

TEACHER VIEWS ON SCHOOL-BASED CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT APPROACH (AN ANALYSIS OF APPLICABILITY IN TURKEY)

Erdal BAY

Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, erdalbay@hotmail.com

Ömer Faruk VURAL

Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, ofarukvurak@yahoo.com

Recep KAHRAMANOĞLU

Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Nizip Eğitim Fakültesi, recepkahramanoglu@gmail.com

Zeynep AYDIN AŞK

MEB, Sezai Karakoç Ortaokulu, Bursa, zeynepardam@hotmail.com

Abstract

The objective of the present study is to analyze teacher views on school-based curriculum development approach (SBCD), which are not completely implemented in Turkey. Thus, the views of teachers on the development of curricula based on schools, pros and cons of school-based curriculum development approach and the details of school-based curriculum development process were investigated. In this study the mixed method (both qualitative and quantitative methods) was utilized and the sample of the quantitative research included 370 teacher who teach at schools, which are classified as low, intermediate and high based on achievement, in Gaziantep central townships, and the study group in qualitative research included four masters and one doctorate students concentrated in the field of education programs and instruction. Parallel to the objectives of the present study, "School-based Curriculum Approach Scale" was used as the data collection tool, and authors have conducted reliability and validity studies for the above mentioned scale. Findings of the study demonstrated that teachers predominantly agreed with the premise that school curricula should be developed on the school level.

Keywords: School-based curriculum development, curriculum development, teacher, mixed method.

OKUL TEMELLİ PROGRAM GELİŞTİRME YAKLAŞIMINA İLİŞKİN ÖĞRETMEN GÖRÜŞLERİ (TÜRKİYE'DE UYGULANABİLİRLİK ÜZERİNE BİR İNCELEME)

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Türkiye'de tam olarak uygulanmayan okul temelli program geliştirme (OTPG) yaklaşımına ilişkin öğretmen görüşlerini analiz etmektir. Bu bağlamda öğretmenlerin, programların okul temelli geliştirilmesine, okul temelli program yaklaşımının

olumlu ve olumsuz yönlerine ve okul temelli program geliştirme sürecinin nasıl olması gerektiğine ilişkin görüşleri araştırılmıştır. Karma yöntemin (nicel ve nitel araştırma yöntemi beraber) kullanıldığı bu araştırmanın nicel araştırma yönteminin örneklemini Gaziantep merkez ilçelerinde alt, orta ve üst olarak sınıflandırılan okullarda görev yapmakta olan 370 öğretmen; nitel araştırma yöntemi çalışma grubunu ise eğitim programları ve öğretim alanında dört yüksek lisans ve bir doktora öğrencisi oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın amaçlarına uygun olarak araştırmacılar tarafından güvenilirlik ve geçerlilik çalışması yapılan "Okul temelli program yaklaşım ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Dört boyutlu ölçme aracı 32 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Araştırma bulgularına göre, öğretmenlerin okul programlarının okul temelli geliştirilmesi gerektiği görüşüne yüksek düzeyde katıldıkları belirlenmiştir. Öğretmenler, ulusal düzeyde belirlenen standartlara bağlı kalmak koşuluyla, programların okul çevresine, idareci ve öğretmenlerin beklentilerine göre okullar ve buradaki yetkililer tarafından geliştirilmesi gerektiğini düşünmektedirler. Öğretmenler, OTPG'nin okulun insan kaynaklarının tam olarak kullanılmasını sağlaması, öğretmen motivasyonunu artırması, öğrenci, veli, okul, çevre şartları dikkate alınarak hazırlandığı için daha etkili olması vb açılardan yüksek düzeyde olumlu olduğu görüşüne sahip oldukları görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Okul Temelli Program Geliştirme, Program Geliştirme, Öğretmen, Karma Yöntem

Introduction

The significant place of information and technology in life makes it necessary for us to follow changes and developments in this area closely. All groups in a society are affected by this situation and educational systems, which are centered at the individual, are no exception. To reach the objectives of an education system that aims to train individuals with qualities that the society needs, the curricula utilized in our schools need to be continuously developed and changed parallel to the demands of the society and the changes in the world and in our nation (Yüksel, 1998; Özer and Kahramanoğlu, 2012). Because, the content and validity of the courses included in curricula change along with new educational ideas and technological changes. This situation necessitates development.

In Turkey, educational curricula were developed by the head council of education and ethics in the Ministry of National Education (MEB). Suitability of the developed curricula are supervised and approved by the Head Council of Education and Morality for implementation (MEB, 2011). The curricula developed within that structure is limited to the particular school. The characteristics of the school precinct are ignored and thus, problems arise in applicability of these curricula (Yüksel, 1998). Because, one of the significant problems of programs developed with a centrist perspective is their inability to provide for the regional expectations and demands.

For implemented curricula to meet educational demands of the particular school precinct, they need to be prepared in accordance with the interests, needs

and expectations of the society. While targeting the training of individuals based on the needs and demands of the country during the development of educational curricula, needs and demands of the society should not be ignored. Thus, the curricula, prepared with respect to national and local level principles, should be developed based on the requirements of the school region to meet the needs of the society entirely. In a study conducted by Tutkun and Aksoyalp (2010) on development of curricula in the 21st Century, it was determined that newly developed programs should prioritize cultural diversity, and the concepts of benefiting from democratic rights, protecting national security, learning to live together should be emphasized in the programs and the curricula should be prepared by a broad social participation instead of a centrist approach. To develop such an educational program, it should be developed and implemented at the school level (Yüksel,1998). This is defined as School-based Curriculum Development (SBCD) in the literature.

