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Abstract

This thesis examines teachers' perceptions of the relationship between teachers and government in the field of curriculum development, in the light of changes in the mode of curriculum control under which teachers carry out their work in Korea and England. In both countries, major recent legislation has brought about fundamental revisions of the curriculum. In Korea, the 1992 sixth National Curriculum declared a decentralization of curriculum development, ostensibly attempting to decrease government control over teachers. In England, the 1988 Education Act imposed a national curriculum: this represented an increase in government control over teachers.

The thesis begins with a review of theoretical work relating to modes of curriculum control and professionalism. It then offers accounts of the historical and cultural context of curriculum development and professionalism in Korea and England, providing overviews of curriculum development, teacher education relating to curriculum development, teachers' organizations, hierarchies in society and schools, gender differences in the teaching profession, inspection of teachers, and teachers' relations with parents.

A central issue for the thesis is the idea of teachers' professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum development. It is the main assumption of the study that teachers' professionalism in the field of curriculum control can be best analysed through an examination of the context in which it is embedded. Thus, this thesis involves empirical studies of structured samples of six primary schools in Korea and nine primary schools in England; questionnaires, interviews and case studies were administered in both countries. These investigations focus on comparing the teachers' perceptions of curriculum development and professionalism in their different cultural contexts. Comparison serves to improve contextual understanding of teachers' professionalism within two different trends: centralization and decentralization.

Examination of the empirical data reveals both similarities and differences between different teachers within each country, and also between teachers in the two countries. Overall, Korean teachers feel that they have only a restricted role in implementing the new curriculum in their own classroom, despite the recent change which introduced some decentralization in curriculum policy. Compared with this situation in Korea, despite governmental intervention in curriculum development the majority of English teachers may be characterized as still having an autonomous role in implementing the curriculum. Although there were different orientations and degrees of control among both groups of teachers, the belief in the desirability of teacher control of the curriculum has been a dominant perspective with widespread acceptance in the two countries.

This thesis supports the view that teachers' professionalism is shaped by social, political, educational and institutional cultures in a very complicated fashion, and cannot be expected to change quickly or easily. It also demonstrates that teachers' professionalism cannot be conceptualized simply in terms of movement along the continuum between centralization and decentralization. The thesis argues that teachers' professionalism in relation to government intervention is affected much more by what teachers think, which is shaped in their own cultural contexts, than by the nature of the change itself as defined by the legislation. Accordingly, it suggests that the strategies for enhancing teachers' professionalism in relation to curriculum development should be considered with reference to the cultural contexts within which they are practised.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

This chapter introduces the rationale and structure of the study. In both Korea and England there have been important changes in the role of the government in curriculum: in Korea some decentralization, in England more centralization. This thesis examines the perceptions that teachers in the two countries have of these changes. Its main focus is primary teachers’ perceptions of professionalism in relation to curriculum and to government intervention in the two countries.

1.1 Rationale

The thesis was originally motivated by my personal reaction to a number of professional experiences as a curriculum developer within the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) in Korea. These experiences had left me feeling very concerned about teachers’ responsibilities and roles in the process of curriculum development. Working with teachers on a particular curriculum development project, I came to consider that teachers did not experience ‘curriculum ownership’ and were still disregarded by the government over significant curriculum changes (Ahn, 1996a). However, these experiences also suggested that teachers must defend their professional autonomy and their ability to make wise provision for their pupils by acquiring relevant knowledge and insight.

An advisor for my first PhD thesis in Korea suggested that, as I wanted to study the issues of teachers’ professionalism in relation to curriculum development, I should study them in England where teachers enjoyed a high level of professional autonomy. Ironically, nowadays, while teachers in Korea have entered a period when their professionalism has shifted to some extent out of the shadow of the government, teachers in England have entered a period when their professionalism is more subordinated to the government. These changes in the two countries complicated in an interesting and valuable way the comparative dimension of this study. Therefore, this thesis has arisen from issues which are of personal concern for experienced teachers who are struggling with changes in government control over curriculum development in the two countries. My own concern
has been to study those issues, teachers’ perceptions of the changing relative roles and responsibilities of government and teachers in curriculum development.

‘Faced with the restructuring of world economies, the growth of global markets and accompanying political uncertainties, many industrialized nations have looked anew at the role of their educational systems in producing both the informed citizenry and the skilled and flexible workforce deemed necessary to ensure social stability and economic success in the twenty-first century... Key features of this restructuring which occur in different geographical and cultural locations are: the introduction of strong accountability mechanisms, including a growing tendency to prescribe the curriculum of schools, often through the development of a national curriculum, and administrative decentralization in the form of local school management’ (Helsby and McCulloch, 1997: 1).

It is clear that the recent educational reform in England exemplifies both these features and the reform in Korea exemplifies the latter. In England, the National Curriculum and a policy of local financial management, which would give schools greater budget flexibility, were key parts of the Education Reform Act in 1988. In Korea, the sixth National Curriculum, which enlarged the discretion of local educational authorities, schools and teachers in curriculum decision-making, was proclaimed in 1992. In England the National Curriculum represented an increase in government intervention in teachers’ role. In Korea the sixth National Curriculum declared a decentralization of curriculum control and a decrease of government control over teachers. In this respect, the English curriculum system is moving toward more centralization while the Korean curriculum development system is moving toward some decentralization.¹

Education in England has had a long tradition of curriculum freedom, in the sense of limited central control over the curriculum, compared to many other countries. In the early nineteenth century, elementary schooling was provided by voluntary agencies. Generally, the ruling classes agreed on a policy of non-interference by the government. However, the school curriculum did not stay independent of either various voluntary bodies or the government supervision of the allocation of grants.

¹ The concepts of centralization and decentralization are complex and will be defined in Chapter 2. Also, the changes of curriculum control system in Korea and England will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3.
There was government intervention in the curriculum of the elementary school by the revised Code of 1862, through a restriction of funding to the curriculum of the '3Rs' (Dent, 1982). The twentieth century began with the abolition of the local community School Boards, whose power was transferred, however, to the more regional Local Education Authorities (LEAs) not to the central government. In particular, a decentralized mode of control was consolidated after the 1944 Act, when de facto control of the curriculum passed into the hands of schools. Lawton (1980: 22) remarked that 'from 1944 to the beginning of the 1960s might be seen as the Golden Age of teacher control (or non-control) of curriculum...It might be said that the teachers had their chance to take control the curriculum, but failed to take it, [though]'.

Starting from the 1960s and intensifying in the 1970s, however, the government queried the existing mode of curriculum control, and the 1988 Education Act finally enabled it to give guidance to schools and to direct teachers through a form of national curriculum. These changes have brought new criteria for the content and structure of the curriculum. It is likely that they have had a large impact on teachers' professionalism. The Act was a move in the direction of greater central control and more mechanisms for teacher accountability.

In contrast, curriculum control in Korea has been always regulated by the central government. Educational administration has been highly centralized, with the Ministry of Education (MOE) making almost all important decisions in the absence of elected municipal or provincial assemblies. However, the most important curriculum reform of the last decade in Korea was the introduction of a degree of decentralization. The sixth National Curriculum shifted decision-making for part of curriculum from the central government to the Municipal and Provincial Education Authorities (MPEAs), schools and finally teachers. Legislation promoted some educational autonomy at the local level. Since the government had always controlled curriculum development strictly, such a change might be expected to be very significant for teachers.

In England, the background to the National Curriculum initiative was a complex mixture of political and professional concerns. The new policy was generally opposed by teachers and their professional associations. Tension between bureaucratic-political demands on the curriculum and the professional concerns of teachers reached crisis point
in 1993 when teachers’ professional associations boycotted the new assessment procedures (Lawton, 1996).

In Korea, when the government first announced their reform, there were two different reactions from teachers. Some considered that it imposed extra work and burdens because teachers did not have sufficient previous experience of curriculum development. Ironically, some teachers asked for more detailed guidelines for undertaking local curriculum development, just as had been demanded for earlier curricula. These teachers showed little knowledge and confidence about developing the curriculum. Other teachers, however, criticised the policy because of the superficiality of its decentralization. Teachers still used official textbooks, indeed the same kind of official textbooks, which they had to follow in the context of the sixth National Curriculum. This was taken to mean that there is little room for real freedom or flexibility of teachers in curriculum development and that there is little difference in practice for teachers. In these contrasting ways, teachers complained about, and even opposed, the policy of decentralizing curriculum control (Jo et al., 1994; Ahn, 1996b).

Whether the tendency is for more or less curriculum centralization, both England and Korea, might be seen as offering a real chance for teachers’ professionalism, but in different ways. In England, especially in the absence of national textbooks, it is still left to teachers to translate new curriculum into practice by continuously drawing upon their professional experience and knowledge. In Korea, the gradual handing over of some power to teachers allows teachers to organise and develop content and teaching method in some areas of the curriculum.

The 1988 Education Act in England has been a turning point, especially in terms of curriculum control. Similarly, the 1992 sixth National Curriculum in Korea has been a remarkable attempt to change the terms of curriculum control. It is necessary to emphasize these turning points in coming to understand the changes in curriculum control and their impact on teachers’ professionalism in relation to curriculum development in both countries: 1988 in England and 1992 in Korea.

In the changing climates created by these turning points, most of all it is important to examine how teachers look at the relationship between governments and themselves in relation to curriculum development. As Helsby and McCulloch (1997: xiii) remarked,
'teachers are not neutral agents, still less empty ciphers in their adoption of the National Curriculum, but tend to mediate it in many different and often unexpected ways'. We need to know what the impact is of teachers resistance to government intervention and how the impact is made. Do curriculum control systems affect teachers' professionalism? What are the respective roles and responsibilities of governments and teachers in curriculum development, in teachers' perceptions? How should the roles and responsibilities of governments and teachers in curriculum development be described?

Now is a good time to investigate how things have changed since the new curricula were introduced in both countries. In England, under the direction of the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) - the government's new organisation merging the old School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCCAA) and the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ) in 1998 - and in Korea, under the direction of the Korea Institute for Curriculum and Evaluation (KICE) - the government's new organisation merging the old curriculum department of KEDI and National Board of Educational Evaluation (NBEE) in 1997 - the curriculum has come up for review.

In England, in 1999, 'The Review of the National Curriculum in England: the Secretary of State's Proposals' (QCA, 1999) announced changes seen as necessary to raise standards to come into force from September 2000. This included introducing citizenship education, from September 2002. In Korea, from 1998, a curriculum revision committee has been developing the seventh National Curriculum and defining the direction of educational innovation for the twenty-first century. The seventh National Curriculum will be proclaimed in 2000, and implemented in 2001 for primary and lower-secondary schools and in 2002 for upper-secondary schools. The questions raised above are significant for these changes, as they have a direct bearing on current thoughts and practices which affect the developing curriculum in both countries.

The primary sector of education has afforded outstanding opportunities for curriculum development, even in Korea where the curriculum has been highly controlled by government. In England, especially after the abolition of the 11+ examination, it was

However, since teachers in both countries do not have any experience with these curricula yet, I will exclude discussion of these new proposals in both countries and mainly focus on the current curricula when analysing teachers' perceptions in this thesis.
largely free of those external constraints, focusing on and symbolized by the public examination system, that have inhibited change in the secondary sector. Before the National Curriculum in England, primary teachers enjoyed an high level of curriculum autonomy, in some ways more than secondary teachers:

...although the primary school class-teacher and individual school had considerably less autonomy than is sometimes assumed, scope for independent judgement grew enormously with the gradual phasing out of the 11 - plus and the broadening of expectations that accompanied the spread of comprehensive secondary education (Pollard et al., 1994: 10).

In Korea, too, after the sixth National Curriculum, primary teachers have experienced more changes in curriculum practice, such as integrated subjects, learning from direct experience, and diagnostic assessment, than secondary teachers. Accordingly, changes in the climate of curriculum control have appeared to be more at odds with the practices of primary than of secondary teachers in both countries. In England, primary teachers feel the greater reduction in their autonomy and flexibility, and in Korea, primary teachers feel the greater effects of openness and new challenges. That makes the primary sector more appropriate than the secondary sector for the concern of this thesis, which analyses teachers’ perceptions of the changing relationship between governments and teachers in curriculum development.

Again, the form of subject organization within which teachers operate is likely to be a key framework for their responses to the changing climate of curriculum development. Secondary schools mostly subdivide their staff according to subject areas. These subject backgrounds are crucial factors in shaping teachers’ practical responses. At the primary level, by contrast, teachers are mainly not subdivided by subject areas, but are in charge of all subjects in their own classroom in both Korea and England. In general, Blenkin and Kelly (1983: 34) explained the results of this feature of curriculum development in primary school:

It is clear that advantages have accrued from the absence of those constraints created for other educational institutions by internal administrative structures, especially the existence of autonomous subject departments. The looser, and more flexible, internal structure of the primary school has thus combined with the absence of strong external pressures to create a soil ideal for the rapid growth of the curriculum.
The significant point here, however, is that since different subject subcultures can be important variables, primary teachers’ perceptions are likely to show more consensus on the issues for this thesis than we would expect from secondary teachers.

This thesis is founded on the belief that teachers’ professionalism in primary curriculum development needs to be understood in terms of their own cultural contexts. That suggests putting the critical examination of the changes under investigation into the context of the different social, political, educational and institutional cultures. Thus, for example, it is likely that the government still continues to dominate in curriculum development in Korea, and that teachers still continue to have a critical role in curriculum development in England, despite recent changes in each country.

Much has been written on teachers’ responses to the National Curriculum in both countries (Ahn, 1997; 1996a; 1996b; Curriculum Revision Committee, 1996a; 1996b; Education Reform Committee, 1995; 1996; Jo et al., 1994; MOE, 1991a; 1991b; Mortimore et al., 1998; Taylor et al., 1996; 1994; 1991; 1990; MacGilchrist et al., 1995; Campbell, 1992; Broadfoot et al., 1993; 1992; 1988; Nias et al., 1992; 1989; Nias, 1989). However, empirical studies specifically of teacher’s perceptions of their own roles and responsibilities and those of governments for curriculum development have not been found. This study also provides what seems to be the first comparative analysis of the relationships between teachers and governments over curriculum development in Korea and England.

1.2 Structure

The purpose of the study is to analyse and compare teachers’ perceptions of the changing relationship between teachers and government in curriculum development in the context of changes in the curriculum control system in Korea and England. The underlying concerns of this thesis are:

a) teachers’ conceptual understanding of curriculum development and

Cultural contexts will be defined in Chapter 2.
professionalism;
b) teachers' curriculum practices in relation to the changes in the direction of
government intervention in curriculum;
c) teachers' perceptions of the relationship between their professionalism and
government intervention in curriculum.

In order to pursue these concerns, a series of issues needs to be addressed (directly
or indirectly):

• what is the meaning of curriculum development, and of teachers' professionalism
  with relation to government control?

• what is the shape of curriculum development and its control, seen in two different
  historical and cultural perspectives?

• what are the significant differences which are made by changing the control
  system, towards centralization or decentralization?

• how might the relations of such changes to curriculum development be explained?

• what is the structure and function of political and professional control of teachers
  in both countries?

• how has teachers' status and power in society and school influenced teachers'
  professionalism in curriculum development?

• how have gender differences in the teaching profession influenced teachers'
  professionalism in curriculum development?
• how has teachers’ education influenced teachers’ professionalism in curriculum development?

• how have teachers’ monitoring systems and teachers’ organizations influenced teachers’ professionalism in curriculum development?

• how have teachers’ relationships with parents influenced teachers’ professionalism in curriculum development?

• what are teachers’ conceptual understanding of curriculum development and professionalism, and how do teachers perceive their curriculum practices?

• what are the influences on teachers’ perceptions of their professional role in curriculum development?

• what are the similarities and differences of teachers’ perceptions in both countries?

• how should we characterize the relationship between teachers’ professionalism and government intervention in curriculum development in different cultural contexts?

• what is the best balance of government and teachers’ roles and responsibilities in curriculum development to enhance professionalism?

• can we identify the appropriate extents of government intervention and teachers’ roles and responsibilities?

• how is teachers’ professionalism enhanced in practice and, and to what extent are positions taken up in the literature validated by practice?
The thesis is divided into nine chapters to facilitate analysis of these issues:

Chapter 1 has explored the purpose of the thesis and research problems. Chapter 2 explores the theoretical framework in which the operational definitions of curriculum development and teachers' professionalism are located. It develops a theoretical and conceptual background for this thesis.

Chapter 3 studies the historical backgrounds to curriculum development and curriculum control in the two countries. Also, teacher education regarding the curriculum is analysed. This chapter, like the next, is a foundation for the later contextualizations of data from the two countries.

Chapter 4 analyses teachers' relations to governments from political and professional perspectives concerning curriculum development. The hierarchies in society and schools are examined to understand teachers' status and power. The influences and roles of teachers' organizations, gender differences, inspection, and parents on teachers' professionalism are explored as well.

Chapter 5 explains the methodology adopted in this study.

Chapters 6 and 7 present and analyse research data from enquiries in six Korean and nine English primary schools. The findings raise critical questions regarding teachers' perceptions of the relationship between governments and teachers over curriculum control, and are used to different types of teachers in relation to changes in the curriculum control system in Korea and England.

Chapter 8 uses the interpreted and contextualized empirical findings from each country to continuously compare teachers' perceptions in the two countries in terms of significant similarities and differences.

Chapter 9 considers the implications of the thesis, and seeks to develop a way forward for teachers' professionalism concerning curriculum development.
Part I Background

This part includes chapters 2-5, and is devoted to providing background analysis of issues of curriculum development and professionalism in both countries.

Chapter 2 offers a theoretical framework for studying the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention in the process of curriculum development. The discussion begins by considering some aspects and characteristics of curriculum development, and continues with those of professionalism. Finally this chapter discusses the relationships among government intervention, curriculum development and teachers' professionalism within various cultural contexts. I am not claiming to provide a set of fixed, necessary, and sufficient definitions of these relations. Rather I am preparing to study the specific ways they function in two different cultural contexts.

