

Curriculum Studies Worldwide

Series Editors

William F. Pinar

Department of Curriculum and Pedagogy

University of British Columbia

Vancouver, BC, Canada

Janet L. Miller

Teachers College

New York, NY, USA

This series supports the internationalization of curriculum studies worldwide. At this historical moment, curriculum inquiry occurs within national borders. Like the founders of the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, we do not envision a worldwide field of curriculum studies mirroring the standardization the larger phenomenon of globalization threatens. In establishing this series, our commitment is to provide support for complicated conversation within and across national and regional borders regarding the content, context, and process of education, the organizational and intellectual center of which is the curriculum.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14948>

Sümer Aktan

Curriculum Studies in Turkey

A Historical Perspective

palgrave
macmillan

Sümer Aktan
Bahkesir University
Bahkesir, Turkey

Curriculum Studies Worldwide

ISBN 978-1-137-53537-5

ISBN 978-1-137-53538-2 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-53538-2>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018949624

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature America, Inc. 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover image: © gökay güven/Alamy Stock Photo

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature America, Inc.

The registered company address is: 1 New York Plaza, New York, NY 10004, U.S.A.

*To my dear son, Samim Meriç Aktan,
wishing him to catch the spring of hope...*

PREFACE

On the first page of his book *The Tale of Two Cities*, Charles Dickens describes the age he lived in as “it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair.” I think, this aptly describes the status of the curriculum studies in Turkey. Let me clarify what I mean by this overwhelming sense of curricular “hope and despair.” As I explain in various parts of this book, the conceptual diversification of the curriculum studies in Turkey gained momentum especially in the post-1950 period, which I call “Americanization.” Introduced to the American version of the positivist and scientist paradigm, the Turkish education thought embraced it wholeheartedly, without any hesitation. This was perhaps because the 60s provided the perfect zeitgeist for this. Covering the most hectic days of the cold war, this zeitgeist was characterized by the USA’s retaliation to the Soviet Union’s placing missiles in Cuba by placing new missiles in its Turkish bases, the increasing effect of the USA on Turkey, Adalet Partisi’s (The Justice Party) coming to power in 1965 and launching some major development projects, and finally the commonly held strong belief that Turkey would become a small USA. In such an atmosphere, it just made common sense to adapt the American educational thought and principles to the Turkish context to improve the Turkish education system. The educational scientists with doctoral degrees in curriculum returning from the USA in the early 60s rapidly set up educational sciences departments in the most important universities of Turkey, and a new positivism-based paradigm began to take root in the academia. For the Turkish educational scientists who realized the key role played by the

experimental natural sciences in the American and European development, to be able to fight the ignorance and attain national development, educational sciences had to imitate the natural sciences and a system of educational research had to be established by following the philosophy of natural sciences. In this way, the gap between the West and Turkey was to be closed, just like the *Great Expectations* of Dickens.

However, in the 1910s, Turkey was a country where some profound and heated intellectual debates were held. The sociological and psychological debates about the educational science, which was called “pedagogy” at the time, were accompanied by debates about the political dimension of education, which were all quite interesting and deep. These debates mainly based on the Continental European scholarship drew on the German and French educational thoughts in addition to the British and American educational philosophies and tried to grasp them fully from various perspectives. This rich intellectual legacy was passed on to the post-1923 Republican period, and the debates on the science of pedagogy continued with different foci and perspectives. Dewey’s 1924 visit to Turkey is significant in this context. Nevertheless, despite such a visit by the greatest educator of the time, the education thought did not change, and the Continental European-oriented pedagogical thought maintained its dominance. World War II was an important breaking point for the Turkish curriculum studies. The post-WWII period was the beginning of the Americanization era mentioned above.