School-Based Curriculum Development Approach

Various different definitions were associated with school-based curriculum development in literature. In the narrow sense, it means reorganization of the existing and active curriculum by school principle and/or the school board decisions, while in the broad sense, it is interpreted as a decision making process that includes planning, implementation and assessment activities to improve the effective curriculum with the participation of the principle, teachers, students, parents and representatives of the society (Sabar, 1991). Brady (1992) argued that SBCD should not be limited with the school, those who should work within the SBCD process should not be only the individuals related to that particular school, but should include individuals and institutions within the community (such as parent, non-governmental organizations, local administrators, industrialists, society leasers, etc.). Bezzina (1991) defined SBCD as the process where the all or certain members of the community that includes the school plan, implement and assesse the curriculum that the school considers to uses and states the cooperation between school personnel as the definitive feature of SBCD. SBCD is a collaborative effort and should be developed by the participation of teachers and administrators alike and should include community stakeholders. Yüksel (1998) defined SBCD as planning, preparing, implementing and evaluating curricula towards the development of educational programs that would be implemented at schools, which conform to previously set national and regional principles without the intervention of external elements.

SBCD does not only entail creating a new program (Brady, 1992; Marsh, Day, Hannay and McCutcheon, 1990). For instance, Bezzina (1991) states that SBCD should contain at least three types of activities:

- Developing a new curriculum,

- Adaptation of the existing curriculum,
- Adaptation of an unmodified existing curriculum.

Generally, SBCD could be defined as the process of curriculum design that could provide an effective education-instruction service for the school and its environment by adhering to national objectives and targets. Active participation of school stakeholders and the precinct should be ensured and a close cooperation between the stakeholders should be established. Thus, this process could not succeed only by the individual efforts of school administrators or teachers. However, usually it is managed by a board where mostly administrators and teachers are members. School administrators, teachers, students and members from the school precinct play a part in this process and form the decision making power. In this decision making process, administrators should bear in mind the national objectives and targets in education and the characteristics of the school precinct. Thus, development of curricula that conforms to national principles and standards, while being suitable for the school circumstances at a local level would be only possible with the active participation of the school community (student, teacher, administrator, parent, society) in the curriculum development process. To promote the active participation of the school community in that curriculum development process, it is required to focus on interests, needs and expectations of the stakeholders and consider these factors in the process. Furthermore, Yüksel (1998) stated that the heaviest load is on the implementers of the developed curriculum, namely the teachers, and therefore they should participate in the process actively and provide support.

Significance of the study

Significant differences between the regions in Turkey result in problems in implementing the curricula designed and developed with a centrist approach and these problems prevent the curricula to reach their expected objectives. The fundamental problem in countries with a centralized education system is unsuitability of implemented curricula to regional conditions. This results in failure to meet the regional interests, needs and expectations, as well as those of the students and parents (Yüksel, 1998).

It is difficult for curricula designed at a central location to meet the needs of the whole society. Several national curricula are attempted to be developed based on different educational environments, student structure, teacher efficiency and educational applications that more than one field require. That ends up being inadequate for the unique educational environment, student structure and teacher efficiency of each school. School-based curricula should be developed for the designed curriculum to be suitable for the school structure. More productive

utilization of existing resources in the school would be possible through the development of school-based curricula (Seferoglu, 2004).

Albeit national curricula developed at a center could be good, teachers, who are in the classroom, know and identify the knowledge, skills, attitudes and behavior of the students the best. Thus, teachers determine the best learning experiences for the students. By including the teachers in curriculum development process, learning experiences of students could successfully be improved in parallel to their interests, needs and abilities. Furthermore, since teachers are aware of the problems induced by the curriculum during applications, they could assist program developers in removal of these problems (Yüksel, 1998).

While developed curricula aims to train individuals based on the nation's requirements and demands, they could not ignore the needs, demands and expectations of the society, the school, the region, etc. To resolve this problem, while developing national level policies, strategies, principles and general objectives, in regional level, other elements suitable for the regional conditions should be added to the curricula (cultural, economic, geographical conditions of the region, its sociological structure, etc.). Within the framework of the established principles, it would be healthier to shape the official curriculum at the school level and also would improve the applicability of the same. Besides, another reason for implementing SBCD would be its capability to provide more appropriate and sensitive learning strategies for special needs and fields of interest of the school and the students (Bolstod, 2004, p.8). Thus, it was considered that the present study would provide serious contribution to the literature in resolving the problems of applicability of the curricula in our education system and in providing a qualified and productive application of SBCD approach. Furthermore, it could also be considered as an alternative application to our existing curriculum development process.

Objective of the study

The objective of the present study is to determine the views of teachers on SBCD approach. In that context, the following research questions were posed:

1. What are the views of teachers on school-based development of the curricula?
2. What are the views of teachers on positive aspects of SBCD approach?
3. What are the views of teachers on negative aspects of SBCD approach?
4. What are the views of teachers on the details of SBCD process?

