısından Türkiye'de Eğitim Bilimleri Tarihi**. M.E.B., Ankara.
- Blenkin G & Kelly, V. (1998). **The Concept Of Developmental Curriculum**; In: Moyles, J & Hargraves L., *The Primary Curriculum: Learning From International Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Bolton E. (1987). **The Control of the Curriculum**. *Occasional Paper*, University Of Durham Publishing.
- Brighouse T. & Moon B.(1990). **Managing The National Curriculum**. Longman.
- Cantor M. & Roberts I. F. (1983). *Further Education Today*. RKP, London, Pp. 232, 38-54, 193-203.
- Carson A. S. (1984). Control Of The Curriculum: A Case For Teachers, *Journal Of Curriculum Studies*,16, 1, 19-28.
- Chitty C. (Eds.) (1991). **Changing The Future: Redprint For Action**. London: Tufnell Press.
- Confrey, J. (1981). Conceptual Change Analysis: Implications For Mathematics And Curriculum, *Curriculum Inquiry*, 243-257.
- Demirel Ö. (1994). **Karşılaştırmalı Eğitim**. Ankara: Usem.
- Department Of Education And Skills (2001). *Framework For Teaching Mathematics: Year 7*. London: Dfee <http://www.standards.dfee.gov.uk/numeracy/>
- Dowling P. & Noss R.(1990). **Mathematics Versus To National Curriculum**, London, The Falmer Press.
- Dowling P. (1998). **The Sociology Of Mathematics Education, London**. The Falmer Press.
- Duman T. (1991). **Türkiye' De Orta Öğretimde Öğretmen Yetiştirme: Tarihi Gelişimi**, İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.
- Erden M. A. (1995). **Eğitimde Program Değerlendirme**, Ankara: Pegem.
- Galton & Patrick H. (Eds.) (1987). *Curriculum Provision In Small Schools: The PRISM Project. Final Report*. University Of Leicester, Mimeo.
- Galton M. & Moon B. (1994). **Handbook Of Teacher Training In Europe: Issues And Trends**. London, David Fulton Publishers.
- Galton M.(1995). In Hargraves, L. & Moyles, J. **The Primary Curriculum**. London: Routledge.
- Galton, M. & Blyth, A., (1989). (Eds.) **Handbook Of Primary Education In Europe**. London: David Fulton Publishers For The Council Of Europe.

- Galton, M. & Hargreaves, L. (1999). **Inside The Primary Classroom: 20 Years On.** London: Routledge.
- Galton, M., Gray J. & Rudduck, J. (1999). The Impact Of School Transitions And Transfers On Pupil Progress And Attainment. London: Dfee. For Précis See: <http://www.dfee.gov.uk/research/query.cfm?cat=5>
- Geffrey H., Keitel C. & Kilpatrick J (1981). **Curriculum Development In Mathematics.** London: Cambridge University Press..
- Good Teachers- Education Observed*, DES May 1985, P.13.
- Grugeon, B.& Artigue, M. (1995). Issues Linked To The Transition Between Didactic Institutions : The Case Of Algebra In The Transition From Vocational High Schools To General High Schools, *PME*.
- Hawson G. (1991). **National Curricula in Mathematics.** The Mathematical Association, Avon, The Bath Press.
- Helsby, G. & Saunders, M (1993). TVEI And The Work Related Curriculum. *Journal Of Evaluation And Research In Education* , 7(2)45-50.
- Jamieson I (1993). TVEI And The Work Related Curriculum. *Journal Of Evaluation And Research In Education* , 7(2)51-64
- Keitel, C. (1987). **What Are The Goals Of Mathematics For All?**, Kerry J Et Al. (1968). *Changing The Curriculum.* London: University Of London Press.
- Kerr J Et Al. (1968). **Changing The Curriculum.** London: University Of London Press.
- Lawton, D. (1973). **Social Change, Educational Theory And Curriculum Planning.** London: Hodder And Stoughton.
- Lawton, D. (1980). **The Politics Of The School Curriculum: Secret, Routledge & Kegan Paul.**
- Lawton, D. (1983). **Curriculum Studies And Educational Planning.** London: Hodder And Stoughton.
- Lawton, D. (1996). **Beyond The National Curriculum.** London: Hodder And Stoughton.
- M.E.B. (1992). **Ortaöğretimde Matematik Dersi Programları.** İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı
- Meighan Walker R. & Walker S. (1980). **Schooling Ideology and Curriculum.**
- Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (1991). **5 + 3 = 8 İlköğretim Matematik Programı.** İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Moyles, J & Hargraves L. (1998). **The Primary Curriculum: Learning From International Perspectives.** London: Routledge.
- Orton A. & Wain G. (1994). **Issues In Teaching Mathematics.** Redwood Book, Trowbridge, Wiltshire.
- Portelli, J. P. (1993). *Journal Of Curriculum Studies*, 24, 4, 343-358.
- Price, M. H. (1986). **The Development Of The Secondary Curriculum.** London: Croom Helm.
- Pring R. (1989). **The New Curriculum.** London: Cassell.
- Richards C. (1977). **Power And The Curriculum: Issues In Curriculum Studies.** Nafferton Books.
- Roberts, P (1989). The Control Of The Further Education Curriculum. *The Vocational Aspects Of Education*, April, 40, 105, 21-26.
- Ryan P. (1998). **Sociological Aspects Of Curriculum**, In: Moyles, J & Hargraves L. The Primary Curriculum: Learning From International Perspectives. London: Routledge.
- Sarason, S. (1990). **The Predictable Failure Of Educational Reform.** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Saunders, M. (1986). **Managing The Enclave: Teachers Outside TVEI.** In C. McCabe (Ed.) TVEI: The Organization Of Early Years. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- Saville, C. (1994) A View From A Metropolitan Discrete, P.223: *In Parental Influence At School*, DES 1984.
- Saylan, N. (1995). **Eğitimde Program Tasarısı**. Balıkesir: İnci Ofset.
- Schagen, S. & Kerr, D. (1999). **Bridging The Gap? The National Curriculum And Progression From Primary To Secondary School**. Slough: NFER.
- School Council Research Studies (1973). **Evaluation In Curriculum Development: 12 Case Studies**. London: Macmillan Education.
- Sosniac, L.A. Et. Al (1991). Teaching Mathematics Without A Coherent Point Of View. *Journal Of Curriculum Studies*, 23, 2,119-131.
- Stenhouse L. (1975). **An Introduction To Curriculum Research And Development**, London, Heinemann.
- Taylor, P. H. & Johnson M.(1974). **Curriculum Development**, NFER.
- Vanderberghe, R. (1988). '**School Improvement: A European Perspective**'. In F. Parkay (Eds.)Improving Schools For The 21st Century: Implications For Research And Development. Gainsville: University Of Florida.
- Wesson, A. J. (1986). Autonomy And The Curriculum: An Exploration Of Three Views, *The Vocational Aspect Of Education*, 38.101, 93-99.
- Whitty, G.(1990). **The New Rights And The National Curriculum: State Control Or Market Forces** In Flude M.& Hammer M. (1990). The Education Reform Act: Its Origins And Implications, The Falmer Press.
- Wojciechowska, A. (1989). Curriculum Reform In Mathematics: Beyond The Impossible Revaluation. *Journal Of Curriculum Studies*, 21, 2, 151-159.
- Yıldırım, A. & Şimşek, H. (2005). **Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri**. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.