In his book *Great Expectations*, Dickens sets out from the dreams of a child living in a small town in England. In the end, he wonderfully describes how the *Great Expectations* were a huge letdown. It seems such an unfortunate coincidence that the *Great Expectations* and the Turkish curriculum studies have the same fate. The American perspective was embraced with great expectations, and the educational sciences, curriculum studies in particular, had a major role to play in the struggle to become a small America. In Turkey, the positivist curriculum development mind-set put the curriculum studies into a technical-scientific track by removing it from an interdisciplinary- and comprehension-based track, and thus initiated a period of confusion and uncertainty. This can be seen in the way the sociohistorical foundations of the educational sciences and curriculum development/educational technology are categorized into different fields. Now, the philosophy and history versus the technical-scientific curriculum development would belong to their own respective disconnected classes. In this process—just like in the USA—an

ahistorical viewpoint has become the prevalent paradigm in the curriculum studies, and the philosophical, historical, or anthropological studies were scorned and ignored. In this new paradigm, the line of thinking based on history and comprehension is viewed as something belonging to the past and trivialized, while studies focusing on the future are revered and encouraged. Scales of attitude, learning styles, holistic learning, cooperative learning, active learning, constructivism, and multiple intelligences now underpin the basic research problems of the curriculum studies. Teacher education is another major research theme. The socio-philosophical or ideological analyses of the curricula are now viewed as the responsibility of the political sciences. Thus, this techno-scientific paradigm is getting so strong that even the technical-scientific progress of the curriculum development as a field is not seen worthy of studying. Therefore, writing the history of the curriculum field in Turkey is a very complex and challenging feat to accomplish. I still do not know how I dared to undertake such a difficult task.

In 2011, when I saw the posting on the Internet that the 1st International Curriculum and Instruction Congress would be held in Anadolu University in Eskişehir, Turkey, I was an elementary school teacher. I knew one of the invited speakers very closely. I learned that one of the authors of the book, which I had rejoiced to find and could not help shout, “I have found it!” in excitement in 2002, was coming to Turkey. Was this a dream? That moment I had been waiting for years had finally come, and I was actually going to meet “the” William F. Pinar, one of the authors of the *Understanding Curriculum*, in person. I already had in mind what to present in the upcoming congress: understanding the reconceptualist movement. One of the most prominent theorists of this movement, which became popular after the early 1970s, was coming to Turkey, but there was nothing in my county about reconceptualism. There was nothing in Turkey about Paul Klohr, Ted Aoki, or Maxine Green. For a Turkish curriculum developer, these were just names. Pinar was just one of these unknowns, but I felt tremendously excited before my journey into the unknown. William F. Pinar and I talked for about an hour in Eskişehir. After this wonderfully horizon-expanding conversation, upon his suggestion, I wrote and published an article about the history of curriculum development in Turkey in the second edition of the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*. Then, when I was suggested to write this book, I accepted it with excitement. This was a dream come true: I would finally be able

to write the adventure of the Turkish curriculum theory from a historical perspective. I have been struggling with this tough writing for a long time now, and finally, I can say it is finished. Or perhaps this is the beginning of a new chapter? This book tracks the evolution of the curriculum theory from three separate paradigms, and the story I tell here ends in 1940s. However, I have tried to analyze the historical progress of civics education until the 2004–2005 school year. The next step will be writing about the evolution of the curriculum field post-1950 period and Americanization. The biographies of the pioneers introducing this field to Turkey can also be written.

In *Oliver Twist*, Charles Dickens tells the life story of a little child named Oliver, which begins in an orphanage and continues with poverty and crime in the streets of London. This life, starting as a period of despair for little Oliver, totally changes as a result of his quest and becomes a period of hope. I believe that the curriculum studies or curriculum theory in Turkey is entering into such a period of hope. I am also aware that this quest for hope is very troublesome and demanding. However, at the end of the day, only the seekers can be the finders.

Balıkesir, Turkey

Sümer Aktan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to the writing of this book. Hadn't been the support of the precious people whose names are written below, this study would not come to life.

First, I would like to thank the editors of these series, William F. Pinar and Janet Miller. I didn't have the chance to meet Professor Miller in person but I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Professor Pinar for his trust in me and my work. I would also like to thank the Palgrave editors I worked with, Sarah Nathan, Mara Berkhof, and Milana Vernikova.

I want to thank one by one to Leo Gough, my dear friend Ayşegül Mester Yılmaz, and my dear colleague Dr. Harun Serpil for their contributions in the translations and proofreading of the book chapters from Turkish to English. Ayşegül not only helped with the proofreading but also made continuous effort on increasing the sophistication of the work with her continuous support and intense deliberation on the content. I am indebted to her for allocating time to me despite her busy work schedule in our department. Besides the translations, Dr. Serpil significantly contributed to the work with his valuable perspective and fruitful suggestions, and Leo with his elaborative feedback on the theoretical framework, for which I cannot thank them enough.