Method

Research Model

Mixed methodology was used in the present study that aimed to identify the existing views of teachers on SBCD approach, which is yet to be implemented in Turkey. Descriptive research survey model, one of the quantitative research methods and qualitative research methods of interview and descriptive analysis methods were utilized in the present study. Within the framework of mixed methodology, initially the quantitative research was conducted, and then interview questionnaire was designed based on the results of the former, leading to the qualitative research portion of this study. Thus, quantitative findings were enhanced and detailed with the qualitative approach (Creswell, 2013).

Population and the sample

Research population included all primary schools and middle schools in Gaziantep central townships in Turkey. Maximum variation sampling method was utilized for that purpose. Maximum variation sampling method is defined as conducting studies based on the determination of different situations with similarities related to the scrutinized problem in the universe (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2014, p.90). Variations used in the present study were the different achievement levels in the schools. These levels are determined using Gaziantep Directorate of National Education data. Eleven schools, determined to be at low, intermediary and high achievement intervals in Gaziantep central townships, were included in the sample. Primary and middle schools denominated as U1, U2, and U3 were high-level achievement schools, O1 and O2 were intermediary-level and A1 and A2 were low-level achievement schools. An attempt was made to reach all teachers working at these schools. As a result, the study was conducted with 370 teachers working at these schools. Distribution of participating teachers in district schools are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of Teachers Included in the Sample in Schools

Achievement Level	School Name	n	f
High-level	U1 Primary School	28	% 7.56
	U2 Middle School	41	% 11.09
	U3 Middle School	32	% 8.64
Total		101	% 27,29
Intermediate-level	O1 Primary School	42	% 11.35
	O1 Middle School	25	% 6.75
	O2 Primary School	52	% 14.06
	O2 Middle School	49	% 13.24
Total		168	% 45,40
Low-level	A1 Primary School	27	% 7.29

	A1 Middle School	30	% 8.10
	A2 Primary School	21	% 5.70
	A2 Middle School	23	% 6.22
Total		101	% 27,31
Grand Total		370	% 100

Five teachers from Gaziantep province, who had at least five years teaching experience and continue their master's studies in Education Programs and Instruction (EPI) field, were interviewed. One of the interviewees was working at a private high school (coded Private1) and continuing graduate studies in the field of EPI. Remaining four teachers were working at state schools as classroom teachers and attending graduate studies in the EPI field (coded Teacher1, Teacher2, Teacher3 and Teacher4). State school teachers were graduated from undergraduate classroom teaching departments and were working at state schools as classroom teachers during the time the present study was conducted.

Data Collection Tool

"School-based curriculum development approach scale," developed by the authors was used in accordance with the objectives of the study. An item pool was initially created during scale development process based on the SBCD literature review. Draft scale that included 46 items was assessed by the authors for language and content validity and transformed into a 32 item scale. Expert opinion on the 32-item scale was obtained from 3 specialists in the field of EPI and 1 expert in Turkish Education for clarity, comprehensibility and content, and required editing was conducted. The 5-point Likert-type scale was scored between "I completely agree" (5) and "I completely disagree" (1). Initial sampling was then conducted using the draft form.

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted for structural validity. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was identified as .894 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity value was 5373.845 ($p = 0,00$; d.f. = 496). These findings demonstrated that the data set was fit for factor analysis. It was also observed that anti-image values of the scale items varied between 0.565 and 0.960, which showed that the items were fit for analysis.

After it was determined that the data were fit for factor analysis, 32 items were assessed for maximum factor count using acyclic method and it was identified that the items were grouped under 8 factors. However, since the scale was designed in four dimensions, direct oblimin rotation was limited with 4 factors using principle components technique. The reason for using oblimin rotation was due to existence of relationships between the sub-dimensions of the scale (Tabachnick and Fidell, 1996). As a result, a 4-factor structure that explained 53.392% of the total variance was obtained. The first dimension was SBCD

requirements, the second was the positive aspects of SBCD, the third dimension was the negative aspects of SBCD, and finally the fourth dimension was the SBCD process. Twenty-eight items in the scale were positive expressions, while 4 were negatives.

Table 2: Measurement Tool Data and Sample Items

Factor	# of items	Factor Loads	Item Variance s	Reliability Coefficient		Sample item
				Cronbach h-Alpha	Split half	
SBCD Requirements	7	,412 - ,773	% 30.30	.779	.677	It should be developed according to environmental conditions.
Positive aspects of SBCD	14	,456 - ,853	% 8.56	.889	.837	It is more successful than uniform curriculum applied nationwide.
Negative aspects of SBCD	4	,533 - ,796	% 8.06	.715	.731	It could cause in the increase of differences between schools.
SBCD Process	7	,472 - ,792	% 6.45	.584	.463	A curriculum development expert must be hired in each school.
Total	32	,412 - ,853	% 53.39	.854	.666	

Table 2 demonstrates that there are 7 items in the first-dimension of the measurement tool, 14 items in the second dimension and 4 items in the third dimension and 7 items in the fourth dimension. It was observed that the item factor loads varied between 0.412 and 0.853. Dimensions explained 53.392% of the total variance. Item Cronbach alpha and split-half reliability coefficients demonstrated that the measurement tool was valid and reliable. As a result, after determination of the validity and reliability of the measurement tool, the actual sampling was conducted to determine the views of the teachers on SBCD approach.