Chapter 3 draws on the history of curriculum development in Korea and England, with particular reference to primary education. I attempt to show how the curriculum has been developed within the cultural context of each country in accordance with different traditions and historical backgrounds. The chapter gives a historical overview of curriculum development within the creation of the two national education systems, and shows how the latest curricula differ from previous ones in their academic and administrative aspects. It also includes discussions of teachers' pre- and in-service education, as bearing on teachers' knowledge concerning curriculum development. Finally, in summarising and comparing the main characteristics of curriculum development and teacher education in the two countries, I show the issues of centralization and decentralization have been salient in each country. The different trends of curriculum development in the two countries are identified and it is suggested that different degrees and forms of control are emphasized by the central governments in Korea and England.

Chapter 4 moves on to analyse how teachers' professionalism has been defined in both countries and, to provide a general picture of teachers' status and power in each. The degree of teachers' status and power may be appreciated if their relationship with the
government and with other institutions and groups involved in the practice of teaching can be defined. So, this chapter is concerned with the positioning of teachers in society and schools. I attempt to analyse teachers' professionalism in the context of their political and professional relations with other groups. 'Political' refers here to teachers' power and status in society and also in relation to the government, while 'professional' refers to teachers' power and status in education and school culture. The focus of this chapter is the main characteristics of teachers' professionalism in the two countries and how each country's cultural tradition has been predominant in determining it.

Chapter 5 describes the methodology of the thesis, including the research foci and the research process. Teachers' perceptions and implication of the National Curriculum cannot be adequately addressed without some empirical study of teachers' views and practices. Work on the thesis has confirmed the value of a mixed model involving both quantitative and qualitative data collection using triangulation techniques, in which data are collected through a combination of questionnaires, in-depth interviews and case studies. Questionnaires and interviews are used to figure out the general patterns of teachers' perceptions and to classify types of teachers, whose responses are analysed in terms of percentage, mean and correlation. Case studies are used to understand more deeply the meaning of the teachers' perceptions and the types of teachers. A comparative methodology is adopted to identify similarities and differences between different teachers in each country and those between teachers in Korea and England.
Chapter 2 A Theoretical Framework

2.1 Curriculum Development

2.1.1 Aspects of curriculum development

According to Doll (1986), 'curriculum development' refers not only to improving the curriculum structure and materials but also to stimulating learning on the part of all persons who are concerned with the curriculum. It is a process that seeks the identification of any inefficacy of the current curriculum in order to revise and redirect an improved curriculum. Curriculum development is also the process of transforming a way of thinking about education into a curriculum, which is a sequence of potential experiences for the purpose of educating children.

Curriculum development includes two aspects, overlapping rather than sharply distinctive: the academic and the political. Lawton (1980) similarly distinguished cultural and political questions: the cultural question is 'what is worth while?', and the political question is 'who makes the selection?' with overlap. The 'academic' aspect includes contents and design. This aspect is related to the overall content, knowledge, skills and processes which teachers are concerned to transmit. Accordingly, it also includes the formal and informal contents and the processes by which learners gain knowledge and understanding, develop skills, and alter attitudes, appreciations and values under the auspices of schools.

The other is the 'political' aspect. Education is itself a political activity and no one who practises it can long remain unaware of the political dimensions of their work. In this sense, curriculum development results from the interpersonal dynamics of decision-making about institutional planning (Gay, 1991; Eisner, 1985). Since a curriculum is the social product of contending forces, its development does not occur in a vacuum (Tanner and Tanner, 1990; Apple, 1988). Reid (1987) connected this nature of curriculum problems to that of practical problems which are moral rather than technical in nature.

Curriculum development, then, is the result of a political process, and reflects the influence of interests and interest groups on the curriculum making process. The distinctive
feature of curriculum development is that it is a dynamic and cyclic process. In this respect, the essential aspect of curriculum development is the political aspect, which involves issues of power, procedure and participation. The question of who should be responsible for curriculum development is a crucial issue. Kirst and Walker (1971: 480-1) described this political aspect of curriculum development as 'the inevitability of conflicting policy viewpoints':

It [curriculum development] is a political process in important ways... Throughout curriculum policy making, political conflict is generated by the existence of competing values concerning the proper basis for deciding what to teach. The local school system and other public agencies responsible for these decisions must allocate these competing values in some way, even though this means that some of the factions or interests win and others lose on any given curriculum issue. The inevitability of conflicting demands, wants, and needs is responsible for the necessarily political character of curriculum policy making, a character which cannot be avoided even by the adoption of some mathematical decision procedure. Some legitimate authority must decide (and perhaps bargain and compromise) among the conflicting policy viewpoints.

On the same issue, Kelly (1999; 1989) identified some of the general and indirect controls, constraints, pressures and influences which constitute the context in which curriculum development goes on, and which will affect it:

The curriculum has to be seen as a battle ground for such competing ideologies and thus in many instances as an uneasy compromise between them. Then some specific influences and constraints were identified, the pressures on teachers and other curriculum planners who derive from established traditions, those which are generated by administrative decisions concerning such things as the organization of the school system or of individual schools and the allocation and distribution of resources, the pressures of public examinations and external testing (1989: 184).

The political aspect of the curriculum is concerned with the distribution and control of worthwhile and relevant educational knowledge and experience (Lawton, 1980). In this respect, curriculum decisions are crucial to curriculum development. Curriculum decisions are judgements about the ends and means of education or socialization (Oberg, 1991). The process of curriculum decisions includes 'the establishment of goals for the entire educational programme, the selection of subjects through which goals can be achieved, and the identification of intended learning outcomes and, possibly, contents that comprise the unique contribution of each subject. The process also encompasses the dissemination of
the curriculum, planning for implementation of the curriculum, and evaluation of both the curriculum itself and the processes that produced it' (Young, 1979: 13).

The political aspect of curriculum development includes who makes what curriculum decisions and how, as well as how these decisions are implemented and changed. From this point of view, the important question arises, ‘who should be involved in the process of curriculum development?’ since participants’ viewpoints, interests and beliefs are reflected in curriculum decision-making. The real sources of curriculum development are all the individuals and groups that exercise influence over the curriculum (Mackenzie, 1962). Taba (1962: 469) emphasized the importance of human factors in curriculum development:

...to change thinking about the curriculum one needs to change people’s attitudes toward what is significant and perceptions about role, purposes and motivations.

The participants potentially include government administrators, curriculum specialists, teachers, pupils and parents or community members. Even though the roles and responsibilities of those participants are varied, some scholars have argued that the teachers should be essentially responsible for curriculum development, since they have direct influence and responsibility for classroom activities and children’s learning through transforming the curriculum into classroom action (Knorr, 1986; Eisner, 1985; Schwab, 1983; Connelly, 1972).

One of the critical issues for curriculum development, then, is the power distribution in curriculum decision-making. This may be analysed using the key concepts of ‘centralization’ and ‘decentralization’, but it is too complicated to find a completely coherent set of principles of these concepts. ‘Who dominates?’ is a key question about curriculum decision-making, but also ‘how does a dominant actor control curriculum decision-making?’ is another necessary question in relation to centralization and decentralization. This study’s analysis of curriculum development will rest substantially, though not exclusively, on the concepts of centralization and decentralization.
2.1.2 Centralization and decentralization

According to *The Public Administration Dictionary* (Chandler and Plano, 1982), 'centralization' is the tendency for political power to move from smaller, weaker, more local units of government towards larger, stronger, and more central units. By contrast, 'decentralization' is the process of dividing and distributing authority and responsibility for programmes to administrative subunits. Centralization and decentralization principally describe a condition or a trend in a hierarchy of power (Sills ed., 1968). In this respect, Broadfoot (1996: 117) described the centralized-decentralized dichotomy as follows:

In systems categorized as 'centralized', power to control educational provision and process is taken to reside in central government. In systems categorized as 'decentralized', such power is taken to be dispersed among various competing interest groups, including local government, the teaching profession, other interest groups and local communities.

Any changes aimed at promoting centralization or decentralization must involve power redistribution. Centralization and decentralization can be understood as two poles between which one can locate the decision-making that allows a given system to operate. However, the nature of each process in operation at any given time, and the area of education concerned, will vary. A single political and administrative system, over a given period of time, can be characterized as moving towards one or other pole. As Schubert (1991: 98) argued, 'there should be a careful and ongoing exercise of judgement by policy-makers in the effort to determine the blend most suited to each curriculum situation'.

In the course of their analysis of the curriculum decision-making process, Mortimer and McConnell (1978: 247-9) used four elements to distinguish centralized and decentralized systems:

a) the proper level of the organizational hierarchy for the exercise of control;
b) who is involved in decision-making, at which level;
c) appropriate means or styles of control;
d) techniques of control.
On the same issue, Kydd and Weir (1994: 9) assessed the extent of central control over education by asking these questions:

a) to what extent is the nature of a state such that it can impose its views by legislation on the various regions of a country, without local government having authority to vary these impositions?
b) to what extent does the teaching profession have control over the entry to and activities of its own occupational group?
c) to what extent is the training of teachers still influenced by the intellectual and academic criteria of the knowledge base, or influenced by mechanistic views of the teacher as technician?
d) to what extent does a social and democratic consensus exist, to which government must attend, and in which the value of education for its own sake is given greater value than education as a condition of economic wealth?

Centralization is a process arising from the central government’s perception of its need to control. Centralization can be analysed according to the level and variety of participation in strategic decisions by groups relative to the number of groups in the organization (Haige and Aiken, 1967). An assumption is often made that the formal goals of education are agreed upon by all members of society. This consensus view indicates harmony without conflict. Where there is consensus, centralization is seen as a useful and accepted process of government administration through which coherent and effective plans may be implemented. On the other hand, it also may be seen as the means by which power is effectively concentrated and opposition is sidelined.

By contrast, decentralization is a low concentration of power (Gould and Kolb eds., 1964). All other things being equal, the more groups are involved, the more decentralized a system is. The number of groups involved also reflects the extent of democracy. Advocates of decentralization assert a democratic principle of decision-making, and claim that a decentralized system is more democratic than a centralized one because it involves significant interest groups as participants in decision-making. Rondinelli (1981: 133-4) distinguishes different kinds of units to identify the nature of decentralization:
Decentralization is the transfer of responsibility for planning, management and resource raising and allocation from the central government and its agencies to: a) field units of central government ministries or agencies; b) subordinate units or levels of government; c) semi-autonomous public authorities or corporations; d) area-wide, regional or functional authorities; or e) non-governmental private or voluntary organizations.

While the centralized extreme represents a unitary context in which all units are parts of an inclusive formal structure and have a common goal, the decentralized extreme represents a social choice in which there are no inclusive goals, and decisions are made independently by autonomous organizations (Clark, 1983). In general, curriculum decision-making in a centralized system depends on government authority, while that in a decentralized system depends on market forces or on individual schools or teachers. In a centralized system, teachers tend to be excluded from the central processes of curriculum development, and act largely as implementers of central directives. Where this is so, the government may have little opportunity to comprehend that an essential feature of planning schemes of work and teaching these successfully is the link between classroom practice and the National Curriculum.

However, the reality of control cannot be identified simply on this centralized-decentralized continuum which equates the degree of control and the location of that control (Broadfoot, 1996; Lauglo and Mclean, 1985). Broadfoot (op. cit.: 118) in her comparative study of England and France stressed that ‘control cannot be equated with centralization’:

Despite the long-standing assumption that in ‘centralized’ education systems, such as those of France and Sweden, teachers’ practice is more closely controlled than in ‘decentralized’ systems, such as those of England or the United States, this is misleading. The equation of strong control with a high degree of centralization fails to take into account less obvious and generally much more powerful sources of control and constraint, notably that of assessment - that is, collection and evaluation of information about the system...It is therefore important to distinguish between the degree of assessment control on the one hand (strong or weak), and the source of that control (central or local) on the other. This distinction is crucial, for the tendency to conflate strong control with central control within the concept of centralization has led to an over-preoccupation with administrative variables in the study of differences between educational systems and a consequent disregard for how that control is actually mediated and ultimately experienced by teachers in the schools.
To understand how these changes of control mode actually work, the pattern of curriculum control should not be reduced simply to differences related to the usual centralized-decentralized distinction. In this respect, Broadfoot emphasized the relationship between 'the form of control' (process or product), with which the education system actually works, and 'the source of control' (central or local) rather than its formal administrative arrangements alone; she restricted her discussion largely to assessment procedures, though.

As will be seen in Chapter 3, the 1988 reform in England was characterized by a centralization of curriculum control, with some decentralization of the management of schools. In the case of Korea, the recent curriculum reform in 1992 was defined as introducing a trend to decentralized curriculum control, in which the mode of centralized control has been modified through a law enhancing local autonomy, but retaining official textbooks of the same style. Since the movement of centralization or decentralization in one system cannot be explained simply in terms of a steady state on the continuum between two poles, for the purpose of my study I shall use these two concepts as meaning a process rather than a state.

In addition, accepting Broadfoot's argument for a more complex conceptualization than the bare centralized-decentralized dichotomy, I shall attend to the relationship between 'the forms of control' and 'the sources of that control' as part of the comparative framework of this thesis. It enables me to compare the opposite directions of curriculum policies in Korea and England, highlighting the way that the different modes of control operate. As Mortimer and McConnell (1978) categorized them, 'appropriate means or styles of control' and 'techniques of control' match the forms of control as other significant indicators to distinguish positions on this continuum. In this way the thesis works with the centralization-decentralization continuum through not only the locations of power but also the emphasis given by the government to a particular form of curriculum control system in each country.

On the basis of this theoretical framework, one of the assumptions of my study is that

---

4 I will discuss these definitions as a framework for this thesis in section 2.3.2 later. The 'forms of control' will be used as the ground for identifying the characteristics of curriculum. The 'sources of control' will be used as the ground for identifying the degree of government control. These are likely to be useful to analyse teachers' professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum development in Korea and England through empirical data.
the forms of control enable us to identify the relative degree of centralization or
decentralization in Korea and England. Thus, the framework will enable the thesis to
clarify and to compare the ways that the governments regulate teachers’ curriculum
practice in the two countries, and to study teachers’ perceptions of these forms of
regulation.

2.2 Teachers’ Professionalism

2.2.1 Aspects of professionalism

The term ‘professionalism’, which refers to the attitudes and beliefs of a profession
required in the practice of that profession, has a wide range of different interpretations.
However, much of the debate has centred around three important concepts, which are
defined in a variety of ways, for example by Bottery (1998: 3; 1996: 179-80):

a) expertise - the claim by an occupational group to exclusive knowledge and
   practice;

b) altruism - an ethical concern by this group for its client;

c) autonomy - the professionals’ need and right to exercise control over entry into,
   and subsequent practice within, that particular occupation.

This analysis provides a valuable insight into the understanding of the complex
concept of professionalism. In an overlapping way, Hoyle and John (1995) also pointed out
some of the complexities of teachers’ professionalism in the three areas identified:

- the values and attitudes assumed in the notion of professional responsibility;
- the significance of autonomy for effective practice.

In a slightly different vein, Campbell (1997) explained the idea of professionalism as having a threefold
history; firstly, ‘the notion of professional craft knowledge’ - the repertoires of skills and
expertise involved in working as a teacher; secondly, ‘the notion of professional status’ as
demanding strong ethical commitment to the interests of clients; and thirdly, the ‘notion
of professionalism’ - the qualities and attitudes with which teachers conduct their work.
Carlgre (1996) also explained different aspects, meanings and concepts of professionalism by distinguishing ‘teachers’ professional knowledge’, ‘professionalization of teachers’ and ‘teachers’ professionalism’. Whereas ‘professionalization’ denotes issues of status, ‘professionalism’ concerns the rights and obligations of teachers to determine their own tasks in the classroom, that is, how teachers use their own knowledge (Eisenmann, 1991).

The first strand which gives professionalism social importance is its knowledge base. The professionalism of teachers may be viewed as simply the knowledge, skills and procedures used by them in teaching. This concept is clearly no more than a necessary condition for being a professional. If such a view is assumed as defining professionalism, teachers may have no opportunity to question the role defined for them by government or others. Hoyle (1980; 1974) referred to such a role of teachers as ‘restricted’, in which teachers may be required to limit their professional judgement to matters of classroom practice only. A restricted role is premised on teachers’ improving their practice with their pupils by working together around issues generated by their classroom practice. Thus, teachers are restricted in their contribution to policy and decision-making in educational matters.

Downie (1990) proposed two features of the knowledge base or expertise of the teacher: the knowledge at the disposal of the teacher, and the skill involved in communicating it. There is no reason to doubt that teaching is essentially the practical business of getting certain skills, attitudes, knowledge and habits into pupils (Carr, 1992). Schon (1983: 339) identified part of this knowledge base as ‘technical expertise’, and emphasized its insufficiency:

The model of professional knowledge as technical expertise, based on the application of science, underlies the traditional contact between the autonomous professional expert and his client, the traditional exchange relationship between practitioner and researcher, and the rather paradoxical incorporation of ostensibly autonomous professionals within the highly specialized structures of bureaucratic systems. The scope of technical expertise is limited by situations of uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and conflict.

---

I will adopt Hoyle’s classification of professionalism, and ‘restricted’ and ‘extended’ as for categories for identifying teachers’ professional autonomy. This is likely to be useful to analyse teachers’ professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum development in Korea and England through empirical data. These definitions will be further elaborated in section 2.3.2 of this Chapter.
The second conceptual strand of professionalism is that professionals provide a service for others, specifically via a relationship between the professional and his clients. The relationship is authorised by an institutionalised body and legitimised by public esteem. Professionals are expected to be altruistic people who provide services that are vital to human welfare, and place the recipients' interests above their own (Dorrel, 1990). They are characterized by behavioural expectations which protect the self-interest of the client, the practitioner, and the public. Thus, Barber (1963: 671-2) listed the elements that were indicators of the professions:

a) commitment to the common good, rather than self-interest;
b) a code of ethics internalised within forms of specialization and organization of work, and operated through a professional association, and  
c) a system of rewards that is designed to encourage achievement, not self-interest.