I would like to commemorate with gratitude my dear professor Dr. Osman Kafadar who enormously contributed to my philosophy as a scholar during my college years and perhaps conduced me to progress more on a historical and philosophical line of study. I also thank my dear

friends, Dr. Fahri Sezer, Dr. Yalçın Dilekli and Dr. Mehmet Akif Erdener, who have continuously encouraged and supported me, and Dr. Erdoğan Tezci from whom I learned a lot.

I am grateful to my friend and officemate, Dr. Ersoy Topuzkanamış, who has made the most significant contribution to this work. I am aware that none of the statements presented here are enough to represent his input. Besides reading all the chapters I wrote and guiding with his constructive critiques, he never withheld his precious suggestions for the literary style of the book. He thoroughly presented me his rigor and diligence. I need to thank additionally for the cups of coffee he made during the work process.

I thank my dear student and colleague, Ünal, for his valuable contribution to the organization of the bibliography of the book. I hope you will finish your thesis as soon as possible, dear Ünal.

My wife, Nilgün, who has been supportive of me both morally and intellectually for twelve years, gave feedback on the book tirelessly, and has as much endeavor as me for this book. I am also grateful to my wife's family for their support. Ömer, Hanzade, and Elif: I thank you very much.

My son, Samim Meriç, came into the world in the design process of this book. He motivated me with his ceaseless joy while this book took away most of the time that was to be spent with him. I owe him a big thank-you and apology.

My last but not least gratitude is to my family. First, I thank my mother, Yüksel Aktan, who has always emphasized the importance of literacy and the value of science and never avoided any self-sacrifice for my bringing up. I will forever be indebted to her. I should also thank my brothers, Selim, and Mahir, who showed a continuous interest in the progress of the book.

CONTENTS

1	Islamic Civilization and Its Classical Curriculum Theory: The Philosophy, Institutions and Important Theoreticians of Classical Curriculum Theory	1
	<i>The Foundations of Islamic Classical Curriculum Theory</i>	2
	<i>The Qur'an</i>	2
	<i>Hadith</i>	4
	<i>Social Factors</i>	4
	<i>The Classification of Sciences or "What Knowledge Is of Most Worth?": The Essentials of the Classical Curriculum Theory</i>	6
	<i>Al-Farabi's Classifications</i>	7
	<i>Ibn Sina's Classifications</i>	9
	<i>Ibn Khaldun's Classification</i>	11
	<i>The Institutions of Classical Curriculum Theory: Primary and Higher Education</i>	11
	<i>Primary Education</i>	13
	<i>Higher Education</i>	15
	<i>The Bayt al-Hikmah: The Establishment of an Academy of Sciences</i>	16
	<i>Madrasas</i>	19
	<i>Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning</i>	20
	<i>Teaching Staff</i>	23
	<i>Important Theoreticians of the Classical Curriculum Theory</i>	25
	<i>Teacher and Curriculum: Ibn Sahnun</i>	25
	<i>Values and Character Education: Ibn Miskawayh</i>	27

<i>Teaching and Learning Process: Zernuci</i>	30
<i>Sociology, Pedagogy, and Curriculum: Ibn Khaldun</i>	31
<i>Transcendental Curriculum Theory: Al-Ghazali</i>	33
<i>Conclusion</i>	36
<i>References</i>	40
2 The Classical Curriculum Theory and the Madrasas in the Ottoman Empire	45
<i>The Establishment and Development of Madrasas in the Ottoman Empire: Structure and Tradition</i>	46
<i>The First Period Madrasas: The Establishment Phase</i>	47
<i>The Curriculum of the First Period Madrasas</i>	49
<i>The Religious Sciences</i>	49
<i>The Rational Sciences</i>	50
<i>The Development Phase: After Constantinople</i>	51
<i>The Sahn-ı Seman Madrasas</i>	51
<i>The Curriculum of the Sahn-ı Seman Madrasas</i>	52
<i>The Zenith: Süleyman the Magnificent</i>	54
<i>Classical Curriculum Theory: What Knowledge Is of Most Worth?</i>	56
<i>Nazmu'l-Ulum of Ishak Efendi of Tokat</i>	57
<i>The Tertibu'l-Ulum of Saçaklızade Mehmet Efendi of Maraş</i>	58
<i>The Kaside fi'l-Kütübi'l-Meşhure fi'l-Ulum of Nebi Efendizâde</i>	63
<i>The Curriculum of the Kevakib-i Seb'a</i>	65
<i>The Tertib-i Ulum of İbrahim Hakkı Efendi of Erzurum</i>	66
<i>Administration, Staff, and Students</i>	69
<i>Enderun: The Palace School</i>	72
<i>Conclusion</i>	74
<i>References</i>	78
3 The Modernization of Education in the Ottoman Empire: The First Steps	83
<i>The Military Revolution: The Modernization of Military Thought in Europe</i>	84
<i>Military Reforms Within the Ottoman Empire</i>	86
<i>The Foundation of the Mühendishane-i Bahri-i Hümayun (Imperial Navy Engineers School)</i>	92