Interview questions were designed based on the four dimensions obtained in the scale development process and finalized by obtaining expert opinion. Interview questions to be used in the qualitative research were finalized as below:

1. Who should be the SBCD stakeholders? (Who should participate in the curriculum development process?)
2. What is your general opinion about SBCD?
3. What is your opinion on the positive aspects of SBCD approach?

4. What is your opinion on the negative aspects of SBCD approach?
5. In your opinion, how should the SBCD process should be conducted?

Data Analysis

Collected data were analyzed with SPSS 20.0 software package. Mean and standard variation values were calculated. Mean values of 1 – 1.80 were considered as very low, 1.81 – 2.60 were considered as low, 2.61 – 3.40 were considered as intermediate, 3.41 – 4.20 as high and finally mean values of 4.21 – 5.00 were considered as very high. Negative items were reverse-scored.

Table 3: Values Considered in the Interpretation of Mean Values

Score interval	Grading	Interpretation
1,00 – 1,80	I completely disagree	Very Low
1,81 – 2,60	↓	Low
2,61 – 3,40	↓	Intermediate
3,41 – 4,20	↓	High
4,21 – 5,00	I completely agree	Very High

Qualitative research data was analyzed by descriptive analysis method. Descriptive analysis technique is based on the interpretation of data collected via the interview method based on predetermined themes (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011, p.224). In the present study, data collected with interview method were interpreted by descriptive analysis using the dimensions obtained in the quantitative research and enriched findings are presented to the reader.

To obtain internal validity (plausibility), participant confirmation was obtained. Following the interviews, interview transcripts were communicated to the interviewees and only used in reporting following their approval. Data diversity was obtained by using qualitative and quantitative data in conjunction. Eternal validity (generalization) was established with purposive sampling and detailed conveyance. To obtain reliability (research consistency and conformability [Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2003]), one other researcher that is an expert in the field and experienced in qualitative studies was included in the process and that specialist contributed to the reporting in the study.

Findings

Findings obtained in line with the sub-objectives of the study are presented in this section.

Findings Related to the First Sub-Problem

It was the aim of the study to initially determine the views of teachers about the school-based development of the curricula. Obtained findings are given in Table 4.

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation Values on Teacher Views About the Requirements of SBCD

Item No	Scale Items	\bar{X}	sd	Interpretation
	The curricula,			
1.	Should be developed in accordance with environmental conditions.	4,72	0,69	Very high
3.	Should be developed consistent with the interests and needs of the school district.	4,54	0,79	Very high
2.	Should be developed consistent with the expectations of administrators and teachers.	3,95	1,35	High
7.	Should be developed by the schools in conformity with the standards set at national level.	3,81	1,14	High
4.	Should be developed within the responsibility and authority of the schools.	3,71	1,23	High
6.	Should be developed by administrators and teachers.	3,46	1,27	High
5.	Should be developed by schools.	3,31	1,29	Intermediate
Total		3,93		High

Table 4 demonstrates that teachers generally highly agreed with the items on the dimension of SBCD requirements. It was found that the teachers very highly shared the views that curricula should be developed in accordance with the environmental conditions ($\bar{X}=4,72$) and the interests and needs of the particular school district ($\bar{X}=4,54$). Furthermore, the teachers highly agreed with the premises that the curricula should be developed parallel to the expectations of administrators and teachers ($\bar{X}=3,95$) and by the schools based on the standards predetermined at the national level ($\bar{X}=3,81$). In addition, teachers agreed with the expression that the curricula should be developed by the schools ($\bar{X}=3,31$) at an intermediate level.

In the interviews, the teachers expressed their detailed views on SBCD process and the teacher coded as Private1 considered that each school should be allowed to develop its own curriculum. Private1 said "If we take the district into an account, if each schools would have a unique curriculum, it has to take other schools in the district into consideration as well. In fact, they could cooperate on arriving at a consensus. Four-five schools could come together to develop a common curriculum. It could be a problem when there is one school, but when the

support of other schools is obtained, at least a common curriculum could be developed.” State school teachers, on the other hand, suggested that the curricula should be developed province or region-based and the needs of the region should be prioritized. Teacher4 said “In my opinion, it makes more sense to develop school-based curricula, since parent profiles could change within the district, it could demonstrate different characteristics from one neighborhood to the other. This is a good reason for school-based development.” According to Teacher4, a common curriculum could be developed for schools with similar socio-economic profile, but different curricula are needed for schools with different socio-economic levels. Teacher4 elaborated: “One curriculum could be developed for close schools within the same neighborhood. But, to develop one single curriculum for the whole Gaziantep would not be any different from the current one. Because, people living in different neighborhoods in Gaziantep have very dissimilar socio-economic backgrounds.”

On the stakeholders of SBCD, Teacher2 said “(among the stakeholders) there should be curriculum development specialists, teachers, and the headman, also the views of the students could be obtained. Community leaders in the district should be consulted as well. Research and development staff at MEB should also be consulted for guidance.”