In this context, Carr (1992: 21) defined an alternative views of teachers' professionalism, in contrast to 'a classroom mechanic view', as the notion of a role rather than a skill:

Like the other so-called professions education and teaching are to be understood less in terms of the routine practical procedures involved in the actual conduct of the task and more by reference to the elaborated network of public duties, obligations and responsibilities in which teaching as a social role is implicated...if education and teaching are defined as professional by reference to the idea of role - more than that of a skill - then this brings to the centre of stage such notions of crucial and moral significance as duty, obligation and accountability to others.

Hoyle and John (1995: 105-13) related this concept to 'responsibility' in the course of distinguishing between accountability and responsibility:

Accountability can take the form of prior requirements defining the nature and scope of the teachers' work, or the teachers' post factum forms of accounting for their professional activities...Responsibility is the process whereby a teacher, or a collectivity of teachers, further ensures that the interests of clients are met. They must be pro-active and act as principals as well as agents. Thus, accountability can be seen as the convergent principle, responsibility the divergent principle...Responsibility clearly implies a degree of autonomy and requires from clients a degree of trust. This trust is guaranteed through the professionalism of
teachers, which embraces a continuous development of knowledge and skill, the
cultivation of judgement, and acceptance of a client-entered ethic.

The third strand of professionalism is that a profession must be to a considerable
degree autonomous in order to enact its various roles in society. In particular, in order to
discharge their functions professionals must be to some extent independent of the influence
of the government. Some scholars, however, deal with this feature as a significant aspect
of professionalism in the issue of 'extended professionalism', 'flexible professionalism',
'critical professionalism', the requirement to be a 'reflective practitioner', and 'teachers
as researchers' (Barnett, 1997; Goodson and Hargreaves ed., 1996; Berg, 1989; Schon,
1983; Stenhouse, 1975; Hoyle, 1974). If this perspective is accepted, professionals are
more appropriately seen as participants in a large societal conversation. It is essential to
effective practice that they should be sufficiently free from bureaucratic and political
constraints to act on judgements made in the best interests of the clients (Hoyle and John,
1995).

Collins (1990) suggested that one needs to concentrate upon how the power
exercised by occupations enables them to increase their ability to influence issues in
society. This suggests that in order to be recognized, a profession must have full control
over the decision-making process in the exercise of their profession. Professionals should
control both the means and the ends within and about their professional role (Hartley,
1985). This would have to include the opportunity to play a critical as well as a teaching
role, in which technical and pedagogical competence would be given scope for
development. Such a role would afford teachers wide powers of professional discretion.
It is an approach to relate the term 'professionalism' to the way of controlling an occupation,
rather than to describing its characteristics.6

These three strands of professionalism seem to cover all the major components of
the issues about teachers' professionalism. Traces of all three concepts can be found in the
teaching professions in both Korea and England, therefore I shall use them to understand

Some writers favour this strand to the exclusive of the others. For example, Johnson (1972: 45)
commented: 'professionalism then becomes redefined as a peculiar type of occupational control
rather than an expression of the inherent nature of particular occupations. A profession, then, is not
an occupation, but a means of controlling an occupation'.
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how the systems and cultures work as they do. In this respect, an obvious issue with
relation to government intervention and teachers’ professionalism is, ‘what is the value of
professionalism to teachers, and how do the changing roles of governments affect teachers
professionalism?’ This is closely related to the issues of professionalization and
deprofessionalization. To compare more productively teachers’ professionalism in both
countries, it should be clarified how these two processes may be interpreted in terms of the
three strands of professionalism. We shall do this in the next section.

2.2.2 Professionalization and deprofessionalization

According to Carlgre (1996), ‘professionalization’ is generally used to denote the
process of strengthening the status aspects of a profession by improving the skills and
knowledge of practitioners. However, professionalization is not a dichotomous event or
a state of grace into which an occupation clearly falls or does not, rather it describes points
along a continuum (Darling-Hammond and Goodwin, 1993). Discussions of
deprofessionalization, as opposed to professionalization, then offer another way to explain
teachers’ professionalization within this continuum.

Kelly (1995) saw the increasing limitation on teachers’ control of the curriculum as
a process of deprofessionalization. As the result of governmental control, there is less
involvement of teachers in the curriculum. Consequently, teachers experience
deprofessionalization. Apple and Teitelbaum (1986: 179) discussed the issue as a process
of ‘de-skilling’.

This is known as de-skilling. As employees lose control over their own labour, the
skills that they have developed over the years atrophy. They are slowly lost,
thereby making it even easier for management to control even more of one’s job
because the skills of planning and controlling it yourself are no longer available.
A general principle emerges here: in one’s labour lack of use leads to loss...Much
the same as in other jobs, we are seeing the de-skilling of our
teachers...Increasingly, teaching methods, texts, tests, and outcomes are being
taken out of the hands of the people who must put them into practice...The skills
that teachers have built up over decades of hard work - setting relevant curricular
goals, establishing content, designing lessons and instructional strategies,
individualizing instruction based on an intimate knowledge of students’ desires and
needs, and so on - are lost.
However, even though teachers' experience of curriculum involvement leading to improved professional practice may seem obvious, involvement with curriculum does not lead automatically to more reflective practice. Also, as Tamir (1986) in his analysis of Israeli curriculum system, argued, it was not necessary to abandon or devalue centrally developed curricula to promote teachers' professionalism. The possibility of professionalization or deprofessionalization in relation to teachers' curriculum involvement whether in centralized and decentralized curricula, raises questions about factors and situations that either support or hinder this process. We need to recognize a complex balance between teachers' professionalism and government involvement to enhance teachers' professionalization.

Professionalism is an expression of social value, depending on the context within which it is examined: for example, historically speaking, the knowledge criterion must have been more central many centuries ago than it now is (Downie, 1990). Likewise, 'professionalization and deprofessionalization are historically specific processes which some occupations have undergone at a particular time, rather than a process which certain occupations may always be expected to undergo because of their essential qualities' (Johnson, 1972: 45). In this thesis, professionalization and deprofessionalization in both countries will be analysed as a continuum, in which their dynamics have affected different groups of teachers differently during any given period in any society (Ginsburg, 1997; 1995; 1991).

Teachers' professionalism is also challenged by teachers' implicit views of teaching and learning, their isolation in the classroom, and classroom forces that encourage non-reflective teaching. In other words, teachers' implicit assumptions about teaching and learning, the limited feedback to their teaching, and their lack of exposure to new form of practice may impede growth of professionalization (Wallace and Louden, 1994).

On the other hand, it appears that governments and teachers may be somewhat suspicious of each others' motives. Labaree (1992: 128) pointed that 'there is good reason to be suspicious of any movement which calls for professionalization, on the ground that it may benefit only the interest group leading the way'. According to Ozga and Lawn (1981), the teachers' professional role can be manipulated by the government as a strategy to control teachers, wittingly or unwittingly. In part, this is because administrators, state
elites, other occupational groups, and other publics have employed elements from an ideology of professionalism to criticize or challenge teachers' claims and aspirations (Ginsburg, 1997; Filson, 1988).

Some government policies have been introduced which may indeed have consequences for the professionalization or deprofessionalization of teachers. It is often difficult to assess unequivocally the full implications of policies, partly because of lack of agreement on what constitutes professionalization and partly because the full implications of these policies for the profession will only appear in the long run (Hoyle, 1990). In this context, Hoyle (op. cit.: 14) indicated two positions which incorporated different interpretations of professionalization:

One implication of these developments [a number of government policies in England since 1980s] is that they entail deprofessionalization of teaching, particularly since their combined effect could be seen as undermining the autonomy of the teacher, traditionally one of the key criteria of a profession. However another view is that true professionalization entails a response to the needs of the clientele and thus the above measures are designed to enable teachers to be more professional in this sense and have, moreover, increased the professional autonomy of schools as units, if not of individual teachers.

It is understood that professionalization or deprofessionalization in relation to the government should be discussed from each point of view. Therefore, to analyse the current context of teachers' professionalism in the light of government intervention in curriculum development, this thesis aims to distinguish between two issues:

a) how much professionalism government policy allows teachers to exercise;

b) how much professionalism teachers choose to exercise.

The analysis of these issues leads to quite different results in the two countries, as will be shown.
2.3 Culture, Government, Curriculum and Teachers

2.3.1 Cultural contexts

‘Education is deeply implicated in the politics of culture’ (Apple, 1996: 22). One way of figuring out certain aspects of curriculum development and teachers’ professionalism is to notice that each case comes from a specific culture and should be analysed within its cultural context. Stenhouse (1967: 14-9) summed up this understanding of culture as follows:

Culture is rooted in common, shared experiences. Culture consists of a complex of shared understandings which serves as a medium through which individual human minds interact in communication with one another. It enables us to recognize as familiar the way other people think and feel, and thus to share their feelings. It also enables us to predict and thus to anticipate the actions of others so that we can cooperate with them...Culture, then, is a matter of ideas and thoughts and feelings...The life of any group depends upon a core of common culture. From the understandings shared in this culture, people develop a set of expectations to regulate their own behaviour.

The attempt to define the pattern of government intervention and teachers’ professionalism in curriculum development in a particular case should take account of the relative applicability of practice of government intervention within different cultural contexts. For example, Chaffee (1981) argued that whether decision-making should be centralized or decentralized depends on the type of decision in question. He implied that no system is necessarily superior to another system in every situation, and, anyway, it is not obvious that we can easily identify this aspect of the system, as I pointed out earlier. Rather each case may have its own best compromise between centralization and decentralization. The analysis of this in each case must be placed within its cultural context. Such an analysis then facilitates the attempt to discover the nature and the complexity of the relationships involved (William, 1961). William (op. cit.: 63) emphasized that ‘pattern’ is a key word in cultural analysis:

It is with the discovery of patterns of a characteristic kind that any useful cultural analysis begins, and it is with the relationships between these patterns, which sometimes reveal unexpected identities and correspondences in hitherto separately
considered activities, and sometimes again reveal discontinuities of an unexpected kind, that general cultural analysis is concerned.

Culture is essentially holistic, yet we need to find sub-categories of some kind if we are to do more than indulge in bland generalizations (Lawton, 1996). In the course of analysing curriculum planning, Lawton (1989: 21-3; 1996: 28-30) suggested nine major headings describing cultural invariants, as follows: socio-political system; economic system; communication system; rationality system; technology system; morality system; belief system; aesthetic system; and maturation system. These cultural invariants give a valuable framework to analyse cultural contexts, though Lawton admitted that this analysis is not exhaustive, and culture could be sub-classified in other ways.

The concept of 'sub-culture' is also important in reference to that set of ideas, attitudes, values, habits and procedures which characterizes a group within a society. Teachers' experiences arise within a range of different cultural conditions, but teachers also have a sub-culture of their own into which their members are initiated (Stenhouse, 1967). What needs to be explained here are the dominant features of the cultural contexts which could explain teachers' perceptions of the relationship between government intervention and teachers' professionalism. 'The sub-culture of any small group must be seen in the context of the total culture of a society. The culture of the group is a particular selection or constellation drawn from all the possible understandings accessible in their society' (Stenhouse, op. cit.: 54). Analysis of teachers' sub-culture will help to explain the characteristics of teachers' professionalism in relation to any given society. Taken in the round, 'social culture' provides the background to these relationships. The notion of professionalism itself is socially constructed and is subject to cultural differences in interpretation (Helsby, 1995). Pring (1993, cited in Hargreaves, 1994: 424) related the special 'social tradition' of teachers to their claim to professionalism:

The authority of the teacher...which lies at the basis of claims of professionalism, depends not so much on an articulated body of knowledge which relates to practice, as on belonging to a social tradition which defines relationships, sets boundaries of appropriate behaviour, establishes goals and purposes, and resists intrusions from those who seek to subvert those values.

As well as the differences in social tradition which define the key characteristics of
professionalism, it seems clear that teachers' relationship with the government, as part of the 'political culture', is subject to change over time. Deal (1985) claimed that at times of economic stability, schools tend to be seen as 'low risk industries' and teachers are allowed considerable scope to manage their own affairs by government. Conversely, at times of economic crisis, education is generally seen as having more central social and economic functions, with greater emphasis placed upon performance and public accountability related to professionalism.

'Environmental culture' cannot then be separated from the society of which it is a part. Yet teachers can be thought of as possessing a specific culture which will to some extent determine their decisions. Not only does an educational culture provide teachers with ways of acting, it also helps to determine their professional identity (Selleck, 1972). Hoyle and John (1995: 91) referred this educational culture to 'professional culture', which connotes any integrated set of beliefs widely held within the teaching profession:

Such a culture [professional culture] shapes all aspects of the teacher's work.

Schools, as institutions, create a culture that constrains and habituates the working lives of its members (Acker, 1990; Nias et al., 1989; Pollard, 1985) and this may justify separate analysis for each institution. 'Institutional culture' means the procedures, values and expectations that guide people's behaviour within school (Hargreaves and Hopkins, 1991). Lawton (1996) proposed three categories of depth to understand this culture as follows: beliefs such as the vision of educational ideals; attitudes and values, as determining the mission to achieve certain aims, goals and purposes; and behaviour, as action to fulfil the mission. Institutional culture is absolutely related to the beliefs, attitudes and values, and behaviour of the teachers.

The cultural contexts of teachers are, then, multiple. Teacher culture varies to an extent with the cultural differences across schools. Each school has its own culture in the assumption of much current literature on culture and schools (Prosser ed., 1999). Teacher culture also overlaps heavily with educational culture. And, together with educational culture, it is quite strongly linked with (influenced by, influencing) the more general social
and political cultures.\textsuperscript{7}

2.3.2 Government, curriculum and teachers

Teachers do not simply implement government control processes; they can also incorporate their own views and interpretations which are formulated in cultural contexts. Thus, identifying government intervention factors as input factors and the related output as the way teachers' professionalism functions is not adequate, as it leaves out the impact of teachers' points of view (Elliott, 1980). As I pointed out earlier, good analysis will refer to different levels. They could be divided into three levels; 'the government level' as the locus of control, 'the curriculum level' as the form of control, and 'the teachers level' as the level over which control is exercised. These are the managerial control exercised by the government, the characteristics of curriculum, and the professional control exercised by individual teachers. Analysis of these levels places the focus on the degrees and forms of government control, and the interpretations employed by teachers. These proposed distinctive levels become the primary instrument for understanding the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention in cultural contexts.

Analysis of the 'government level' clarifies the functioning of governmental control and the extent to which government allows teachers to exercise aspects of professionalism can be analysed. The 'curriculum level' will refer to legally defined processes of curriculum development exercised by the government at the national level. These levels are related to the question 'how much professionalism does the government allows teachers to exercise'. At the 'teachers level', teachers' actual degree of control may be identified, and the extent to which professionalism takes place in practice may be explored. This level is related to the question 'how much professionalism do teachers choose to exercise in playing the role of teachers'. At this level teachers get their own sense of professionalism, which is the precondition to carry out their work effectively.

\textsuperscript{7} The cultures of teachers, then, are linked to their 'social', 'political', 'educational' and 'institutional' cultures which could overlap with the socio-political, economic, communication, rationality, technology systems, the morality, belief, aesthetic and maturation systems in Lawton's terms (1989).
"The government level: 'power over' or 'power with'"

Government involvement in education is a common phenomenon in both centralized and decentralized systems. Important differences between any two systems depend on how and how much the government controls the system, although the degree of control cannot simply be equated with the location of that control, as we saw Broadfoot (1996) pointing out. Even though government involvement comes in various patterns, the government always provides the largest share of resources to education and ensures its accountability.

In certain countries, curriculum development has been widely recognized as a chief domain of teachers' power and a major source of their professionalism. However, the political aspect of curriculum development is concerned with power and control, and teachers have a power relationship with the government. As the government is the main external actor, the degree of teachers' power, to a large extent, is determined by the degree of government control. The most obvious problem of government involvement, however, is that such control may weaken the professionalism of teachers.

Ginsburg (1997) demonstrated the patterns of government intervention in education by using the concept of 'power'. To help in addressing the issue of how much the government should involve itself in education, he divided power as a central element of professionalism into two concepts: 'power over' and 'power with'. 'Power over' involves the capacity to get people to act, not to act, or to not even consider acting in ways that are contrary to the interests of the powerful (Lukes, 1974). In contrast, 'power with' is manifest in relationships of co-agency. These relationships are characterised by people finding ways to satisfy their desires and to fulfil their interests without imposing on one another.

While the notion of 'power over' implies that power is 'a scarce resource to be coveted, hoarded, and used in one's own interest so that there are winners and losers', the idea of 'power with' characterizes power as 'an expanding renewable resource available through shared endeavours, dialogue, and cooperation' (Kriesberg, 1992, cited in Ginsberg, 1997: 9). In some respect, Kelly (1989) distinguished direct political intervention from influences of an indirect, less overt and possibly less effective kind. These distinctions of
The curriculum level: ‘contents-driven’ or ‘pedagogy-driven’ or ‘assessment-driven’

As I emphasized in an earlier section, the dominant pattern of curriculum control can be best understood in terms of the particular ‘forms of curriculum’. This is related to the question, ‘how does the government in each style of control attempt to regulate teachers’ curriculum practice?’ Archbald and Porter (1994: 22-3) defined three models used in most curriculum control policies: curriculum guidelines, textbook adoption and testing. These forms of curriculum control are intended to guide teachers in their decision-making about course content and to hold teachers and schools accountable for prescribed content and achievement standards:

Toward the prescriptive end of the continuum are guides that contain hierarchies of goals and objectives, describe sequence of units composing a course, and state or imply a pacing schedule. Units can be described in detail, with concepts and recommended learning strategies... Textbook adoption controls content by restricting the range of textbooks that can be used for a course... One purpose of textbook adoption policies is to reduce the potential variability in content across different sections of a course (both within and between schools). Assuming teachers using the same book use it similarly - curriculum guides are intended to facilitate this - central adoption policies increase the likelihood that students in the same course get the same content... The curriculum control policy model views teachers as both prescribing content and improving performance.