Nizam-ı Cedid <i>and</i> Mühendishane-i Berri-i Hümayun (<i>The New Order and the Imperial Army Engineers School</i>)	94
<i>Radical Reforms Era</i>	97
<i>Conclusion</i>	100
<i>References</i>	108
4 Institutionalization, Bureaucratization, and Westernization in Curriculum Theory	113
<i>The First Steps to Bureaucratization</i>	115
<i>A Paradigmatic Change in the Curriculum Theory</i>	118
<i>Teacher Training</i>	119
<i>The Westernization of Pedagogical Thinking: Selim Sabit Efendi and Rehnüma-yı Muallimîn</i>	120
<i>The Lancaster Approach</i>	125
<i>Robert College and the Mekteb-i Sultani at Galatasaray</i>	127
<i>Girls' Education: The First Initiatives and the Female Teacher Training College</i>	129
<i>Overview of the Sultan Abdulhamid II Period</i>	130
<i>The Spread of Education and Its Institutionalization</i>	132
<i>Ideological Dimensions and the Curriculum in Education</i>	135
<i>Pedagogy Science and Books</i>	138
<i>Conclusion</i>	139
<i>References</i>	143
5 Curriculum Theory in the Early Republic Era: Philosophy and Perspectives	147
<i>Declaration of the Constitution and the Intellectual Movement It Spurred</i>	148
<i>The Education Policy of the Constitutional Monarchy</i>	150
<i>Different Philosophies and Pedagogical Movements</i>	155
<i>The New School Movement</i>	160
<i>Educational Legacy of the Second Constitutional Monarchy</i>	161
<i>Education Policies in the Early Republican Period</i>	163
<i>The Report by John Dewey</i>	167
<i>A Teacher Education Movement in the Early Republic Period: Village Institutes</i>	169
<i>Conclusion</i>	173
<i>References</i>	176

6	Reflections on the New Curriculum Theory: Social Studies Curriculum and Civic Education in Turkey (1924–2004): A Case Study	179
	<i>Social Studies Education in the Early Republican Period: The Power of Ideology</i>	180
	<i>1924 Elementary School Curriculum: On the Cusp of Change</i>	181
	<i>1926 Elementary School Curriculum: The Deweyan Perspective</i>	184
	<i>1936 Elementary School Curriculum: The Nationalist Ideological Discourse</i>	192
	<i>1948 Elementary School Curriculum: Social and Political Tendencies</i>	198
	<i>1962 and 1968 Elementary School Curricula: The Quest for a Democratic Citizen</i>	204
	<i>2004 Elementary School Curriculum: Discussions on Economic Development and European Union</i>	211
	<i>Conclusion</i>	217
	<i>References</i>	219
7	Curriculum Theorists in the Early Republic Period of Turkey	223
	<i>Baltacıoğlu and the Social School Theory</i>	224
	<i>Social School as a Curriculum Theory</i>	229
	<i>A Kerschensteinerist Turkish: Halil Fikret Kanad</i>	234
	<i>Practical Pedagogy or Teacher Education</i>	238
	<i>A Practitioner: İsmail Hakkı Tonguç</i>	241
	<i>Education of a Teacher</i>	242
	<i>A Pedagogy of Challenges and Necessities</i>	246
	<i>From Work School to Labor School</i>	249
	<i>Conclusion</i>	254
	<i>References</i>	255
	Conclusion	257
	Index	267