It was stated that not only the views of institutions and individuals related to the school should be obtained, but also the institutions and individuals that contribute to the development of the region should be consulted. Teacher3: “We should meet with the head of the chamber of industry, who represents the industry. Their needs could be inquired as well. MEB provincial directorate could be consulted. We could ask them what is expected of us, what is expected of the curriculum.” Furthermore, Teacher3 stated the following on the requirements of SBCD:

“When I assess the current situation, there are tremendous differences between a student in Eastern Anatolia and the one in the west (in terms of development level). Thus, it is not appropriate to implement a curriculum developed in Ankara in every part of the country. Each region should develop its own curriculum. Curricula suitable for the geography and the culture of particular regions would be more productive. In Eastern Anatolia, summers are warm, winters are cold, the time schedule of schools in this region should be readjusted and the time schedule of the schools in Black Sea Region should be readjusted to their climate. Also, if you select the subject matter of social studies course based on the geographical standards of a particular region, the information would be more meaningful for the child.”

Findings Related to the Second Sub-Problem

Views of the teachers on the positive aspects of SBCD approach were analyzed in the study. Obtained findings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation Values on the Views About the Positive Aspects of School-Based Curriculum Development Approach

Item No	Scale Items	\bar{X}	sd	Interpretation
	School-based developed curricula			
20	Are more effective since they are developed by taking into account the views of students, parents, and the conditions of the school and environment.	4,18	0,98	High
10	Enable full utilization of school human resources.	4,18	2,82	High
9	Increase teacher motivation.	4,09	1,01	High
17	Result in continuous adaptation of the schools by following the innovations.	4,09	0,93	High
14	Increase in-school interaction and communications.	4,07	0,96	High
16	Enable schools to adapt to the changing environment.	4,03	0,98	High
13	Enable teachers to develop a sense of achievement.	3,98	0,98	High
12	Enable self-realization of the teachers.	3,97	0,97	High
18	Increase the motivation of the school staff.	3,95	1,01	High
15	Increase the confidence of students, parents and society in the school.	3,90	1,05	High
21	Cause a change in the conventional tasks of teachers.	3,88	1,07	High
19	Provides for the needs of the society.	3,85	1,05	High
11	Increase competition with other schools in the district, increasing the quality in education.	3,84	1,11	High
8	Are more successful than uniform applications that are implemented nationwide.	3,65	1,39	High
Total		3,98		High

It was observed that teachers highly agreed with the statements about the positive aspects of SBCD. The teachers highly agreed that school-based curricula would be more effective ($\bar{X}=4,18$) and enabled full use of the school human resources ($\bar{X}=4,18$), since they are developed by taking the conditions of the students, parents, the school and the environment into consideration. Teachers also highly agreed that school-based developed curricula would increase the motivation of teachers and school personnel, result in schools to follow up the innovations continuously and adapt to these developments, increase the interaction and communications within the school, facilitate the adaptation of

schools to the changing environment, and help teachers to improve themselves. Furthermore, it was determined that the teachers highly agreed that school-based curricula would result in changes in conventional tasks of teachers.

However, the level of agreement by the teachers on the item, which expressed that school-based curricula would be more successful than currently implemented uniform curriculum, was lower ($\bar{X}=3,65$) than other items.

Teachers interviewed on the subject stated that the positive aspects of SBCD were the inclusion of all related parties in the curriculum development process, and the facts that individuals would be educated in the best and most suitable curriculum for them, because the curriculum was developed with their own ideas, and the curriculum would train individuals who are fit for the needs of the region and who know the traditions of both the region and the nation. Furthermore, since the curricula would be serving the needs of the region, the human resource requirements of industrialists would be met. Private1 said:

“At least we would include all in the process. No one is included in the current curriculum, some people develop it and we use it”

Teacher1 stated that, since SBCD would train individuals based on the conditions of the region, it would promote the regional development:

School curriculum gains a meaning for the child, for the individual. For instance, when a curriculum suitable for the conditions of an area is developed for a student who lives in an industrial area, industry in that area would develop, and the same would happen in an agricultural area.”

Teacher2 stated that SBCD could have positive aspects such as producing solutions for regional problems, training good citizens, providing solutions for ethnic problems in the country, solving regional problems due to different languages and dialects:

“Positive aspects, first you would train good citizens for the country. These would contribute to the economy. It also would contribute to the relations between people socially.”

Findings Related to the Third Sub-Problem

Views of the teachers on the negative aspects of SBCD approach were analyzed in the study. Obtained findings are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Mean and Standard Deviation Values on the Views About the Negative Aspects of School-Based Curriculum Development Approach

Item No	Scale Items	\bar{X}	sd	Interpretation
	School-based developed curricula			
22.	Could result in further differentiation of qualifications of students that graduated from different schools.	3,70	1,12	High
25.	Could increase the differences between schools.	3,61	1,24	High
23.	Could result in additional workload for administrators and teachers.	3,19	1,36	Intermediary
24.	Hers and parents.	2,89	1,35	Intermediary
Total		3,35		Intermediary

Based on Table 6, teachers demonstrated intermediate level agreement with the items related to the negative aspects of school-based curriculum development. However, teachers showed high level of accordance with the views that school-based curriculum development could cause great differentiation between the qualifications of the students who graduated from different schools ($\bar{X}=3,70$) and could result in an increase of differences between the schools ($\bar{X}=3,61$). Teachers had moderate agreement with the items that school-based curriculum development could ass to the workload of administrators and teachers and could cause conflicts between administrators, teachers and parents.