Similarly, discussing the curriculum, Bernstein (1975) identified the three message system, which included curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. According to him, ‘curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realisation of this knowledge on the part of the taught’. This analysis of message systems in curriculum is likely to be useful to analyse the form of control by government intervention in curriculum development in Korea and England.
The teachers level: ‘restricted autonomy’ or ‘extended autonomy’

‘Power over’ and ‘power with’ can be interpreted in relation to teachers’ role at the practical level. These are relative concepts whose applicability depends on the extent to which teachers operate in close relation to the government.

‘Transformations in the control of curriculum and teaching are occurring that are linked in some powerful ways to changes in the control of culture, policies, and the economy in general’ (Apple and Teitelbaum, 1986: 177). Shalem (1990) argued that teachers’ loss of control is evident in the separation of school knowledge from the lower categories of educated labour and its concentration in the hands of experts, policy advisors and education management. He described the earlier power of teachers as ‘licensed autonomy’ - an organised set of social practices, which defined the context in which teachers worked and had been secured by the struggle of educated labour (i.e. teachers).

‘When teachers’, Shalem insisted (op. cit.: 17), ‘teach from any form of prepacked school material, they are being subjected to an object, to a commodity, to a delivery. In this relation, a relation of identity between an “acted-upon subject” - subordinated to the other’s imagination, planning and selection - and an “acting-upon centre” - an all-powerful “they” (the system) - is formed’. Groundy (1989: 89) reminds us that this power is never absolute:

Although the professional practitioner theoretically has autonomy to interpret what is ‘good’ for an individual or group of clients, that autonomy is limited by the accepted meanings and understandings of the profession.

In the same vein, John and Joss (1997), referring to these aspects of government intervention, contrasted the ‘technical operative professional’ and the ‘reflective practitioner’. The former is increasingly de-skilled and deprofessionalized by ever more prescriptive rules and regulations. In contrast, the latter is a facilitator whose role is to help find an optimal course of action or a solution to problems. The relationship with the client is a collaborative ongoing dialogue which is facilitated, but not controlled, by the professional.

Fullan and Pomfret (1977) identified two possible modes of implementation of centrally developed curricula; one designated as ‘fidelity’ and the other as ‘mutual adaptation’. These concepts depend on the degree of the central governments’ intervention.
in teachers' work. Ben-Peretz (1982) also classified these modes in curriculum development as two main avenues of teacher involvement. In a restricted role, teachers can act as 'modifiers and implementer' of a developed curriculum to fit their own beliefs, pupil's need, and the nature of classroom situation. By contrast, in an extended role, teachers can serve as curriculum 'makers' in a curriculum development team as well as in their own classroom.

In this study, I will distinguish these aspects, by using the terms 'restricted autonomy' and 'extended autonomy', which derive from Hoyle (1980). If the role is restricted, teachers may be required to restrict their expertise and professional judgement to matters of classroom practice only, which may well also be prescribed for them. This is seen as narrow role. In such a system any deep dissent might be perceived as a threat. On the other hand, in the extended role, teachers may focus their attention upon the wider aspects of their professional position in education. This would allow them to consider and comment upon matters relevant to the education system as a whole.

In the case of 'restricted autonomy', teachers enjoy some degree of freedom and control over what takes place within the limits of their own classroom, but they often have little control over school goals and administration, and therefore over the context within which they operate. According to Darling-Harmond (1989), restricted autonomy includes also collective responsibility for the definition, transmission, and enforcement of a profession's standards of practice and ethics, the professionals' enforcement of collegial control (Dorrel, 1990). A profession will exercise some standards, such as entrance requirements, to maintain the quality of its members.

The danger is that teachers are devalued by 'relating the teachers' role to that of a technician delivering or implementing the curriculum' (Zumwalt, 1988: 149). This assumption formulates the concept of curriculum as a fixed agenda, and the perception that teachers should be encouraged to implement rather than make curriculum. The role, however, may stretch to understanding teachers as 'political brokers' (Schmidt et al., 1987). Schwille et al. (1983: 375) commented:

This view represents a middle ground in the classical sociological contrast between professional autonomy and bureaucratic subordination. It pictures teachers as more or less rational decision-makers who take high-level policies and other pressures into consideration in their calculation of benefits and costs.
Within the restricted autonomy role, the idea of professionalism conveys integrity and responsibility for promoting consensus, harmony and the agreed norms in a society whose needs are predetermined by the government. The professionalism of teachers may be viewed as merely the knowledge, skills and procedures used by them in the teaching process (Hoyle, 1969) and teachers may have no opportunity to question their role as defined for them by government. Shalem identified this limited professionalism with the image of teachers as ‘public servants’. In this sense, a professional teacher is the one who obeys the law and is an apolitical person. Teachers’ professionalism, thus understood, implies a strong distinction between the educational and the political:

This role of teacher as a ‘public servant’ is an image that was propagated and created to help sustain certain relations of power in which teachers were to accept their obedience to a higher authority, to a person (generally male), to a management system, and much later to the newly reductive behaviourally based curricula (1990: 1).

This makes public servants equivalent to civil servants. We shall see that this is an important variable in comparing Korean and English teachers.

On the other hand, ‘extended autonomy’ appears when the practitioners feel that they are able to make a decision in their work without approval of others or any intervention of insiders and outsiders. Practitioners should be self-directing in their actions. Wright (1970: 12) wrote:

[Extended] autonomy is the extent of decision-making power which [the professional] is permitted to exert over his own work activities within the organization... [Extended] autonomy can be considered in two ways - as freedom from outside control in a social context, or as freedom to designate one’s own activities within the organization.

If teachers have extended autonomy, they are likely to play an active role in the formulation of curriculum as well as its enactment. The assumption is that teachers are not separated from the development of curriculum. Curriculum decision-making comes into their remit in such an extended role, giving the teacher wider powers of discretion. Teachers may then develop a great sense of commitment to their work with children in the process of actual engagement with the curriculum (Clandinin and Connelly, 1992; Zumwalt, 1988).
The power and control relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention is within the centralization versus decentralization and the professionalization versus deprofessionalization continua. Although centralization does not exactly equate with deprofessionalization, and the degree of its effect varies depending on cultural contexts, generally, within a highly centralized, technically administered system of bureaucratic control, government is regarded as having power-over and teachers think of their role as that of a curriculum implementer with restricted autonomy. By contrast, in a decentralized system, the relationship between government and teachers presupposes more or less well developed cooperative relations, which guarantee teachers' extended autonomy, in which teachers think of their role as being curriculum makers. Figure 1 summarizes these relationships as the theoretical framework of this thesis:

Figure 1 The Theoretical Framework of this Thesis: the Relationships of Government, Curriculum and Teachers within Cultural Contexts
Chapter 3 Contextualization of Curriculum Development

3.1 Curriculum Development in Korea

3.1.1 Shaping curriculum development

Historical overview

Korean formal education was initiated with the foundation of 'Taehak' (the Great School) by the Kingdom of Kokuryo in the year 372. The main objective of this institution was to teach the Confucian ideology to future elites and moral education to the general public (MOE, 1994). 'Most of the cultural attributes of Korea have their provenance in Chinese civilization: Confucianism is an example' (Smith, 1992). The Yi Dynasty (1392-1910), which brought the establishment of a Confucian state, endured for more than 500 years, until Japan occupied Korea. It established a strong centralized government with efficient administrative systems. At the end of the nineteenth century, the Yi Dynasty opened its closed doors to the outside world, and a massive influx of western cultures followed. National institutes and private schools founded by Christian missionaries and patriotic leaders began to emerge. Koreans were exposed to new world views and awakened to the need for an educational system which would be fitting and proper for the changing society.

The independent development of Korean modern education was interrupted by the annexation of Korea by Japan in 1910 (MOE, 1997). It is difficult to be enthusiastic about the Japanese influence on education in Korea, which was oppressive in the extreme, but one could say that a modernization process of education took place during the period of Japanese colonialism. The Japanese government was anxious to bring all education under its control and the centralized government control tradition in Korea started here. Jayasuria (1984: 37-8) explained their policy as expansion of the governmental school system and destruction of the non-governmental school system:

One was to expand the government system of primary schools on a large scale, and the system of secondary schools on a very small scale. This was done as a foil to foreign missionary enterprise and local Korean enterprise in education. The second line of attack was to destroy the non-governmental school system, namely the missionary schools and the Korean private schools... As for the Korean private
schools, the Japanese knew very well that the private schools were breeding places of nationalism, and stood for the independence of the nation. Their curricula gave a predominant place to Korean cultural heritage, and this, too, was anathema to the Japanese who wanted to destroy the distinctive cultural identity of the Koreans.

The long period of Japanese control of the Korean school system established a tradition of centralized control which persisted after the end of Japanese power.

Independence from Japanese colonization after 1945 created the grounds for democratic education. However, central control of education by the government was retained as necessary to develop a strong nation independent from outsiders. The main concern of education was to prepare future leaders for national restoration (MOE, 1994). The Educational Law of 1949 specified the school curriculum for each level of formal education and thus established the system of centralized curricular decision-making. As a result, since the establishment of the government of the Republic of Korea, Koreans have had a National Curriculum in which curriculum decision-making has been monopolized by bureaucrats. Up to the present, or officially until 1992, Korean education has developed under highly centralized government control which has pursued uniformity. In this context, Hong (1996: 1) commented on 'centralized decision-making' as a norm in Korean education:

Historically, multi-layered combinations of Confucianism, patriarchy, colonialism, authoritarianism, and military dictatorship institutionalized the 'centralization' norm in Korea's everyday life including politics and education. Under the highly centralized education system, educational reform plans, educational goals, curriculum developments, curriculum materials, teacher education, learning objectives, time allotment of school subjects and entrance tests were all predetermined at the national level and handed directly down to schools, teachers, and students.

The National Curriculum has been revised and reimplemented six times since 1945, the sixth revision being proclaimed in 1992. It has been subject to the national policy of periodic revision every six to eight years. Generally, 'the form' of governmental control

---

8 As I indicated earlier, in 1998 a curriculum revision committee was organized to develop the seventh National Curriculum and defined the direction of educational innovation for the twenty-first century. Since that time, the committee has continued to develop the new curriculum. The seventh National Curriculum will be proclaimed in 2000. It will be implemented in 2001 for primary and lower secondary schools and in 2002 for upper secondary schools. Since teachers do not have any experience of the seventh National Curriculum yet, I will exclude discussion of it for the purpose of my thesis.
has focused on the content and pedagogy of the curriculum, which are defined through official textbooks. These are composed within the framework of the subject curricula, developed or approved by the Ministry of Education (MOE) and then handed directly down to teachers and pupils. This textbook development is an integral part of curriculum development; it provides final advice or instruction on how to implement the National Curriculum in daily classroom teaching. Implementation relies on the textbooks to the extent that teachers identify them with the curriculum itself.

Between 1945 and 1955, a school curriculum was temporarily constructed by the American Military Administration to promote democratic education. Naturally, Korean educators were eager to develop their own new syllabuses for creating a national identity and uniformity. However, this was postponed because of the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. During the war period, education became more functional, emphasizing its role in overcoming the national crisis and leading reconstruction. The ‘War-time Emergency Education Act’ in 1951 introduced two national standard admission tests for lower and upper secondary school applicants, in order to improve the quality of education. In this period, teachers relied on curricula which they wrote for themselves without a unified and well constructed National Curriculum. Although they could exert comparatively high autonomy over their classroom teaching and its contents, they put the emphasis on transmitting the knowledge and skills needed for passing these tests.

In 1955, when the war was over, educators began to revise these temporary syllabuses and construct the first revised National Curriculum. This was influenced by John Dewey’s ideas. A leading Korean educationist (Chunsuk Oh), one of Dewey’s students, introduced his ideas to the field of Korean education, where he became an influential figure (KEDI, 1994; Kwag, 1983). These ideas were progressive, of course, with

The textbooks can be categorized into two types: the MOE-developed, and those developed by private publishers. The first type is developed by MOE commissioned institutions or the National Education University which organizes a 'textbook writing' committee consisting of professors, teachers, researchers and inspectors. Private publishers enter into contracts with groups of authors to create the second type of textbook which then have to be screened by the MOE’s Textbooks Evaluation Committee. In the screening process, the emphasis is placed on checking the validity and relevance of the specification or interpretation of the National Curriculum. These books are then used across the country for a one-year trial period before publication. In primary schools, only one textbook for each subject is produced. When a new curriculum is officially introduced, the textbooks are issued and distributed at the same time (MOE, 1994; Kwag et al., 1994).
an emphasis on basing curriculum on the lives and interests of children. However, the spirit of Dewey’s progressivism\textsuperscript{10} was not faithfully reflected in specific curriculum contents and methodology, but only stated in the framing of the general curriculum guidelines such as goals and objectives:

The focus of the first National Curriculum in the classroom was not on the needs and interests of children but on the subject contents of the curriculum or textbook. The discrepancy between the goals or aims and the contents or methodology of the curriculum increased the need for the identification and critical examination of the theoretical framework used in the first curriculum development (Jo et al., 1994: 49).

In the end, the curriculum was actually developed on the basis of traditional subject boundaries, and this is the way it has remained ever since. It defined in great detail what should be taught, and how and when it should be taught in the classroom. So this first National Curriculum was subsequently termed ‘subject-oriented’ rather than ‘child-oriented’.\textsuperscript{11}

The second revision occurred in 1963. This was a year of political turmoil in Korea, including the April students’ revolution, which resulted in the collapse of the First Republic. The Second Republic also collapsed after a military coup in May. The resulting military dictatorship would continue until 1992, when a more democratic and civilian government was inaugurated. It immediately decided that the National Curriculum should reflect the government’s political philosophy. The government feared any communist influence. So the curriculum stressed anti-communism and the traditional moral ethos of the community. It also emphasized the life experiences of pupils. Thus, the second revision was announced as an ‘experience-oriented’ or ‘life-oriented’ curriculum. Its official definition reflected this idea:

[The second National Curriculum is] the total ‘experiences’ that the students undergo under the guidance of the school (MOE, 1963: 1).

\textsuperscript{10} The words ‘progressive’ and ‘progressivism’ are not always clear.

\textsuperscript{11} This categorization of the curriculum changes, in particular, the first revision as subject-oriented, the second one as experienced-oriented and the third one as discipline-oriented, has been admitted as the quasi-official opinion. Sometimes, when the government announced a new curriculum, they emphasized such a category as a leading concept in order to rationalize the curriculum change.
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Localism was trumpeted as the principle of curriculum management for this revision. However, there was little or no allowance for flexibility in the selection of content in classrooms. In fact, the centralized educational system did not allow for a classroom practice defined autonomously and dependent upon locality. On the other hand, teachers did not implement the curriculum faithfully, since teaching was mainly focused on helping pupils to pass the lower secondary entrance tests instead of following the whole curriculum. To solve this problem, the standardised assessment test for lower secondary entrance was abolished in 1968. Lee (1974: 9) described how the curriculum had been distorted by the entrance examination:

The excessive competition resulted in the implementation of abnormal or distorted curricula. When the competition was at its peak, the time allocation of curricula was quite abnormally unbalanced: the national language, science, mathematics, and social studies were considered to be included in the curriculum. Music, art and practical activities were neglected...The entrance examinations for the lower secondary schools thus adversely affected the proper objectives of compulsory education and made primary education insubstantial.

This situation was very similar to English primary education at the time of the 11+ examination between the 1930s and the 1950s. As Broadfoot (1996: 204) pointed out, 'educational provision in England has been traditionally characterised by one of the highest degree of school autonomy and, at the same time, one of the greatest preoccupations with public examination'. As the selection device for high-status grammar schools, the 11+ examination affected the curriculum in English primary schools. Both situations could be explained by 'high stakes assessment': 'teachers may be distracted from their real purpose in order to teach to the test and produce good results' (Lawton, 1996: 8). However, it should be noticed that, unlike English teachers, Korean teachers had a double burden; not only the anxiety and frustration of helping pupils to pass lower secondary entrance tests, neglecting subjects which were not included in the test, but also the obligation to conform by realizing all the subjects in the National Curriculum. Korean teachers then experienced great pressure and stress due to the distorting effect of high stakes assessment and, at the same time, the contradiction within government policy itself.

The National Curriculum was updated again in 1973. The need for rapid economic development was emphasized, and also the continued pursuit of a strong anti-communist policy and the need for a national identity and national spirit. The government used the
slogan ‘the curriculum with nationality’ to validate government ideology. This composite philosophy affected the curriculum through an emphasis on science, technology, ethics and national history. However, another aspect of this revision was a move towards a more ‘discipline-oriented curriculum’ as was being advocated by Jerome Bruner (1960). Following Bruner, the ‘structures’ and ‘basic concepts’ of each subject were emphasized, and ‘discovery and inquiry’ were promoted as excellent teaching methods (Jo et al., 1994).