INTRODUCTION

What knowledge is of most worth? asked by Herbert Spencer is probably the first and most substantial question about the curriculum theory. This question can be considered as the bedrock of curriculum theory. Granted, this question had already been asked by people living in different times and locations. However, each society has asked it within its own particular historical context and produced answers to it within its own cultural structure. Each culture has tried to teach in its schools whatever it ended up valuing through its own historical development. In Kliebard's words, the basic question of curriculum history is what types of knowledge societies come to value and view as vital for their survival, as a result of their specific trajectories of evolution. This is the very reason that requires us to see curriculum history as part of the cultural history and situate curriculum studies within the broader field of social theory. As underlined by Pinar (2004), if public education is the education of the public, this inevitably leads us to the process of socially, historically, and intellectually rebuilding the individual and the society. Undoubtedly, the analysis of this process can only be possible through the application of the conceptual/theoretical framework proposed by the historical, philosophical, sociological, and social theory. For me, reaching this conclusion took a very troublesome adventure, which began in 1996.

In 1996, when I began my undergraduate studies in the field of curriculum and instruction, the courses I took in the first semester expanded my horizons. The sociology, philosophy, psychology, and introduction to

economy courses introduced me to a whole new world. When I was a junior, I was introduced to the concept of curriculum development. The buzzwords of task analysis, needs analysis, target behaviors, and instructional design dominated this period, and as an undergraduate student in his third year, I was trying to understand these concepts. However, in my senior year, I began to get more intrigued by some courses than others. To be honest, I was not really interested in needs analyses, systems approach, input, output, feedback, or behavioral targets. The course titled “Teacher Education Curricula in Turkey” that I took in my senior year opened my mind to a totally new way of thinking. Thanks to this course, I learned for the first time about systematically analyzing problems through a historical perspective. Again, it was with the help of this course that I noticed the importance of understanding events and phenomena by situating them within their historical contexts. The instructor of this course, Dr. Osman Kafadar, played a key role in my academic career. The educational sociology course that I had taken previously had already opened my eyes to the significance of social theories, and Proudhon, Marx, and Weber were some of the philosophers whose works I read extensively during that course. Furthermore, the leaders of the Frankfurt School, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse were some of the thinkers I was introduced to during these courses. Still, there was a problem. I could not establish a link between the work of these thinkers and the curriculum theory, worse still, the real nature of the curriculum theory was not an issue talked much about during my undergraduate studies and did not seem to be important for most of my professors. However, historical perspective was naturally leading me to make this association, but I still failed to understand most of it. In my final year, Dr. Kafadar introduced me to the hermeneutic perspective and Wilhelm Dilthey. This was exactly the missing link I was looking for. Historical understanding was to be situated in the center of all phenomena, and the curriculum was to be studied as a historical/cultural phenomenon. Nevertheless, this brought up a new problem. My undergraduate courses mentioned the social theory, but they were inadequate. But I did not have a road map to use for this new historical route. Things like behavioral targets and instructional design, which were parts of an approach to undergraduate education which was essentially based on the Tyler rationale, had turned me into a technician. Upon graduation, I was assigned to teach in a village. After teaching for about three years in the village, I enrolled in a postgraduate (master’s) program. These courses were

basically a more detailed repetition of the Tyler rationale. However, the A-ha moment for me came in 2002. While I was searching for a book in the university library, I stumbled upon a small but profound book, a serendipitous discovery that would mark the beginning of a new academic life for me. This book was *Understanding Curriculum* (Pinar et al. 1995). I had finally found what I had been looking for. I was pleasantly surprised to find out that there were other people thinking like me, and the world of curriculum was not just about the Tyler rationale. *Understanding Curriculum* was the gate to a new world for me. After reading each chapter, I tried to find and read the key references cited. This process led me to the following conclusion: Curriculum in Turkey was not seen as an academic field of study, but rather a technical process. In other words, curriculum was nothing but a set of procedural tasks where only technical processes that required technical knowledge were applied. If you are only interested in performing a technical procedure, what you need to know are not history, philosophy, sociology, or arts, but the knowledge of that technical procedure. However, this technical activity called curriculum development in Turkey focused not on curriculum but on the process of teaching and learning. For example, whereas the Tyler rationale had an important place in this technical view of curriculum, no in-depth academic studies of Tyler had been conducted, and this “Holy Book” of the curriculum field had not been translated into Turkish yet. It was only in 2014 that such a translation appeared in print.