Teachers we interviewed about the negative aspects of SBCD stated that it would be difficult for MEB to control school-based curriculum, core subjects that need to be taught could change from one region to another, which would render common examinations such as TEOG difficult to manage. Since the students would be trained based on both local and national cultures, the curriculum would be intensive and it would be difficult to find suitable teachers for that curriculum. Furthermore, when a student is transferred to another school, that student could experience problems due to curriculum differences. Teachers would experience similar problems when they are appointed in a different region. Furthermore, there would be negative aspects of developing the curriculum in eastern region of Turkey, due to the special situation in that region. Private1 elaborated on this:

“First of all, it is difficult for MEB to control this. It would be difficult to control the core subjects that need to be taught. For instance, there is TEOG exam, and thus, common courses are required, this would create a problem. It would be very difficult to conduct a common exam”

Teacher1 supported these views: “SBCD could create problems in the teacher aspect. When a teacher goes from the west to the east, or when the

opposite occurs, the teacher could experience problems of compliance. (S)he might not know what to instruct to the students, since the living conditions in the east would be different from these in the west. Also, since different curricula would be instructed in different regions, it would be only natural for the teacher to experience adaption problems.” Teacher2 said “Since this would be a process, it could lead to educational casualties” and proposed that “it should be voluntary, also socio-cultural aspect of each region should be comprehensively scrutinized and then the curriculum should be developed.”

Teacher1 asserted that the curriculum that would be developed for the eastern region of Turkey could have negative aspects and “office of the governor or provincial national education officers should supervise the SBCD process there and should not allow the special conditions of the region to affect the curriculum development process negatively.”

Teacher3 stated that SBCD is a difficult process and application of the curriculum without trial could have adverse results in the future and said: “It sounds like a difficult task to me, to prepare a separate curriculum for each school. It sounds like it is a very difficult task to me to develop such a curriculum. If such a curriculum is implemented without trial, I think individuals educated with that curriculum could experience problems in the future.”

Findings Related to the Fourth Sub-Problem

The views of teachers on the development process of SBCD approach were analyzed in the present study.

Table 7: Mean and Standard Deviation Values on the Views of Teachers About the Development Process of School-Based Curriculum Development Approach

Item No	Scale Items	\bar{X}	sd	Interpretation
	In the process of school-based curriculum development,			
27.	Curriculum development course should be instructed effectively in teacher training institutions.	4,51	0,75	Very high
26.	A curriculum development specialist should be employed in each school.	4,45	0,92	Very high
28.	Competence levels of school administrators and especially teachers on curriculum development should be improved.	4,42	0,83	Very high
30.	Teachers and administrators should undergo training that would equip them with required qualities.	4,42	0,83	Very high

Teacher Views on School-Based Curriculum Development Approach (An Analysis of Applicability in Turkey)

29.	The primary responsibility and authority should be the teacher's.	3,70	1,17	High
32.	Local authorities should have more power.	2,83	1,36	Intermediate
31.	The primary responsibility and authority should be the administrators'.	2,60	1,30	Low
Total		3,85		High

As observed in Table 7, teachers generally agreed at a high level with the scale items related to the school-based curriculum development process. Teachers very highly agreed with the statements that curriculum development course should be effectively instructed in teacher training institutions ($\bar{X}=4,51$), a curriculum development specialist should be employed in every school ($\bar{X}=4,45$), competence levels of school administrators and especially the teachers on curriculum development should be improved ($\bar{X}=4,42$), and teachers and administrators should be given training to obtain the qualifications that are expected of them in curriculum development ($\bar{X}=4,42$). Furthermore, teachers agreed highly with the statement that the principal responsibility and authority should lie with the teachers in curriculum development process, however their agreement was at an intermediate level with the statement that local authorities should be furnished with more authority and they agreed at the low level with the item, which stated that the principal responsibility and authority should belong to the administrators.

Teachers we interviewed in SBCD stated that initially it should be decided whether the curriculum would be developed on a regional or local basis. They also argued that SBCD should be regional, because it would be easier to control regional curricula, and since each region has a common culture, a curriculum could be developed based on that culture and each school could adapt this regional curriculum to its own culture with minor changes. It was also mentioned that the process should be managed by the office of the governor and provincial directorates of national education and prepared based on the conditions of the particular region. TEOG and similar examinations should also be regional and prepared particularly for the students of the region and the quality of the universities should be improved and regional differences should be resolved. Private1 elaborates:

“In my opinion, initially it should be decided whether SBCD would be regional, local or school-based. In my opinion, it should be region-based, not school-based. Because, if it is school-based, it would be too difficult to control.”

On the subject, Teacher1 added:

“Curriculum should cover a region, not a single school. Within the framework of general goals, each school should develop its own curriculum. In the process, major workload would fall on the office of the governor and provincial national education directorates..”

Teacher2 said:

“Content should be developed in accordance with the conditions of that particular region. Content should be developed by individuals who are knowledgeable on the regional conditions, curriculum development specialists.”