The abolition of the lower secondary school entrance examination in 1968 had removed the narrow bottleneck leading to the lower secondary school. Lower secondary education was now every pupils’ preparation for entrance to upper secondary schools. With the same purpose as that previous abolition, that was in order to make teachers follow the national curriculum properly, the upper secondary entrance examination was abolished in 1976. Since then, there has been no formal national assessment system in compulsory education, except a college entrance examination run by the central government. This means that the primary curriculum has been remote from the influence of national assessment, as operated by the college entrance examination, which mainly affected secondary education. 12

In 1981, the National Curriculum was reviewed again. This was decided by the new

12 In Korea, preparing for any level of school entrance examination has always needed extra studying besides the normal school curriculum, which is based on the National Curriculum. Pupils resort to additional cramming and private tutoring to prepare for the examination. This situation has caused the neglect of the school curriculum among teachers and pupils. Thus, the government abolished the entrance examination for lower and upper secondary school in order to regulate school education, and ensured that teachers and pupils concentrated on the National Curriculum. Now, Korean pupils have a highly competitive national college entrance examination for admission to a college or university. Since this examination has not been completely related to the National Curriculum, teachers and pupils in upper secondary schools neglect the school curriculum, as before they did in primary and lower secondary education. The intensity of preparation for college entrance examinations is so high that upper secondary schools are turning into preparatory schools. Therefore, the government has tried to relate the national college entrance examination to the National Curriculum at secondary level, in order to make schools concentrate on the national curriculum in the classroom. In this respect, the government established the ‘Scholastic Achievement Examination for College Entrance’ in 1981. Interestingly, in England, as will be seen in 3.2.1 of this Chapter, the National Curriculum has been criticised because it is tightly linked with the national assessment scheme, narrowing children’s experience, as schools mainly focus on what the National Curriculum indicates and aim at good results in the assessment. While the Korean government abolished the national entrance examination for secondary schools to make teachers conform to the National Curriculum, the English government established SATs to enforce the National Curriculum.
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government of the Fifth Republic, which came to power in 1980. This fourth revision was entrusted to a professional curriculum institute, known as the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI),\(^{13}\) and so it has been recognized as a ‘Research and Development (R&D) Curriculum’. Politically, KEDI is a very bureaucratic and pro-governmental institution, however, even though its members are not civil servants. Thus, in practice, there was no big difference from previous curriculum developments as to who was in control of the curriculum. The intention of the government was to provide professional legitimacy for highly centralized curriculum decision-making, not to alter the centralized control of the curriculum.

For this revision, KEDI introduced an integrated subject curriculum in the earlier years in primary schools. The aim was to have a more ‘humanistic-oriented’ curriculum, which emphasized the education of the whole person. However it is difficult to identify a particular leading theory, different from prior ones, which influenced this revision. Therefore, some scholars have argued (Jo et al., 1994) that the fourth revision was ‘a composite curriculum’ based on a mixture of subject-oriented, experience-oriented, life-oriented and discipline-oriented curricula.

The fifth revision occurred in 1987-1988. By this time, the Korean Republic was politically stable, and internationally the nation was referred to as a ‘Tiger Economy from the Pacific Rim’. This was a golden period for the nation, and Korea hosted the twenty-fourth World Olympic Games in 1988. Like the fourth revision, this one could not be identified with any leading curriculum theory. It emphasized ‘creativity to cope with social changes’ and ‘diversity of content and methodology’ with respect to the individual differences, abilities, and needs of pupils. However, these goals could not be sought by individual teachers according to their own judgement, but only in the framework of the National Curriculum, in which the government indicated more teaching strategies than before.

\(^{13}\) KEDI, which was founded in 1972 as a curriculum research and development centre under the MOE, has undertaken comprehensive research on Korean education and policies. KEDI set the slogan ‘plan rationally, practice efficiently, and evaluate scientifically.’ The first project of KEDI was an elementary and middle school curriculum reform, as a part of the third curriculum revision, which included a) child-centred instruction, b) follow-up and an evaluation plan, and c) new programmes for teacher education.
Finally the sixth National Curriculum was introduced in 1992. In this period, a more democratic and civilian government inaugurated the Seventh Republic and abolished the military dictatorship. The long traditional trend of centralization has begun to change, as a result of socio-political, economic and educational changes such as democratization, the staging of the country's first local elections and the introduction of a partial local autonomy system. This sixth revision emphasized moral character, democratic citizenship and human individuality, and the particular purposes were 'democratization' and 'decentralization'. The principles set for the sixth revision were:

a) decentralization of decision-making related to curriculum development;
b) structural diversity of the curriculum;
c) relevant contents of the curriculum;
d) efficiency in operation of the curriculum (MOE, 1992a; 1997: 50).

In all previous revisions of the curriculum, reform had been restricted to content and methodology. For the sixth revision, it was extended to the mode of control, which changed from centralization to some decentralization. The new curriculum was created by an independent curriculum committee, which was intended to be less influenced by the government. Up to the fifth National Curriculum, there has been no significant teachers' participation in curriculum development. Teachers had been 40% of the curriculum committee in the fifth curriculum development process (Han, 1992), but this might have been only rhetoric and pretence (Ahn, 1997). In the development of the sixth National Curriculum, a greater proportion of teachers (74%) took part in the research committee for the curriculum revision. However, these were mostly experienced teachers in administrative positions in school who were not much involved in teaching. Classroom teachers' views were perhaps unlikely to be much represented. There was little opportunity to introduce views which came from teachers' own practice. Furthermore, in reality, the

14 The socio-political democratization movement in recent decades inspired the need for participation among lay citizens. The labour movement helped people to have a voice in decision-making processes which impact their working conditions. Democratization in Korea is an on-going movement. Ironically, the agents for democratic change are the ex-authoritarian governmental officials: still occupying their positions, they execute democratization programmes with the same authoritarian hands (Hong, 1996).
members who had the major role in curriculum decision-making in the Deliberative Council, in evaluating the draft and defining the final version of the National Curriculum, were of exactly the same type as before; the majority were from MOE and KEDI (Ahn, 1996a). Using Broadfoot’s term (1996), ‘the location of control’ was still at the centre, although some intended its degree of control to be reduced. However, although appointed to the Council by the government and given only a limited role in deciding about the curriculum, the increased number of teachers who were involved could be seen as a positive step towards teachers’ input into the curriculum.

On the basis of a review of current curriculum theories, it has been argued that the sixth National Curriculum can be best described as integrating various theories, such as the subject-oriented, experience-oriented, life-oriented and discipline-oriented curriculum theories; in this respect it is like the fourth and fifth revisions (Jo et al., 1994). This means that some subjects in the curriculum can be said to be aiming at the development of knowledge and skills that are useful in daily life, while others are more academic, aiming at the development of an understanding of the world. Furthermore, although the educational contents of academic subjects should still be understood in terms of the forms or the structure of knowledge, the principles of experience-oriented curriculum theories can be implemented as methodological principles. The methodology is now not quite as rigid as it was formerly.

The characteristics of curriculum development since 1992

Academic features

The sixth National Curriculum specifies the nation’s educational goals and objectives for each level of school. It includes the goals/objectives for each of the school subject areas to be taught, the number of days of school attendance, and the hours devoted to instruction; and other details of managing the individual subjects are further clarified (MOE, 1997). Although the details are somewhat different depending on the school level, the forms of the school curricula have been basically the same at all times since the first revision. The curriculum for each level of school is compiled in one volume which consists of two parts: ‘General Guidelines’ and ‘Guiding Principles’ (MOE, 1992a; 1992b). The ‘general
guidelines' are the same regardless of the school level, whilst the 'guiding principles' differ depending on the level of school and the subject.

The 'General Guidelines' for the sixth National Curriculum consist of four parts:

a) the status of the curriculum;
b) general framework of the curriculum;
c) organization of the curriculum;
d) time allotment by subject, and extracurricular activities.

a) Compared to the previous curricula, 'the status of the curriculum' is newly introduced to emphasize the decentralized characteristics of the new curriculum, and 'basic guidelines for the organization and implementation of the curriculum' are more specified than before, to reinforce the role of the MPEAs and schools.

b) The 'general framework' identifies the well-educated person as a person who is healthy, independent, creative and moral. The emphasis on creativity is so that citizens can cope with a more democratic society. They will also have to cope with information technology, more international ideas, and much more 'high-tech' industrialization. The revision also encourages variety in educational contents and methods in accordance with pupils' individuality, ability and careers. There is some flexibility, to allow attention to the needs of individual schools and teachers. In some degree, the new curriculum reflects a child-oriented or progressive approach. The framework emphasizes the individual's in-built potential and creativity.

c) The 'organization of the curriculum' comprises subject matters, extracurricular activities, and optional courses offered by schools. Optional courses were not included in the previous curricula. The main subjects in primary schools are moral education, Korean language, mathematics, social science, science, physical education, music, fine arts, and practical arts. In the first two grades, subjects had already been more integrated than in the other grades. In the fifth revision, social science was integrated with Korean language, and science was integrated with mathematics. However, that integration was criticised as just 'combining and arranging two subject titles and contents' instead of 'integrating by topics or themes' (Jo et al., 1994: 46). In the sixth revision, the subdivisions for the first two grades are described as 'Disciplined life' which covers moral education, 'Intelligent life'
which integrates social science and science, and ‘Pleasant life’ which includes physical
education, music, fine art. On content, there is a re-organization towards integrated
knowledge, which attempts to abolish the traditional fragmentation of knowledge.
Compared to the earlier curriculum, moral education has continued to be emphasized, to
strengthen children’s social morality in every subject and in extracurricular activities. The
instructional time for moral education in the first two grades is increased from one hour
to two hours per week. The content of practical arts has been changed to heighten its
practicality for real life. The starting time for practical arts has been changed from Grade
(Year) Four to Grade Three.

d) The sixth National Curriculum defines how many teaching hours each subject
should receive in the grade-based timetable, as Table 1 below indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Areas</th>
<th>Time Allotment* by Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplined life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Education</td>
<td>60** 68 34 34 34 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean language</td>
<td>210 238 238 204 204 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>120 136 136 137 170 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellige Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>120 136 102 102 102 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 136 136 136 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102 102 102 102 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>180 238 68 68 68 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68 68 68 68 68 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- - 34 34 34 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 34 34 68 68 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional Courses***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- - 34 34 34 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>709 850 952 986 1,054 1,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The minimum numbers of total instructional hours, by subject and grade, during 34 school weeks a year
(only 30 for Grade One).
** One instructional hour covers 40 minutes.\(^{15}\)
*** Optional courses depend completely on the individual school’s choice.


\(^{15}\)
To compare with England, as will be shown in 3.2.1, the time allotment should be calculated by
hours (not by 40 minutes). If this is calculated by hours, for example, the grand total for Grade Two
will be 566 hours and that for Grade Six will be 703 hours. Each optional course will be 23 hours.
The ‘Guiding Principles’ list the subjects which have to be taught and offer a five-part outline of each subject: a) Rationale; b) Objectives; c) Contents; d) Instruction; and e) Assessment.

a) The ‘rationale’ describes why and how a subject should be taught, and presents the general guidelines for teachers to use in determining the direction of their teaching.
b) The ‘objectives’ are concerned with the targets which pupils should achieve. However, objectives are indicated by the contents rather than the pupils’ expected performance.
c) The ‘contents’ section is seen as the most important part of the curriculum. It describes the level and the scope of knowledge to be dealt with for each subject and each school level. It presents what is to be taught, and how, in great detail. Each subject is divided into general units, sub-units, and individual topics, providing a step-by-step analysis of the prescribed contents. The detailed explication of the content of the curriculum appears as the table of contents in each official textbook. Teachers have little or no space to interpret the curriculum content according to their own judgement. Consequently, the National Curriculum in Korea could be characterized as ‘a content and pedagogy-driven curriculum’ in terms of ‘forms of control’. For example, the specification of curriculum contents and, for purposes of comparison, the table of contents of the textbook for Grade Three social science are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 The National Curriculum Requirements and Textbook Compared in Korea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The sixth National Curriculum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specification of Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- landscape and maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*** land and fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads and houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawing our local area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- utilization and preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources of the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- necessities for life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production from nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production in factories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>markets and stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people and work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• general units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) The 'instruction' section offers general guidelines for teachers. It shows them how to develop a lesson plan, and how to prepare and use teaching aids. In this revision, besides textbook-driven and whole-class instruction, the curriculum encourages experiments, small-group discussions, inquiry and field trips etc. e) The 'assessment' section suggests that teachers use a variety of methods, such as written tests and observation etc. In particular, pencil and paper tests in the first two grades have been abolished. The number of school-wide tests has decreased from four times to twice a year. Assessment is to be diagnostic and formative rather than summative and evaluative in primary schools, in which the standard numerical grading from 1 to 5 ('Su' to 'Ga') is abolished. Teachers provide annual reports, based on general and broad descriptions of each pupil's performance (Han, 1995).

However, in this section, there is nothing parallel to the levels of description and the attainment targets of the English National Curriculum. The pupils' expected performance is merely defined in terms of the contents of the subjects, and written in the same style and form of language for all subjects, such as 'pupils should achieve such and such contents'. This conforms with the form of control in the Korean National Curriculum not being through assessment but through content and pedagogy defined in textbooks. In terms of Bernstein's three message systems (1975), content, pedagogy and evaluation, the Korean sixth curriculum continues to govern through controlling the majority of content and keeping a textbook adoption policy, and may therefore be characterized as 'content and pedagogy-driven.'

Administrative features

It is claimed that the sixth National Curriculum has aimed at 'some decentralization of curriculum decision-making':

16 The organization of educational administration in Korea is composed of the MOE, MPEA, and the District Office of Education (DOE). Since the sixth National Curriculum, the MOE develops and implements national educational projects, approves and publishes textbooks, and supervises MPEA for educational policy planning and implementation including curriculum development. MPEA has educational autonomy at the local level in making educational decisions. It works out budgets, and controls primary, secondary and special schools. DOE is the autonomous educational organization of a city or county (MOE, 1997; Jo et al., 1994).
we intend to turn away from stigmatized monotony, exclusiveness, and rigidity of curriculum content and, at the same time, enlarge the discretion of local educational authorities and schools in curriculum decision-making (MOE, 1992a: 99).

So, it is defined as 'a general framework for educational contents and evaluation' at national level, 'guidelines of MPEAs' at local level and finally 'criteria for organization, implementation, and evaluation' at the individual school level. It emphasizes democratic, professional and site-based curriculum decision-making. It hands over more powers to MPEAs, schools and teachers in relation to curriculum decision-making. This change can be seen as most remarkable compared to earlier curricular policies. It is a tremendous step, as it allows at last for a desirable degree of flexibility. The framework now prescribes that each MPEA should provide schools in its area with a set of guidelines for curriculum organization and implementation, based on research concerning the special needs and the circumstances of local schools and communities.

Since the first National Curriculum, curriculum content has been distributed across school time and organized into subject matters and extracurricular activities. Previously it covered the whole time available in primary schools. However, as I mentioned above, the sixth revision offers optional courses for one hour a week from Grade Three, depending on the school's situation and the children's needs. Furthermore, instruction time for Grades Four, Five and Six teachers has been reduced by one hour a week reflecting a need for equality of teaching-loads with Grades One, Two and Three teachers (see Table 1). Most significant, the new curriculum tries to provide more autonomy for the local authority, and each individual school with more authority in curriculum planning and operation to control its own educational quality.

However, the MOE still decides whether to change the curriculum or not, what to change, and how to change. The sixth National Curriculum still does not allow teachers to participate actively and fully in decision-making process at national level (Ahn, 1996a), even though 'the decentralization of curriculum decision-making policy' encourages

---

17 The grand total time is 1,020 hours for Grade Four and 1,088 for Grades Five and Six in the fifth National Curriculum, 986 for Grade Four and 1,054 for Grades Five and Six in the sixth National Curriculum.
teachers' involvement as major decision-makers at school level. Furthermore, teachers are still obliged to use the official textbooks that cover the specified content imposed by government. In other words, although the Educational Law was alleged to devolve power to the local level, it brought no fundamental changes in the traditional 'power over' bureaucratic character of the system. Therefore, the system is still to be classified in the category of 'centralized control', though moving towards 'decentralized control.'

3.1.2 Teacher education

Pre-service education

In 1895 the first institution for the training of primary school teachers within the upper secondary level was established. It operated from 1895 to 1962. In 1962, two-year national teachers' colleges were established, with the upgrading of the 'normal' schools in the secondary education sector. Admission to the national teachers' colleges was competitive. Tuition, room and board were made available to pupils who qualified, with the understanding that after graduation they would teach for at least two years in the primary schools to which they were assigned (Gannon, 1985). Since 1981 there have been two types of primary teacher education: national teachers' colleges and colleges of education in four-year universities. The former were also upgraded to four-year colleges granting bachelor's degrees. Students, who are still provided with tuition, room and board when attending national teachers colleges, are obligated, upon graduation, to teach for at least four years in the primary schools to which they are assigned.

National colleges are financed by central government, with the exception of Ewha Women's University, which is private. Furthermore, since all institutional arrangements are under the strict control of the MOE, they all offer essentially the same programme for study. Personnel selection, funding, curriculum, admission policies, graduation requirements, calendars, events, enrollment patterns, and degree offerings are all under the purview of the MOE. The colleges of education in four-year universities also offer a four-year university-affiliated programme which is a source of primary teachers and the major source of secondary teachers. Primary school teachers are trained at 11 national teachers'
colleges, and since 1989 at the department of primary education at Korea National Teacher University and Ewha Women’s University.

The curriculum covered in the four-year teachers’ university courses consists of: a) a general education course, b) a major field of study as an enrichment course, and c) pedagogical training and practice, which are all planned by the MOE. The general education course includes foundational courses in education, such as educational theory and history. It is intended to cultivate a broad, basic knowledge of education. The major fields of study include a variety of subjects, through which prospective teachers can become specialized teachers. All students must select a major from the available options such as national ethics, Korean language, history of civilization, Korean society, hygiene, natural science, mathematics, and foreign languages. However, the main objective of primary initial teacher education in Korea is to prepare general subject teachers rather than teachers with one or two special teaching subjects. Among the required qualities of teachers, humane character, warmth of heart and an altruistic attitude are seen as most important dimensions, apart from the expertise and skill of teaching (KEIM, 1992; MOE, 1997).

Pedagogical training and practice include specific pedagogy and skills associated with teaching subject matters, and are intended to produce broadly-informed teachers and to raise the professionalism of teaching. Teachers’ colleges have a primary school attached, where the students are required to complete at least eight weeks of on-the-job training. In the course of teaching practice, a student teacher is obliged to take an internship which includes four weeks of observation of class instruction and four weeks of actual teaching and performance of related duties, such as classroom management, writing a syllabus, and school administrative work. However, the most prominent weakness of teacher education in Korea has been indicated as the lack of teaching practice, compared with other countries. Although extended from four weeks to eight weeks for whole years of training since 1981, the small proportion of teaching practice throughout the four-year course brings into doubt the relevance of the curriculum for teachers (KEDI, op. cit.).