These reflections I had during my master’s study naturally led me to the roots of the curriculum field. Thus, I got into the field which I called “the history of curriculum” but called by others as “history of education” in Turkey. I was facing an ocean of pedagogical knowledge accumulation. This was clear: For a Turkish curriculum development specialist—whether employed at a university or a school—the historical or philosophical problems were not that important. The development of the curriculum field was simply glossed over with very short and simple descriptions. What was known about the progress of the field in the USA consisted only of some very superficial and historical events. For example, Franklin Bobbitt was mentioned in some articles, but his contribution to the curriculum field was not critically discussed by anyone. Ralph W. Tyler was also cited, but nobody really questioned or discussed why he was important or exactly what kind of contribution he had made to the field. Hollis Caswell, Doak Campell, W. W. Charters, and Harold Rugg were also among the educators unheard by most Turkish people

in the field. Not only such international developments, but the historical development of the curriculum field in Turkey was not deeply studied, and there was not much said about the great pioneers who had worked very hard to establish curriculum studies as a field in Turkey. My readings and analyses gradually shaped my perspective in a certain way. I had the great honor of meeting William F. Pinar in person during the 2011 International Curriculum and Instruction Congress held in Eskisehir. I finally had the opportunity to have a face-to-face talk with him, whom I had known since 2002 only through his books. In 2014, my work analyzing the curriculum studies in Turkey through a historical perspective was published as a chapter in the *International Handbook of Curriculum Research*. I can say that this chapter formed the basis for this book you are holding in your hands now.

The question of how to go about writing the status of curriculum studies in Turkey kept me busy for a long time. What was the best way forward, and what kind of conceptual framework could I propose? If I discussed the development of the field only in the post-1950 era, I would fall into the trap of presentism. It could be taken as if nothing had existed before 1950, and I had to avoid such presentism. Therefore, instead of taking a certain date as the starting point, I decided to analyze the development of the curriculum field around three basic concepts. My basic problem was figuring out how curriculum theory had evolved throughout the historical continuity. I had three key concepts to do this: religion, science, and ideology. These three concepts led the development of the curriculum theory in its historical continuity in various ways. I would like to explain why I use religion, science, and ideology here as a trifocal lens. At the heart of what I call as “the classical” curriculum theory, which forms the philosophical basis for the courses taught in the madrasa curriculum in Turkey, lies the religion of Islam. Islam is the core element of the madrasa curriculum and the mortar that is used in shaping its curricular structure. Islam has influenced not only the theory of classical curriculum, but also the curricula of high schools and university theology departments that were opened after the declaration of the new Turkish Republic. This influence has manifested itself not only in the schools of religious education but also in the curriculum of other mainstream schools. Science, on the other hand, is the second force with a major impact on the curriculum theory, especially in the post-1699 period and more prominently in the schools opened in the 1770s. The establishment of schools providing education based on modern

science and technology as well as schools providing religious and the strengthening of positivist philosophy in the Ottoman lands was also reflected in the school curriculum and deeply influenced intellectuals' viewpoints. Science continued to be a dominant force in the post-1923 period following the proclamation of the republic, but this time around it was accompanied by ideology. Ideology has been a powerful force in both the early republic period and the later periods vis-a-vis political socialization or building citizenship. In the period of modern Republic of Turkey, ideology, and science combined forces in shaping the curriculum theory. I believe that these three concepts are the main driving forces behind the Turkish curriculum theory in historical continuity, and without considering their profound impact, it would be impossible to gain a good understanding of the structural dimension of the Turkish curriculum theory.

Part I of this book [Chapters 1 and 2] analyzes the development of the classical curriculum theory in terms of religion. The first two chapters of Part I view the religion-based developmental process of the classical curriculum theory from a historical lens. Undergirding the classical curriculum thought are the Qur'an and Hadiths (sayings of the Prophet Mohammad) as the primary references of Islam. The first part thus tackles the developmental trajectory of the curriculum theory by situating it within the context of Islamic science and culture development. Motivated by the first order (Read!) of Qur'an, and the words by the prophet encouraging learning, Islam quickly spread a wide geographical area and made great progress in philosophy, mathematics, medicine, physics, and other fundamental sciences. While Baghdad became the world's most important hub of science, in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Andalusia located in the southernmost Europe, scientific thinking developed rapidly. In such a place where science and philosophy were making progress, education was advancing as well, and various curriculum philosophers attempted to provide answers to the question of "What knowledge is most worth?" Grounded in this historical background, the second chapter focuses on the curriculum and instruction works carried out subsequent to the foundation of the Ottoman Empire. This chapter aims to determine how the classical curriculum theory that originated and developed in the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Andalusia was reflected in Eurasia (Anatolia). In the Ottoman territory, the basis of classical curriculum theory is also the madrasah. Therefore, this second chapter focuses on the curriculum taught in the Ottoman madrasahs.