Teacher3 stated that TEOG examination should be reviewed to provide a region-specific, curriculum-specific examinations for each region for SBCD to succeed:

“If Directorate of National Education is trying new things about TEOG exam, a system could be developed that is specific for the students of a particular region, and students could go to the regional schools by taking the regional exam”

Private1 also said that TEOG exam should be abolished due to regional differences and said that “In this context, TEOG exam should be abolished, because it would be difficult to implement such different curricula” and believed that SBCD would help resolving the problems particular to eastern and southeastern regions in Turkey:

“Certain schools could have special conditions and could make minor adjustment to the curriculum. But generally one single curriculum for the whole southeastern region would be perfect, because the needs are different”

Teacher4 said SBCD process would be difficult, but if it is designed and organized well and the responsibility of each individual in charge is defined well, and those in charge would do their deeds well, it could succeed:

“This is a difficult task, it sounds difficult to me to actually implement it. First, there should be a well-organized team, in my opinion, the job description of all members should be well-defined, workflows and tasks and responsibilities of the members should be well-defines, teams should be formed, commissions should be established in each province and initially the curriculum could be developed (planned)”

Discussion and Results

It was observed that participating teachers generally demonstrated a high level agreement on the items concerning the necessity of SBCD. It was observed that the items with the highest mean were “curricula should be developed in accordance with the environmental conditions” and “curricula should be developed consistent with the interests and needs of the school district.” Furthermore, teachers that participated in the interviews supported that data. Teachers that participated in the interviews generally stressed that schools should have unique curriculum, because parent profiles, student characteristics, and socio-economic and socio-cultural features of the school districts vary considerably. They have noted that teachers and all school stakeholders should participate in school-based curriculum development. These results were parallel to the definitions and explanations about SBCD given in previous studies (Brady, 1992; Bezzina, 1991; Marsh et al., 1990; Yüksel, 1998; Ünsal 2011). This could create a quite effective learning environment for the learner. Because, one of the important reasons for implementing SBCD was the fact that it provides suitable and sensitive learning strategies that satisfies the interests and needs of the learners (Bolstod, 2004, p.8). These strategies could only be used effectively by reflecting the characteristics of the environment in the curricula.

It was observed that teachers were in a high level agreement with the items about the positive aspects of SBCD. Teachers were in high level agreement with the statements that school-based curricula are more effective, since they are developed by taking the conditions of students, parents, school and the environment into consideration, enable the efficient use of the school human resources. Furthermore, qualitative results supported these findings. Teachers that participated in the interviews stated that SBCD would be a more efficient curriculum, since school stakeholders would be included in curriculum development process and the conditions of the school district would be taken into consideration during curriculum development. Obtained results were consistent with previous explanations about SBCD (Ünsal, 2011; Marsh, 2009). Creating effective and productive learning experiences, entertaining and balanced learning content for learners in SBCD application, and relating the instruction of these content with the social life of the learner, and creating suitable learning strategies are only possible through active efforts by the school stakeholders. In that perspective, active participation of stakeholders in the school district is a significant factor for SBCD. However, it was observed that teachers also considerably agreed with the statements that school-based curricula would result in differentiation of the qualifications of students that graduated from different schools and would cause an increase in differences between the schools. When this situation is considered based on the curriculum elements, it could be deducted that SBCD application would differ based on the educational circumstances. Thus, it would be inevitable that differences between learning levels of the learners would surface.

Because, there are several factors that affect this differentiation. These are; administrator and teacher qualifications, student characteristics, parent participation and physical characteristics of the school, etc. If teachers could effectively reflect the properties of the school district in the educational circumstances, that is if instruction of the content available in the curricula could be supported by activities that are suitable for the environmental factors, learning levels of the children would be positively affected. This positive contribution, naturally, is not only limited with the skills of the teacher. It also depends on the responsibilities of the administrators to motivate and work the teachers, promote active participation of the parents and to include the potential of the school district in the process. Thus, the differences that could occur between the schools are dependent on these factors. Herewith, a difference in qualifications of the learners and differences between schools could occur. Furthermore, it was determined that the teachers had an intermediate level agreement with the statements that school-based curricula would increase the workload of administrators and teachers and could result in conflicts between administrators, teachers and parents.

Participating teachers stated that administrators and managers were not sufficiently equipped for SBCD process, and thus, they should receive required training. In addition, they mentioned that each school should employ a curriculum development specialist and curriculum development courses should be emphasized in teacher training institutions. In the related literature, there are studies that support the above mentioned results (Li, 2006; Cheng, 2004; Wu, 1999; Zhou, 2004). The focal point of previous studies was the facts that the teachers were not sufficiently qualified for SBCD, scarcity of curriculum development specialists, lack of knowledge on the related subject of school administrators, lack of resources and lack of guidance available for the teachers on SBCD. Cheng (2004) expressed that it would not be common sense to demand from the teachers to develop school-based curricula without expert guidance. On the other hand, Wu (1999) summarized the real difficulties with SBCD in the Chinese education system: (1) ultra-centrist Chinese system and learner-centered requirements are constitutional opposites; (2) schools and teaching staff do not possess the professional awareness and abilities related to SBCD; (3) lack of sufficient number of curriculum development specialists would soon create an impossible situation; (4) insufficient school resources and poor teacher qualifications would inevitably have immense effects on SBCD in China. These findings were supported by qualitative data. Teachers that participated in the interviews considered the facts that it would be difficult for MEB to control the developed curricula, there would be problems in joint exams (such as TEOG, etc.) since the curriculum would differentiate, uniform education would not be possible and an intense curriculum would be created as the negative aspects of SBCD.