Teachers are licensed, by the MOE, as regulated in a Presidential order. This licensing classifies them in four levels; a) grade II teacher, b) grade I teacher, c) deputy headteacher and d) headteacher. Teachers who have completed courses for teaching
primary and secondary schools in a college or university receive a grade II teacher certificate at graduation in addition to a bachelor’s degree. The grade I teacher certificate is granted after three years of experience plus 240 hours of in-service training. Teachers who possess the grade I certificate and more than 15 years of teaching experience can be promoted to supervisory positions. Being a headteacher is the top position that teachers can ascend to through their teaching career. This hierarchical order has been seen as a drain of competent, experienced teachers to administrative positions, creating a tendency to ignore classroom teachers (KEDI, 1988). The present hierarchical order of licensing militates against the professionalization of teachers.

Graduates of the national colleges of education had the privilege of priority in appointments: upon graduation, all had been guaranteed posts in primary education, whereas graduates of private colleges of education needed to take a public screening test. However, since the 1990 reform of the teacher appointment system, public schools hire all teachers, as civil servants, through the test operated by the regional boards of education, while private schools hire teachers through self-conducted procedures. The transfer of public school teachers follows definite rules and laws. Teachers transfer to other schools within the same school district every three or four years.

In-service education

In-service education has been a legal requirement for teachers since 1953. Its defined purpose is to improve educational expertise, enhance the quality of teaching, establish the teaching profession, and encourage a sense of commitment. Since the 1970s in-service teacher education has been changed to a more site-based approach, emphasizing specific knowledge and skills for teachers (KEDI, 1987).

The teacher training institutes, which are authorized by the government, form a two-tier system. At the central level, there are three institutes: the National Institute for Educational Research and Training, the Comprehensive Teacher In-service Institute for primary and secondary teachers, Korea National Teacher University, and the Educational Administrator Training Institute of the College of Education, Seoul National University. At the local level, there are three types of teacher training institutes in the provinces and municipalities, under the jurisdiction of the superintendent of the office of education; 11
primary teacher training institutes attached to teachers' colleges, 16 secondary teacher training institutes attached to the national colleges of education, and MPEAs set up their own in-service teacher institutes. All in-service programmes are sponsored or arranged by the MOE.

The availability of in-service education aims not only to refresh teachers' knowledge and professional skills, but also to provide the necessary training for promotion to higher grades (Ofsted, 1994a; Kim, 1991). In-service training programmes are classified into four types, namely: qualification training, enrichment training, adjustment training and general training. 'Qualification' training is occasioned by the need for promotion to a higher grade, and varies depending on the audience it is targeted for. For grade II teachers to qualify as grade I teachers, they must earn the required credits in nine subjects. The 'enrichment' training programme is to establish a firm theoretical base for education and teaching, keeping abreast with the rapidly advancing frontiers of knowledge. Educational administrators and school managers are the major participants in this programme. The 'adjustment' programme is offered under the direct supervision of the National Institute for Educational Research and Training and teacher training institutes in provinces or municipalities. It targets headteachers, deputy headteachers and teachers who resume teaching after a long leave of absence. 'General' training is intended to broaden overall knowledge of educational theories and practices. When the new curriculum is introduced, the government offers general training programmes for supervisors and school teachers in order to improve their understanding and efficiency in dealing with the school curriculum making process. The main strategy for introducing the new curriculum to schools is a series of in-service training programmes. At least one teacher and the headteacher of each school participate in the programmes. They are in turn to deliver what they have learned in the programme to other teachers. However, according to a research (KICE, 1998), the training for the new curriculum through these general training programmes has been merely verbal and rarely helpful to teachers, and the majority of the teachers responded that they had had no experience of in-service education for the new curriculum.
3.2 Curriculum Development in England

3.2.1 Shaping curriculum development

Historical overview

If we know that in England a national system of primary and secondary education was established only by the 1944 Education Act and that there was no attempt to prescribe a national curriculum between then and 1988, we may be surprised when Lawton (1989; 1996) pointed out that it was only partly true that English education has had a long tradition of curriculum freedom and has avoided central control over the curriculum:

It is sometimes asserted that in England there is a long tradition of teacher control of the curriculum. This is not true. Before 1944 there were very strong central influences: elementary schools had been tightly controlled by Codes from 1862 until they were replaced by a ‘Handbook of Suggestions’ in 1905 which continued to act as a powerful set of curriculum guidelines; county secondary schools were centrally controlled by Regulation from 1904 onward - immediately following the establishment of county secondary schools by the 1902 Education Act (1989: 35).

The elementary school curriculum during the nineteenth century defined a deliberately inferior and limited kind of education designed for the lower orders, while the public school curriculum was designed for leadership (Gordon and Lawton, 1978). For most of the nineteenth century, the government controlled the elementary curriculum through the allocation of grants dependent upon strict assessment procedures. In 1833 a proposal to establish a system of national education was rejected because it involved so much state control and expense. However, the House of Commons was induced to grant the sum of £20,000 to assist the National and British Societies to build schools (Dent, 1982). A Select Committee on Education in 1838 exposed the need for educating the poor, and action was called for, which was the first indication of the responsibility of the State for policy in education. In 1839 a Committee of the Privy Council was set up to

---

18 ‘This was the first successful attempt at state intervention in elementary education in Great Britain, although at this stage great care was taken to deny any intention of state control and no mention was made of the curriculum’ (Gordon and Lawton, 1978: 8)
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control the allocation of grants to schools, and Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (HMI) was established to oversee the correct spending of grants.

In those days, criticism of a number of inadequate and unsatisfactory features of the existing elementary education system was widespread. The Newcastle Report (1861) noted a tendency to neglect the more elementary subjects, the 3Rs, in less effective schools. As a result, through the Revised Code of 1862, the government brought into being the system of ‘payment by results’, which continued until the end of the century. A school’s grants were dependent on pupil attendance and its success in teaching the contents of the elementary school curriculum, according to the results of an annual examination of all children in the 3Rs. The Revised Code resulted in excessive concentration on the ‘basics’, and teachers protested at the prescriptive syllabuses. It represented a high point of state control of the elementary school curriculum.

The Education Act of 1870 introduced a system of public elementary education. This incorporated a broad measure of curriculum guidance through Elementary Codes (1871; 1875) issued by the government. This was an example of centralized control over the curriculum. However, it gave a certain amount of flexibility to individual teachers to develop their own educational practices. State control was more firmly reduced by the ending of ‘payment by results’ in 1898. This abolition and the Code of 1895 which abolished the annual examination of pupils in the higher standards, led to teachers creating their own syllabuses to meet the needs and ambitions of their pupils.

Early in the twentieth century, the 1902 Education Act swing further away from central control of the elementary schools. The Act abolished the School Boards and transferred their responsibilities to the recently created County and Borough Councils, which were larger bodies than the School Boards. Control of teachers’ salaries and finance, secular education, the curriculum and other aspects of school administration passed to the new Local Educational Authorities (LEAs) (Baron and Howell, 1974). Curriculum control was reinforced by the Elementary Code of 1904 which, laid down some broad requirements for teachers and the Secondary Regulations (1904) which while demanding that schools followed a central curriculum, left a large measure of choice to the individual teachers. Centralized control of the elementary curriculum in the form of regulation was replaced by a Handbook of Suggestions (Board of Education) in 1905, which was revised
from time to time. These publications were usually thought to mark an important stage in
the liberalization of the elementary school (Gordon and Lawton, 1978).

In 1927 a Consultative Committee’s report recommended the creation of two stages
of education: Primary and Secondary. This was followed in 1931 by a second Consultative
Report, ‘The Primary School’. The report could be regarded as the transition from the
elementary tradition of schools ‘for the children of the labouring poor’ to a new and in
some respects ‘progressive’ view of the type of schooling that was appropriate for all
children up to the age of eleven (Gordon and Lawton, op. cit.). This report recommended
changing the content and style of education in primary schools. Not only did it give the
teachers great freedom but it encouraged them to seek by experiment even better methods.
However, the ‘11+ examination’ as the means of selection of pupils for admission to
secondary education developed and seriously affected the curriculum in primary schools.19
Also they were still inspected by local and central inspectors.

Central control over the curriculum was further loosened in the period from 1944 to
the 1960s. The intention of the 1944 Education Act was to establish a national system of
education, but there was no attempt to prescribe a national curriculum (Ashcroft and
Palacio, 1995). The only subject it specified was religion with a daily communal act of
worship. The Act emphasized pupils’ age, abilities and aptitudes as the relevant factors in
determining their education but the state continued to delegate curriculum planning to local
education authorities and there was no mention of curriculum regulations. Dent (1982: 81)
described the trend of the next 25 years as follows:

‘Despite the 11+ examination, a growing number of schools were during 1950s
and 1960s providing increasingly wide and liberal curricula, making extensive use
of individual and group methods of learning, encouraging initiative, activity, and
enterprise in their pupils, giving them a great deal of freedom to determine the jobs
they [teachers] would do, the way they would carry them out, and the speed at
which they would work.

19 ‘As a selection process, the ‘11+’ was the cause of more anxiety, frustration and disappointment
than any other feature in the English educational system. Without realizing the distress caused by
the 11+, it is not possible to understand fully the trend towards comprehensive organization of
secondary education...From the late 1950s onwards growing numbers of LEAs abolished the 11+:
that is to say, they abandoned some of its techniques, or spread the tests over a longer period, or
otherwise rendered the selection procedure more innocuous and less obvious. The rapid increase
during the 1960s of Comprehensive schools expedited this process’ (Dent, 1982: 87-9).
During this period, the curriculum became the concern of individual schools and teachers with little interference from the LEAs. The government determined broad educational policy and allocated resources, the LEAs were responsible for the implementation of educational policy with wide margins of local initiative, and schools defined their curriculum policy (Hall, 1985). This period may be seen as the era of almost unquestioned professional control of the curriculum, with the gradual abolition of the 11+ examination. It consolidated the English decentralized mode of curriculum control.  

The idea of a return to more central influence on the curriculum started in the early 1960s. In 1962, the government established the Curriculum Studies Group to make helpful contributions to curriculum development. Partly because of teachers’ indignation, this group was soon replaced by the Schools Council for Curriculum and Examinations (SCCE) with a majority of representatives of teacher organizations and subject associations dominating most of its committees, which was launched in 1964 (Osborn and Black, 1994). Under strong teacher influence, the SCCE engaged in research and curriculum development, producing reports, materials, and teaching programmes which the individual school or teacher could use or reject. Its work was exploratory and developmental rather than prescriptive (Thornton, 1993).

Another landmark of this period was the Plowden Report (1967) which encouraged the child-centred or progressive view. Bernstein (1996a) suggested that this report marked the official shift from the traditional-performance model to the progressive-competence model of pedagogic practice. Furthermore, abolition of the 11+ examination in most LEAs increased teachers’ autonomy concerning the curriculum and reinforced progressive educational practices.

At this time, the Korean primary curriculum, though it too acknowledged progressive approaches, still adopted traditional models of knowledge and was operated by highly centralized governmental control. In England, by contrast, partly because the teachers had no prescriptive unified curriculum, a minority of educationalists challenged what they saw as the uncontrolled spread of progressive practice in schools. In particular, the ‘Black Papers’ (Cox and Dyson, 1969a; 1969b; 1977), a series of right-wing pamphlets,  

However, there was a strong control of the grammar school curriculum by public examinations at 16 and 18.
questioned the standards of achievements in schools. They claimed, controversially, that
the progressive approach not only failed to produce improved results, but that levels of
achievement were significantly below those which resulted from the more ‘traditional’
approaches. Within this context, in the early 1970s, the Curriculum Publication Group
within HMI were discussing the possibility of having a common curriculum of some kind.

In 1976 the Prime Minister James Callaghan’s speech at Ruskin College stimulated
the ‘Great Debate’ on education. In his speech he implicitly criticised schools for failing
to provide suitable manpower for a modern industrial society. He stressed that school
standards had to improve dramatically. The ‘Great Debate’ was about what should be
taught and how education should be delivered. This marked the beginning of the change
of ownership in primary education. Its result was to promote the acceptance of the right
of the government to be directly concerned with what was taught, the standards children
attained, monitoring the quality of teaching and the management of primary education
(Osborn and Black, 1994).

A Green Paper, Education in Schools (DES, 1977) further emphasized the necessity
for the Secretary of State to have responsibilities for the curriculum. During the 1980s
several reports were published by the DES, which can be seen as further insinuating the
idea that if standards in the schools were to be raised to the level which the nation
demanded, the control of the curriculum would have to be organized nationally (e.g. A
Framework for the School Curriculum, 1980; Better Schools, 1985). These reports tended
to favour a subject-based core curriculum and also discussed the time which should be
allocated to it. Furthermore, the professional controlled SCCE was replaced by two
separate bodies, the Schools Curriculum Development Committee, and the Schools
Examination Council, whose members were appointed by the Secretary of State for
Education rather than being composed of representatives of professional and educational
organizations. Control of curriculum was now moving into hands of politicians. This

The 1988 Education Act included at its centre the introduction and implementation
of a National Curriculum. This imposed a series of subjects on primary, as well as
secondary, schools and what came to be seen as an over-elaborate testing programme,
which resulted in a political and bureaucratic curriculum. Control of what was taught and
tested was now directly in the hands of the government. From 1989 the National Curriculum got under way in some subjects and starting from the beginnings of the new 'Key stages'. Curriculum implementation was shortly followed by Standard Attainment Tests (SATs). The National Curriculum was criticized as over-subject to non-expert political interference and untested assumptions. Ashcroft and Palacio (1995: 8) commented:

The perceived over-politicization of education and the stresses caused to teachers and children by an overcrowded, over-assessed curriculum led to some fairly concerted opposition to the National Curriculum.

For that reason, and several others, the government encountered considerable opposition to the introduction of the tests. In 1993 most primary and secondary teachers boycotted the annual tests at Key Stages 1 and 3. Many members of the profession were very strongly against 'testing', 'league tables' and the 'overloaded curriculum' (Lawton, 1996; Osborn and Black, 1994). The government responded by appointing Sir Ron Dearing as a problem-solver.

Dearing’s review reduced the content of the National Curriculum quite substantially, after consulting about 4,400 schools and many other organizations and individuals. His report emphasized that individual primary schools should build around the National Curriculum to create a coherent whole curriculum, and use the National Curriculum as the basis for their own school-based curriculum design (Lawton, op. cit.). After the acceptance of this final report and the responses of the advisory groups, which were composed of teachers for each subject and set up by the new School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA), the revised National Curriculum was published in 1995, with a starting date of August 1995 for primary schools.

Lawton (1989) summarised several early criticisms of the National Curriculum:

a) the bureaucratic style which seemed more concerned with control than with improving quality;
b) publication of test results;
c) an old-fashioned subject based curriculum;
d) not applying to independent schools.

Since 1998, the Qualification and Curriculum Authority (QCA), which merged the old School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA) and the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ), has had the responsibility to keep under review all aspects of the statutory
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The main changes involved a slimming down of the contents, a reduction in the level of prescription and a simplification in the means of assessment in order to allow teachers 'scope for professional judgement' (Dearing, 1993). The workload of teachers and the demands for testing and recording were reduced. Schools would have to interpret the National Curriculum and use it as the basis for their own school-based curriculum plan:

*The National Curriculum* (DFE, 1995) carefully avoided any direction about how the primary curriculum should be organised - or taught...The national curriculum was a top-down imposition, but the whole curriculum has to be school-based. There is also no legal requirement for a school to have a School Development Plan (SDP), although there are strong expectations that planning should take place, with or without a formal document (Lawton, 1996: 49).

In 1996, the new Labour government announced the policy of the 'literacy hour' and 'numeracy hour' signifying a new curricular preoccupation with these 'basics' in primary schools in England. Primary schools were more or less promised major cuts in specified content and more flexibility in the National Curriculum as a whole, and strongly recommended to spend more time on the 3R's. The highly structured literacy hour started in Autumn 1998, with detailed guidelines supplied in *The National Literacy Strategy: Framework for Teaching* (DfEE, 1998a). From Autumn 1999, it has been followed by a similarly structured daily 'numeracy hour' for all pupils, according to *The Implementation of the Numeracy Strategy* (DfEE, 1998b). These strategies are intended to provide detailed day-to-day references for classroom teachers, about the 'what, how and when' of teaching (Ofsted, 1998a; 1998b). Unfortunately, these 'hours' are even more prescriptive than the original version of the National Curriculum. Though still non-statutory, they are perceived by many as extremely rigid in their requirements and as evidence that the new and non-statutory curriculum, including National Curriculum programmes of study, attainment target and associated assessment arrangements. The QCA requires schools and organizations to development the school curriculum for September 2000 as follows: a) preparation (May - August 1998), b) development (September - December 1998), c) informal consultation on draft proposals (January - March 1999) d) formal consultation on the Secretary of State’s proposals (April - August 1999 e) publication, distribution and dissemination (September 1999 - September 2000) (QCA leaflet *The Next Steps in Developing the School Curriculum*, September 1998). Like the case of the seventh curriculum development in Korea, since English teachers had no experience of this new proposal of the time of my fieldwork, I will not discuss it in depth in my thesis.

23 *The Review of the National Curriculum in England: The Secretary of State's Proposals* (QCA, 1999) proposed the literacy and numeracy hour would be statutory from September 2000.
Labour government is certainly no less intrusive in curriculum than its Conservative predecessor which introduced the original 1988 National Curriculum. However, introduction of these ‘hours’ is offset by a much more relaxed view of the ‘non-core’ foundation subjects.