The lessons and curricula taught in the Ottoman madrasahs are similar to those of the Seljuk's in terms of their basic contents and characteristics. Nevertheless, the answers provided by the scholars who prepared the curricula to the question of "What knowledge is most worth?" include some critical information enabling a deep grasp of the education delivered in the madrasahs. An analysis of these curricula clearly shows that the history of curriculum in Turkey dates back to the fifteenth century.

Part II of this book [Chapters 3 and 4] examines a scientific understanding of education that is partially liberated from the influence of religion by the scientific paradigm. The conceptual framework of this chapter is the idea of a military revolution. The geographical borders of the Ottoman Empire expanded over a huge area by 1580. The Ottoman Empire, which was one of the most powerful forces in the world by its military might and administrative system, was too late to apply the innovations developed in Europe in the field of infantry, artillery, and military, which appeared toward the end of the 1600s and called the military revolution, and despite its adoption of some military innovations, it failed to make them permanent and suffered huge territorial losses after some significant military defeats. These land losses and defeats led the Ottoman statesmen to take precautions and some reforms were launched to renovate both the army and navy forces. The focus of such reforms was the innovation of the education. These training studies, which were initially shaped by Western experts and organized as simple courses in land and naval forces, later became more institutionalized and some modern science and engineering schools were opened. These schools gained an even further institutional character over time. In the post-1826 period, the number of new European-style educational institutions rapidly increased. Nevertheless, religion still retained its power; the religious education continued to influence the modern schools while the madrasahs still continued to teach. When the curriculum of schools opened in this period is examined, it is seen that the religious courses are taught along with the modern Western courses. This period is when the education bureaucracy started to form. Particularly in the fourth chapter, the place of curriculum studies in the education bureaucracy is examined. When considered in the modern sense, post-1876 period is the beginning of the development process of curriculum studies in Turkey. Curriculum was used as an ideological instrument in the hands of the state during this period. For the unity of the state, and especially in order to ensure the solidarity of the Muslim elements, special attention was

given to religious lessons in the modern Western-style schools and even in the elementary schools. In other words, the Ottoman bureaucracy used religion as an effective ideological tool.

Part III of this book [Chapters 5, 6 and 7] analyzes the theory of curriculum in terms of ideology. This part focuses on the curriculum debates of the Second Constitution period, which formed the basis of the later education thought in the early Republican period. The educational debates of the Second Constitution period led to a very rich accumulation of intellectual wealth and depth. This period was a period in which freedom and different philosophies competed with each other, especially following the policy of censorship by Sultan Abdulhamid II. Allowing some progressivist curriculum tendencies to appear, the Second Constitution was also a period of fertile intellectual ground. This progressivism was also reflected in the curriculum of the period. This rich accumulation was the basis of the Republican educational thought. The Republican government, which had Westernization as the primary goal, used the intellectual heritage of Westernization of the Second Constitution very rationally. This was a time when Eurocentric pedagogical theories and approaches were more intensively discussed. It can be said that especially the German pedagogy was quite dominant in this period.

As I said before, while 1923 is usually given as the beginning of the curriculum field in Turkey, it needs to be underlined here that the curriculum theory dates back to a much earlier period than that. The in-depth analysis of the developmental trajectory and Americanization process of the Turkish curriculum field from 1950 to the present can be the focus for another book. In Turkey, where the positivist methodology is still dominant, and studies on the learning, attitude, and teaching processes are encouraged, can this book serve as a starting point for a self-critique of curriculum studies and reconceptualization, so that the field can redefine itself? It is very hard to answer. The problem for the curriculum theory expressed by Pinar (2004, p. 2) “*Curriculum theory is a distinctive field of study, with a unique history, a complex present, an uncertain future*” seems valid for Turkey as well. With its own history, the curriculum theory in Turkey is a complicated field with a vague future. The certain zeitgeist of the future will determine the exact fate of the Turkish curriculum.

REFERENCE

Pinar, W.F. (2004). *What is curriculum theory*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.