Participating teaches agreed that the primary authority and the responsible party should be the teachers during the curriculum development

process. Teachers had an intermediate level agreement with the statement that local authorities should have more power in school curriculum development studies and they had a low level agreement with the statement that primary responsibility and authority should be given to school administrators. This finding was parallel to the view by Hergraves that school-based curriculum development primarily promotes teacher participation (Kirk, 1988, p. 457). Furthermore, as mentioned by Oberg (1991), teachers have significant effects on understanding the needs, characteristics and responses of the students in curriculum development studies with their experience, past and skills (Oberg, 1991, p. 303). Findings demonstrated that teachers generally had supportive of SBCD approach, however they considered that in addition to have several advantages, SBCD could also have some disadvantages, and they had reservations on the authority and responsibilities of the stakeholders during the process. Furthermore, most of the interviewed teachers expressed that SBCD should be developed regionally. Because, they stated that regions have a culture of their own and this culture did not differ much within the region. Furthermore, they stressed that office of the governor and provincial national education directorates should play an active role in supervision.

Recommendations

As a result of the analyses and investigations conducted within the scope of the present study, the authors developed the following recommendations:

1. Due to the limited number of studies available on the subject in Turkey, further detailed studies should be conducted on theoretical principles of SBCD and applications in other countries. Workshops should be organized with active participation of educational stakeholders nationwide for discussion of SBCD application.
2. Curriculum development specialists should be appointed to schools to conduct SBCD work at schools in the same district. In time, every school should have its own curriculum development specialist.
3. For active implementation of SBCD application, curriculum development departments should be established in state schools, similar to certain private schools.
4. Power and responsibilities of administrators, teachers, students, parents and other personnel that would participate in SBCD process should be clearly defined, and ,n parallel, administrators and teachers should be trained accordingly.
5. Attempts should be made to reinstate previously closed Curriculum and Instruction undergraduate departments in the universities.

References

Bezzina, M. (1991). Teachers' perceptions of their participation in school based curriculum development: A case study. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 11(2), 39–47.

Brady, L. (1992). *Curriculum development*. Sydney: Prentice Hall.

Cheng, Y. C. (April 1, 2004). Every family produces steel in the backyard (in Chinese). *Mingpao Daily*, 12.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. California: Sage publications.

Kirk, D. (1988). Ideology and school-centered innovation: A case study and a critique. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 20(5), 449-464.

Li, H. (2006). School-based curriculum development: An interview study of Chinese kindergartens. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33(4), 223-229.

Marsh, C., Day, C., Hannay, L., & McCutcheon, G. (1990). *Reconceptualising school-based curriculum development*. London: The Falmer Press.

Marsh, C. J. (2009). How school-based curriculum development (SBCD) can facilitate curriculum differentiation (CD). *International Conference on Primary Education*, 25-27 November, Hong Kong, 1-11.

MEB, (2011, Eylül 14). Millî Eğitim Bakanlığının teşkilat ve görevleri hakkında kanun hükmünde kararname. Resmi Gazete, No: 28054.

Oberg, A. A. (1991). Curriculum decision. *The International Encyclopedia of Curriculum*, 302-303.

Özer, B. ve Kahramanoğlu R. (2012), Assessment of Professional Teaching Knowledge Courses Taught at Faculties of Education According to Teachers' Opinions, *Mevlana International Journal of Education (MIJE)*, 2(1), 48-63.

Reid, W. (1987). *The functions of SBCD: a cautionary note*. In N. Sabar, J. Rudduck, & W. Reid (Eds.), *Partnership and autonomy in school-based curriculum development*, 115–124. University of Sheffield: Division of Education.

Seferoğlu, S. S. (2004). Öğretmen yeterlilikleri ve mesleki gelişim. *Eğitim Dergisi*, 58, 40-45.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Tutkun, Ö. F., ve Aksoyalp, Y. (2010). 21. Yüzyılda eğitimde program geliştirmede yönelim, kavram ve anlayışlar. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, (19), 156-169.

Teacher Views on School-Based Curriculum Development Approach (An Analysis of Applicability in Turkey)

Ünsal, H. (2011). Okul temelli eğitim programı geliştirme ve uygulamalar. I. Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Kongresinde sunulan bildiri, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Eskişehir.

Wu, G. P. (1999). Opportunities and challenges of school-based curriculum development (in Chinese). *Education Review*, 1, 54–56.

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (8. Baskı). Ankara: Seçkin Yayınları.

Yüksel, S. (1998). Okula dayalı program geliştirme. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 4(4), 513-525.

Zhou, H. F. (2004). *Introduction of school-based curriculum study (in Chinese)*. In Shanghai Education Commission (Ed.) *Developing kindergarten-based curriculum: Theoretical and practical studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Publishing House.