*The characteristics of curriculum development since 1988*

**Academic features**

The National Curriculum was presented as an attempt to give all children an entitlement to a broad education, and to ensure that standards were established and the progress of individual children charted. The 1995 version presents together in a single volume (DFE, 1995) all the required subjects for five to sixteen year olds as revised by Dearing. It applies to pupils of compulsory school age (5 - 16) in maintained schools and is organized on the basis of four Key Stages. The Key Stages are defined in section 3 (3-6) of the Education Reform Act 1988, as amended by the Education Act 1993, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stage</th>
<th>Ages and Year</th>
<th>Pupils' Ages</th>
<th>Year Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The National Curriculum may be said to consist of three components: Foundation Subjects, Programmes of Study, and Attainment Targets. Designed on the basis of ten subjects, it has moved primary schools towards a more subject-specific teaching approach. These are three ‘core subjects’ - English, mathematics and science, and seven others - information technology, design and technology, history, geography, art, music and physical education, and a modern language from age 11.

The ‘programmes of study’ set out the content which pupils should be taught for each subject and for each key stage. These are common requirements for all subjects, general
requirements for each subject, and each key stage's programme of study. The specification of content of the post-Dearing curriculum is less than in the original version; there has been a general 'slimming down'.

The 'attainment targets' set out the expected standards of pupils' performance, and what has to be assessed. Detailed 'statements of attainment' in the 1988 National Curriculum were replaced by more holistic 'Level Descriptions' and 'End of Key Stage Descriptions', which are 'joined-up' descriptions of key elements in the Dearing Review. The differences between 'Level Descriptions' and 'End of Key Stage Descriptions' were officially clarified:

At the end of Key Stage 1, 2 and 3, for all subjects except art, music and physical education, standards of pupils' performance are set out in eight level descriptions of increasing difficulty, with an additional description above level 8 to help teachers in differentiating exceptional performance. For art, music, and physical education, end of key stage descriptions set out the standard of performance expected of the majority of pupils at the end of each key stage. Descriptions of exceptional performance are also provided in art and music at the end of Key Stage 3 and physical education at the end of Key Stage 4 (DFE, 1995: v).

The descriptions show a clearer progression within each subject and a greater comparability across subjects than some of the original 'Statements of Attainment' (Aschcroft and Palacio, 1995).

In principle, at least, the National Curriculum does not prohibit cross-curricular teaching or integrated approaches. However, it does limit progressive approaches to the extent that curriculum content is necessary and pre-determined rather than open to being led by pupils' needs or interests. In much the same way as usual, assessment procedures strongly influence the organization and delivery of the curriculum. In terms of Bernstein's three message systems (1975), the National Curriculum, in which 'objectives are expressed in terms of learning targets which are to be assessed in a clear and specific way' (Lawton, 1996), can be characterized as 'assessment-driven'.

The Dearing report (1993: 33) recommended that 'some 20% of teaching time (about 99 hours for Key Stage 1 and 100 hours for Key stage 2) can and should be freed for use

---

24 This is changing a bit with 'literacy and numeracy hours'. However, teachers have not much experience with these at the time of my field study.
at the discretion of schools and teachers at Key Stage 1 and 2 by slimming down the statutory content of the curricula in Key Stage 1 and 2. Most of all, the report emphasized that 'it will be for schools to determine exactly how much time they should allocate to particular subjects in the light of their pupils' specific needs and local teaching opportunities'. The recommended times were as shown in Table 4:

Table 4 Recommended Timing by Subject in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The National Curriculum Subject</th>
<th>Hours per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key Stage 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* directly</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* through other subjects</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology (through other subjects)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each of six foundation subjects*</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious education</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Since the literacy hour has been started in 1998, six subjects (history, geography, art, music, design and technology, and physical education) have ceased to be compulsory for children aged five to eleven.

Source: Dearing (op. cit.: 33)

Compared with the time allotment in the Korean National Curriculum (see Table 2), English primary schools have less total time than Korean ones (which have, for example, 566 hours for Grade Two and 703 hours for Grade Six). Furthermore, the former allow more flexible time for teachers to teach whatever they want, 100 hours as against 23 hours.

Administrative features

The National Curriculum was first written by subject working groups, who were politically appointed but included professional voices such as teachers and curriculum specialists. A number of critics were concerned about the bureaucratic style of the curriculum documents. There was also concern that the Act gave the Secretary of State so 25

20% at Key Stage 3 and 40% at Key Stage 4
many additional powers (Lawton, 1989): the responsibilities of local authorities were severely curtailed and teachers' powers redefined. In addition to the detailed orders of the National Curriculum, schools were from early on flooded with additional 'clarifying' documents from the School Examinations and Assessment Council (SEAC), the National Curriculum Council (NCC) - and their later successive bodies - the government itself, and local education authorities.

The National Curriculum presumed that teachers would continue to be involved in some school-based curriculum development and evaluation, and this is accentuated in the post-Dearing version. This intimates that it will enable teachers to make considered professional judgements, but within the compulsory framework. In particular, teachers are generally free to decide how the prescribed curriculum should be taught:

The revised programmes of study and attainment targets for each subject become legal requirements by means of an Order by the Secretary of State for Education...The revised National Curriculum provides teachers with much greater flexibility to respond to the need of pupils (DFE, 1995: v).

The Dearing report (1993: 101) offered some guidance for assessing and recording children's attainments in general, as follows:

The education (School Boards) Regulations 1989 require that schools keep a record for each child which includes academic achievement, progress and other skills and abilities. This record must be updated at least once a year. The Regulations do not say how schools should keep records or make any detailed requirements about their contents.

Governmental legislation does not require schools to have a development plan. Yet from a national survey of primary and secondary headteachers in 1991 (Arnott et al. eds., 1992), it emerged that 98% had a School Development Plan (SDP). In particular, the demands of the 1988 Education Act pointed towards school planning. Schools perceived SDPs as a solution to fulfil the planning requirements of the new National Curriculum (MacGilchrist et al., 1995). As one part of the SDP process, 'the developing school

In 1993, SEAC and NCC were unified to form the School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (SCAA). In 1998, SCAA and the National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ) were merged in the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA).
curriculum’ itself could demonstrate the organization and implementation of the National Curriculum at school level.

LEAs are to be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the National Curriculum. They are required to review their policies for the curriculum in schools and their arrangements for making these policies known. Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (HMI)\(^{27}\) continues to be responsible for the inspection of schools, but now with a strong focus on the implementation of the National Curriculum and in a new and different form. Under the auspices of the Education Act of 1992, the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) was established in 1994 to ensure that all schools should be inspected every four years. Under the Ofsted procedures, the inspection report have to be published to parents, to provide a four-yearly quality check on each and every school. Parents would also receive the results of standard assessments, there would be more performance indicators on attendance and truancy, and there would be league tables to compare the performance of one school with another.

In sum, as in Korea’s case, the National Curriculum in England is political and bureaucratic. Although it is thought to have the support of most teachers in principle, its command-control approach is regarded as a threat to teachers’ autonomy. As we saw, the shift of control from teachers and local to central government encountered the organized power of teachers to resist change. Their boycott of national curriculum assessment at one time did secure a revision of the curriculum. It could even be said that the National Curriculum in England is significantly in charge of teachers themselves and is in the category of ‘decentralized’ mode moving towards ‘centralized’ mode: there is still a strong emphasis on teachers’ professional judgement and flexibility. Thus the SDP under local management presumes that teachers have still some flexibility in how to implement the curriculum. This is reinforced by the assessment-driven nature of the curriculum control system which, by comparison with a textbook-driven system, allows teachers to use their professional judgement to choose the content and pedagogy. However, the literacy and numeracy hours are limiting their flexibility in these respects. Later, we shall get a clearer

\(^{27}\) According to Lawton (1987), HMI had three main purposes: check on public funds; provision of information to the Secretary of State; provision of advice to schools. In 1992, HMI has been reorganised as Ofsted.
view of these matters from our fieldwork.

3.2.2 Teacher education

Pre-service education

In the nineteenth century, teacher training colleges were established by private initiatives and later by the central government. Between 1846 and 1881, elementary school teachers were trained in the pupil-teacher system. Chosen from elementary schools at thirteen years of age, they served a five year apprenticeship, and they were paid directly by government. Training aimed at the provision of a basic education, and lacked any theoretical dimension. The gradual decay of this system was followed by the growing demand from teachers, supported by the central government, for more academic training. More teacher training colleges were established in the late nineteenth century and they were given more freedom to plan their own syllabuses.

After the 1902 Education Act, the LEAs founded their own training colleges. Students followed a two-year period of training after the successful completion of their secondary education course. By the 1960s, initial teacher education was being provided by the non-university sector for the Certificate in Education for teachers, and by the universities for the post-graduate certificate (PGCE). In 1960 the two-year teacher training course was extended to a three-year course in an attempt to upgrade the status formerly associated with elementary schooling. Over the next decade, the Certificate in Education was gradually replaced by the university validated Bachelor of Education degree (BEd), which required three-year education and training and the Honours Bachelor of Education which required four-year of education and training. This followed the Robbins Committee Report which in 1963 recommended that all primary teachers should have a degree, and that the colleges should be incorporated into universities. The committee made no specific recommendations concerning either the organization or the content of the revised form of teacher education, which was left to the validating institutions. However, the structural framework proposed by the committee involved a strong pull towards the 'academization' of the curriculum as a degree-worthy course of study. The members of the university departments filled out the academic bones indicated by the committee. Wilkin (1996: 68) commented on the situation and the reasons as follows:
Many tutors in the colleges of education rejected it because it contravened the traditions of teacher education in the non-university sector; and most students rejected it because it was deemed irrelevant for their immediate concerns as practitioners. However, it is likely that a minority of tutors and students were committed to the disciplines and the academic structure of the new curriculum.

In the 1970s there was considerable variation in courses of training. The curriculum was returning to a more equal balance of theoretical and practical elements. Another possible description is that the aims of courses changed from the personal intellectual development of the student to professional competence.

During the 1980s the government attempted to gain control of the curriculum of teacher education. It introduced a system of training which in both structure and content reflected its ideology: its orientation was 'practical', theory was disappearing, and increased responsibility for training was given to teachers and schools (Wilkin, op. cit.). The government continued to encourage a changing agenda in teacher education, characterized by the deployment and development of a concept of 'relevance' which might be most appropriately delivered by shifting more responsibility for teacher education from the academy to the classroom (McBride ed., 1996).

In 1992 the Conservative Secretary of State for Education, Kenneth Clarke, outlined an initiative to transfer substantial elements of responsibility for initial teacher education from higher education to schools. There was an emphasis on training institutions working in 'partnership' with schools along the lines of development already established in the 1980s. Furthermore, he wanted a change in the assessment framework for new teachers, which set out the specific knowledge, understanding and skills needed by the newly qualified teacher:

The whole process of teacher training needs to be based on a more equal partnership between school teachers and tutors in institutions. It is vital that a young teacher, like any other professional starting on a career with responsibilities for people, should have the competence to do his or her job effectively...The essence of school-based training is that the partnership is one in which the school and its teachers are in the lead in the whole of the training process, from initial design of a course through to the assessment of the performance of the individual student...It is my intention to move as soon as possible towards the use of performance indicators for the choice of partner schools - such as academic results, staying on rates, truancy rates, and the destination of the pupils, in terms of employment, Further Education and Higher Education. I believe that value added indicators could well be applied to exam results for this purpose, because it will be
important for student teachers to experience schools that are successful in difficult circumstances (Clarke, 1992: paragraphs 18; 20; 32).

The content of higher education courses for teachers developed under a number of common headings: curriculum courses, subject studies and educational and professional studies. In almost all courses there was strong evidence of all areas of work being directly related to the world of schools, and being highly practically oriented. Subject studies necessarily form a central element in all two-, three-, and four-year undergraduate degrees and on two-year conversion PGCE courses. On many such courses, students take their subject studies alongside students studying for other degrees. A number of examples exist where subject studies courses have been explicitly constructed so as closely to mirror the National Curriculum (Poulson and Merchant, 1991). In this respect, when introducing 'the numeracy hour' which should take place in Autumn 1999, the government set out the new requirement for future teachers:

Providers of Initial Teacher Training (ITT) should teach trainees about the National Numeracy Strategy, as part of the new National Curriculum for primary mathematics. The providers have a crucial role in ensuring that new teachers enter the classroom with the level of knowledge, skills and understanding that will allow them to teach mathematics well to primary age pupils (DfEE, 1998b: 43).

As ‘on-the-job-training’ in the PGCE course, two weeks of school observation for the first term, and five and seven weeks of teaching practice in the second and third terms are offered. For the BEd course, around one term of teaching practice are required every year. The focus of teacher training has thus shifted to more school-based experience, transferring a large part of training from universities to schools. Compared with the Korean case in which there are only eight weeks of on-the-job-training throughout four-year courses (see 3.1.2), pre-service education in England offers and emphasizes much more school-based practical experiences than in Korea.

The Education Act of 1994, setting up the Teacher Training Agency, further indicated a government more committed to expanding school-centred training than school-higher education partnerships (Crook, 1995). The government’s reforms of initial teacher education focus on the need to improve the practical competence of beginning teachers, but place little or no emphasis on their need to understand what they are to teach, or how
to construct new objectives from what happens as they teach with an incrementally improving competence (Osborn and Black, 1994).

Unlike Korean teachers, English teachers are not civil servants and can apply for any post advertised. The criteria for specific appointments are defined by the local authority or by the individual school. In most cases, a short list is drawn up and an interview follows with the appointment being made by the school governors, for whom this is a very important responsibility (Broadfoot, et al., 1993).

**In-service education**

Until the 1960s, in-service education normally meant short refresher or supplementary courses provided by LEAs and institutions of higher education, which had not been planned systemically:

In the past many colleges of education offered full-time 'Supplementary Courses', usually of one year's duration, to serving teachers, who were from 1955 seconded on full salary for the purpose. These courses were particularly intended for teachers wishing to equip themselves as specialists. Some colleges also offered similar part-time courses extending over two years. Both types of course could earn a specialist Certificate or Diploma. There were also one term full-time courses; for these, teachers could be seconded on full salary, but they did not receive any named qualification (Dent, 1982: 173-4).

Since the 1970s there have been discussions about how in-service education could be developed. The James Report (1972) suggested that teachers should be entitled to regular in-service education through a programme of leave to engage in such work. At that time LEAs began to give increasing attention to the induction of newly-qualified teachers and the in-service and training (INSET) of more experienced ones. They also provided INSET experts and offered their own teachers' centres as venues for continuing professional development. In 1977 the DES launched a scheme to encourage people to train for teaching one or more of the 'shortage subjects': mathematics, the physical sciences, craft, design and technology.

In 1978 the government's Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers (ACSTT) (DES, 1978) encouraged schools to plan their own INSET
programmes. They gave responsibility to senior staff for planning and co-ordination. First, the identification of teachers' need should take place on an individual level through groups of teachers within the school and in schools as a whole. In addition, importance was attached to courses provided by a range of different agencies. Finally, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the programme of in-service education was also seen as a crucial area of concern.

Since the 1980s, the content of in-service education has been a greater concern of the central government. In 1984, the Teacher Training Sub-Committee of the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Education of Teachers emphasised and encouraged curriculum development; subject up-dating; re-orientation and the development of new skills; professional and career development; and re-vitalization. The White Paper *Better Schools* (1985) stressed that all teachers should engage in in-service training relevant to their professional needs and requirements.28

The Education Reform Act of 1988, introducing a tightly regulated, centralized structure for curriculum and assessment, also reinforced the development of a more tightly controlled scheme for INSET. In 1991 the INSET funding arrangement was replaced by Grants for Education Support and Training (GEST). Preparations were also being made to introduce the first phases of the National Curriculum work. School teachers were given specific targets regarding INSET through such tasks as; training for the National Curriculum management and assessment, training for the National Curriculum content and training for the basic curriculum and collective worship.

However, INSET remains relatively decentralized. Funding has been covered from local authorities and DES pool arrangements to support individual school budgets. But, as part of the local financial management arrangements (LMS), individual schools have...

28 During this period, several schemes for in-service education such as the Local Education Authority Training Grant Scheme (LEATGS) and the Grant Related In-service Training Scheme (GRIST) were introduced. The main purpose of these schemes, which provided funding for INSET, was to promote the professional development of teachers. The monitoring and evaluation of these schemes were encouraged. However, in practice, the amount of attention paid to them varied from school to school and from LEA to LEA. The curriculum of in-service education remained much the same. The training of headteachers and senior staffs emphasized organization and management of schools, while the training of classroom teachers emphasized subject areas and training related to specific issues such as special education needs, multicultural education and the preparation of pupils for the world of work (Williams and Bolam, 1993).
greater responsibility for and control over their INSET budgets. A consequence of the lack
of statutory determination in this area, or central supervision of training for the National
Curriculum, has been a variety of provision, depending on school level decisions. This
arrangement may result in a lack of consistency of the INSET within an individual school.
In that respect, Poulson and Merchant (1991: 13) warned about the problem of financing
INSET from each individual school's budget:

There is a danger when individual schools hold the financial resources for all in-
service training, that an overall coherence and direction may be lacking; that it may
become reactive, in seeking to solve immediate problems, rather than proactive in
enabling innovatory practice and the professional development of staff.

According to DfEE Circular 5/99, every teacher awarded qualified teachers' status
(QTS) in England and Wales after May 1999 is required to complete an induction
programme, usually lasting one academic year, on taking up their first teaching post
(Journal of NUT, 1999). The DfEE Circular advises that 'a newly qualified teacher who
is not satisfied with the content or/and delivery of the programme of monitoring, and
support, should the first instance, make use of the school's internal procedures for raising
professional concerns, including those involving the school's governing body'. These
comments reflect the requirements of the National Curriculum. According to the
'Standards for the Award of Qualified Teacher Status' (Teacher Training Agency, 1998),
more specific knowledge and skills, i.e. knowledge and understanding of subjects;
planning, teaching and class management; monitoring, assessment, recording, reporting
and accountability, are recommended.

3.3 Conclusion

Traditionally Korean education has developed under a highly centralized government
to pursue uniformity and to control the schools and teachers through an efficient
administrative system. As a consequence, teachers have been excluded from the process
of curriculum development. They have been confined to their own tiny freedoms, their
classrooms, to implement the imposed tasks with rigorous fidelity. Similarly, teacher
education has been controlled by the central government, in which it has predetermined the
framework for the teacher education programmes. In short, teachers have been excluded politically but mobilized technically.

However, the Korean government has understood the problems which have resulted from the rigid curriculum control system in view of the new socio-political atmosphere which emphasizes a more democratic approach. As a reflection of these changes, the sixth National Curriculum in 1992 represents a trial of a more democratic and decentralized curriculum development compared with the previous rigid and centralized style of curricular development. Within this context, the government emphasizes site-based training, which focuses more on practical knowledge than on educational theory. In particular, in-service education has become more school-focused and staff development policies linked to the needs of the school have emerged.

Conversely, in England, the tradition of pluralistic and divergent educational provision allowed a slower development of a national system of education than in some other countries. Although throughout the nineteenth century, there was some central control - at times highly prescriptive control - over the curriculum, in the form of obligatory guidance, assessment and its related funding, teachers have had a tradition of flexibility concerning what should be taught in schools. In particular, from 1944 until 1988, the central government ceased to have much influence over the curriculum, a situation which was entirely different from Korea in the same period. In addition, the programmes of teacher education in England were remote from government control and in charge of the institutions themselves or the LEAs. Their character varied depending on the institutions and the period, but increasingly they emphasized the practice-based curriculum.

However, in the 1988 Act, the UK government set out the legal framework of the National Curriculum with a view to improving the standards of schools and defining their responsibilities. The proposal increased central government control at the expense of teachers' autonomy and local government's flexibility. Prescriptive and subject-based approaches were embodied in the National Curriculum. Even though the revised National Curriculum puts some emphasis on teachers' flexibility, teachers must teach within its legal framework. In addition, the government encourages teacher training programmes which are connected to the National Curriculum.

Although the sixth National Curriculum in Korea has been introduced as a
decentralized curriculum, which gave some flexibility to teachers and allowed primary teachers to decide on one subject area as an optional course and on extracurricular activities, the government still plays the major roles in determining what should be included in the school curriculum, how it should be taught and the syllabuses for each subject. Detailed explication of the content of the curriculum appears as the tables of contents in official textbooks. Teachers have little or no space to interpret the curriculum contents according to their own judgement. In terms of Broadfoot’s classification of ‘the sources of control’ (1996), the National Curriculum in Korea is still strongly under the control of central government, in which the government has a ‘power over’ relation to teachers.

On the other hand, in England, the government has directly challenged teachers’ control of the curriculum, in that the National Curriculum appears to emphasize teaching and learning in a more traditional manner, and the supposedly ‘progressive approach’ is being attacked. However, the strong tradition of local and teachers curriculum authority has been ‘a distinctive feature of English democracy and schooling’ (Grace, 1987). In this tradition, curriculum governance still keeps the traditional policies of encouraging teachers to take part in curriculum development as an aspect of their responsibilities, which has been always out of the question for Korean teachers. Using Broadfoot’s term, ‘the location of control’ is still at the local level and teachers have a ‘power with’ relation to the government, although the government intended the degree of teachers’ flexibility to be reduced.

Using another term from Broadfoot (1996), ‘forms of control’ in the Korean curriculum are strongly connected to official textbooks: the Korean curriculum has been mainly concerned with definition or implementation of the content through these. In this respect, although the new curriculum has promoted the integrated subject, theme or project approaches, using group activities based on pupils’ needs and interests, the changes are not making a significant difference, principally because of mandated textbooks which are not different from before. Arguably, at the teachers’ level, it does not matter who changes the curriculum, and how; what matters is the content of the textbooks. The majority of teachers regard curriculum change as a change in the content of textbooks, which they must implement as directed (Ahn, 1996b). Consequently, the National Curriculum in Korea...
should still be characterized as ‘a content and pedagogy-driven’ curriculum.

Compared to the National Curriculum in Korea, the English National Curriculum has emphasized detailed attainment targets and level descriptions and every key stage is defined and assessed by SATs. Government has criticized the progressive approach as the reason for falling academic standards, and advocated the restoration of subject boundaries and structured and formal assessment procedures. Accountability, in the form of assessment, thus takes a central place in the National Curriculum. In this regard, the form of controlling the curriculum in England has become mainly the assessment of the academic performance of pupils. In the light of that situation, the National Curriculum in England could be called an ‘assessment-driven’ curriculum. These changing tendencies of curriculum control in Korea and England are summarized in Figure 2.29

Figure 2 Comparison of Current Curriculum and Control Dominant Tendencies in Korea and England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Control</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central (power over)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (power with)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form of Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of two differing curriculum control systems, with more centralization in England and some decentralization in Korea, has now emerged. The detail of the National Curriculum in both countries varies significantly according to the social, political, educational and institutional contexts. However, the overall aims and motivations may be similar. The government in both countries claimed that one of the aims of recent curriculum change is to enhance teachers' professionalism; in Korea, by giving some power in deciding the curriculum to teachers, and in England, by increasing teachers' responsibility and accountability. Whatever the degree of centralization or decentralization,

29 This figure represents not a reality but a simplified model, to emphasize the contrasts between the two countries. Of course, in England, the National Curriculum controls content to some degree, but assessment is the major instrument of control. It is defined in a relative term, so that it is over simplified and broadly true.
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the new curriculum will be actually operated by teachers, who are the main concern of my thesis: the success or failure of a curriculum is completely dependent upon the teachers' understanding and utilization of that curriculum.
Chapter 4  Contextualization of Teachers’ Professionalism

4.1 Teachers’ Professionalism in Korea

4.1.1 Political power and status

Hierarchy in society

Traditionally, the status and public image of teachers was largely influenced by the Confucian tradition,\(^\text{30}\) which provided the foundation for the shaping of the social and moral outlook in Korea. A teacher was seen as ‘a well-educated moral person’ and ‘a model for future generations and the society’. The Korean word for teacher, ‘Sun Sang Nim’, means one who ‘guides, counsels, teaches and educates’, and connotes ‘a high moral bearing for such persons’ (Korean Dictionary, 1998). This conception of teachers has supported the value of education and the teaching profession in Korean society, in which teachers are always respected by the public. Even though teachers have had low salaries and status in comparison with other professions, the teaching profession has continued to be respectable, and has been ranked as one of the most preferred career choices throughout the centuries (KEDI, 1992). In a foreigner’s view, Korean teachers of nineteenth century were described as follows:

He is treated politely by everyone, but he is looked upon very much as a pensioner. He receives no salary, but the boys bring him frequent presents, and he ekes out a living in some way. But there is a more dignified side to the question. Teaching seems to be looked upon as a thing that cannot be estimated by its money value (Homer, 1969: 337).

As we have seen in Chapter 3, the formal teacher training system started in 1895

\(^{30}\) The Confucian educational tradition has provided Koreans with a rational way of thinking, a strong moral sense, and a zeal for education, as it stresses that one can become a whole person through education (Park, 1991). However, it also includes the teaching that the people should follow the established leadership without question, and should not be concerned about acquiring the knowledge necessary for the exercise of leadership (Jayasuriya, 1984). This tradition not only establishes and rationalises the aristocracy, the upper class in society, but also regards teachers as leaders and powerful loyalists who transmit absolute knowledge to the masses.
when the first training institute for teachers was established, and it was consolidated during the colonial period. In the thirty six years under colonial rule, public schools were erected, but the aim of education was to convert Koreans into loyal citizens of Japan. This intent was manifested in the teacher education and supply policy. Academically bright students who came from lower-class and poor country areas were selected and trained as teachers. Officially, the Japanese set up this policy to ensure teachers’ quality, but beneath the surface lay the political goal of making teachers who were faithfully submissive to them and preventing or limiting bright students’ support of any liberation movement (Jayasuria, 1984).

Thus, the system exhibited from the start clear signs of centralization. Moreover, this teacher supply system has continued, and so has the trend for relatively academically excellent students who are economically poor to enter the teaching profession. Since tuition was free and teaching posts were provided by the government immediately after graduation, teacher training institutions were very attractive to those who were able, highly motivated, and somewhat socio-economically disadvantaged (APEID, 1984a). Becoming a teacher has been an important avenue of upward social mobility, in particular because of the financial support and the opportunity of obtaining a higher education. The profession itself has enabled those of humble social origin to achieve a higher social status, as in many countries, including England at an earlier stage.

In 1945, when Korea was liberated, education for everyone was introduced. The most important element was the introduction of free compulsory education for all. Introduced almost one century later than in England, the Korean system still reserved secondary education for the elites, according to the idea of ‘elementary education’ for the mass and

---

31 In the 1930s and 1940s, the use of the Korean language was prohibited and Koreans forced to use the Japanese language under the Japanese scheme to erase the cultural identity of Koreans. Korean history was eliminated from the curriculum (MOE, 1994).

32 In 1992, KEDI conducted a sample survey on the background of primary teachers. The result showed that the largest group of parents of teachers (40%) were workers in the category of poor farmers.

33 In England compulsory elementary education was introduced in 1880, while fees were abolished in 1891. However, as I mentioned in Chapter 3, elementary education during the nineteenth century was organized as a deliberately inferior and limited kind of education designed for the lower orders.
secondary education for the elite class' until 1968 when the lower secondary school entrance examination was abolished.

Generally, the dual system of training for the teaching profession led naturally to a different status for primary and secondary teachers. The two different groups of Korean teachers with different training, have always had different levels of prestige and economic returns. This lower status continued until 1981. Evidence suggested that, until 1981, primary teachers tried to move into secondary teaching positions through in-service experience when this was possible (Smith, 1992).

It is interesting to compare with the situation of England, when primary teachers had a different education from secondary teachers. Since traditionally teaching has been regarded as valuable work that cannot be estimated by its money value, there is a sense in which all Korean teachers have always been held in high regard. In England, until the mid-twentieth century, primary teachers had a lower-middle or working class background (Gibson, 1980), and received their basic training in institutions outside universities. They taught children coming mainly from the lower-middle and working classes, because more prestigious private schools were provided for well-to-do children, with teachers who were of the same status as the clergy. Secondary teachers were trained at university and taught in England. The title of 'elementary' education, for the working class, was changed to 'primary' education for all in 1944 with the introduction of the national secondary education system.

In Korea, level of teacher training for primary teachers was up-graded as follows: Before 1961, they were trained at secondary education level and trained at two-year colleges until 1980. Since 1981, they have trained at universities, since 1962 the secondary teachers have trained at universities.

Compared with Korean teachers, English primary teachers, minimally, were trained at secondary education level during the 1920s and at two-year colleges during the 1930s. Since the 1960s, they have trained at universities. The level of primary teacher education in England has been almost forty years ahead.

In Korea, there have been fewer private primary schools than in England: at primary level, only 22 schools (0.4 %) and 602 teachers in 1965 (0.7 %) (MOE, 1994). By contrast, in England, at primary level, 1,873 schools (8.1%) and 10,526 full-time teachers (8.1%) existed in 1966 (HMSO, 1966).
mainly the upper and middle classes. This discrimination of status between primary and secondary teachers has not extended for some time, but when it did exist, English primary teachers may probably have had less social privilege than Korean primary teachers.

In 1949, the Educational Law legitimised the status of teachers as ‘civil servants’. Koreans in general regard civil servants as having a more respectable and higher position than most other people. Although teachers have had relatively low salaries in comparison to other professions, they have economic security, they receive numerous health and retirement benefits, and they are not required to pay taxes on their income. The government guarantees teachers’ loyalty by being their only employer. Consequently, teachers have gained a more powerful and respectable formal status.

On the other hand, teachers have also become more controlled by the government. Their role as teachers has been to support the political and ideological orientations of the government. According to Article 53 of ‘the law for civil servants’, teachers must carry out the following duties as civil servants: the duties of obligation, sincerity, dignity and obedience. These duties affect not only their public lives but also their private lives. Korean teachers are civil servants who work for nationally accepted values. This leads to an authority relationship between the government and teachers. Teachers remain subordinated to the government, which exerts considerable influence on their actions. Therefore, Korean teachers have played the role of government agents (KEDI, 1992).

Many teachers hold that their promotion depends on scrupulous management of administrative tasks and a good relationship with the hierarchy, not mainly on the outcomes of their performance (Ahn, 1996a). In other words, to be promoted, they should be obedient to the headteacher and higher officials in doing school administrative jobs, not merely competent in teaching ability. Such attitudes may partly come from their current status as civil servants. Also, teachers’ salary scales, in common with Korean pay scales in general, are based on automatic annual increases related to age. In other words, salary rises basically according to experience and seniority. The Korean tradition of salary rewards reflects deeply rooted values that link advancing age with wisdom, respect and authority with financial reward. Such a circumstance might be thought to engender a strong orientation toward authority, order and discipline, and a lack of challenges in the teaching profession.
Governmental policy for economic development in the 1960s gave much importance to encouraging a diligent and devoted work force, like the teaching profession (MOE, 1988). Until the 1960s, teachers had belonged to an elite group in the social hierarchy. In the 1960s and 1970s, as many new professions for the educated developed with rapid economic expansion and growth, economic values dominated society and teaching posts became less attractive to males, in particular, in terms of salary. Teachers felt that they were paid lower salaries than those in other professions with equivalent levels of education and training. Since then, the teaching profession in Korea has been characterized by its conflicting status: socio-culturally privileged, being respected superficially by the public, but mistreated in terms of remuneration. The UNESCO report commented on this:

Korea’s economy grows, and the teachers in elementary schools increasingly feel that they are underpaid and in a sense that they are relatively deprived. Teachers who feel their profession has dignity and integrity can themselves behave with dignity and integrity. But when they feel they are mistreated by the public’s derogatory attitude toward their teaching jobs, they may themselves begin to behave with inferiority complexes (APEID, 1984a: 21).

Thus, some primary teachers during the 1960s have regarded their posts as temporary, before transferring to higher professions. There has developed a tendency for the graduates of teacher colleges or universities, especially the males, to escape from the teaching profession. The difficulty of recruiting able and dedicated people and the perceived deterioration of the quality of teaching personnel have become serious and controversial issues in Korean society. According to a study conducted in the 1960s when economic development in Korea was rapid, primary teachers perceived their social status as very near the bottom of the vocational prestige scale (Marion, 1962). This was already a remarkable contrast to the traditional respect for teachers; that is to say, ‘the King, the teacher and parents are the Trinity’. This problem of a feeling of loss of professional prestige has been chronic and not confined to primary teachers.

In 1962, the training of primary teachers was upgraded to the two-year junior college level; and in 1982 to the four-year university level. Primary teachers now had the same professional status as secondary teachers, even though this status has not resulted in a significant increase in teachers’ salaries: primary teachers are paid less than secondary
teachers. Since 1997, moreover, Korea has confronted an economic crisis,\cite{38} and Korea's economy has deteriorated, with increasing unemployment\cite{39} and job dismissals. In 1998, the government announced that in views of a demographic fall in birth numbers and current economic crisis they would reduce the retirement age for teachers from 65 to 62, 61 and 60 by degrees until 2001. Accordingly, in 3 years the number of teachers will decrease by 11.3%. Teachers increasingly feel that the teaching profession, although part of the civil service, no longer offers job security and stable employment. There was strong resistance to the policy among teachers. However, teachers still generally want to remain in a profession, which still offers job security, at least until the age of 60, and has normally been respected by the public (Journal of Newsmaker, 13/5/1999: 24-5).

\textit{Gender differences in the teaching profession}

According to the OECD report (1998), although the rapid development of the education system in Korea has greatly influenced the quality of the labour force and increased the share of women in it, the proportion of women in the 1990s was still 20% lower than the average in OECD countries. In this circumstance, the teaching profession offers a good opportunity for women, and female teachers have a relatively high status in a generally male-dominated labour market.

Women in Korea tend to value a job that provides the hours, benefits, security, and vacation time that are compatible with their lifestyle; men are more concerned with a high

\footnotetext{38}{Before the outbreak of the current economic crisis, which began in 1997, Korea seemed to enjoy an unqualified success story, a model of modernization for the rest of the developing world. However, the legacy of government intervention made it difficult for Korea to reach the next phase of economic and political development. Moreover, there was an absence of systematic checks and balances in the political sphere, and decision-making in the economic sectors was not freely based on market principles to support market discipline. As a result, the government - big business - banking triad continued to thrive, and corruption and moral hazard became endemic. A series of major bankruptcies in Korea amplified the contagious effect of the foreign currency crisis in Southeast Asia, and Korea experienced a currency crisis of its own. These problems pushed the Korean economy close to the brink by the beginning of 1997" (Journal of Economist, 1998b, pp. 76-7).}

\footnotetext{39}{The unemployment rate, in November, 1997, was 2.9%, equivalent to 574,000 people. The figure was expected to treble in 1998 (Journal of Economist, 1998a, P.60).}
salary and rapid upward mobility, which they cannot attain in a teaching career (Smith, 1992). Disincentives for males to become primary teachers are low salaries and little opportunity to advance rapidly despite hard work, excellent skills, and intelligence (Smith, 1995).

Thus, since the 1960s, the teaching profession in primary schools has gradually come to be dominated by qualified females, and this tendency has continued until now. 25.5% of primary school teachers in 1965, but 58.7% in 1997, were female. In 1994, 78.0% of primary teachers in their 20s, and 76.1% of those in their 30s were female. 72.0% of primary teachers in Seoul were female, while 57.2% of lower secondary and 23.5% of upper secondary teachers were female (MOE, 1997). Female teachers are thus concentrated in schools for younger children, and an increasing proportion of young teachers is female. In particular, since the primary teachers' education was upgraded from two-year college to four-year university level in 1982, which is equivalent to the secondary teachers' education, female primary teachers have been comparatively satisfied with their status and salaries (KTFA, 1996; KEDI, 1992).

Organized teachers

Up to 1998, teachers' organizations in Korea could be characterized as professional rather than based on unionism, resembling, say, the NEA (National Education Association) in America before the 1960s and the PAT (Professional Association of Teachers) in England. The government approved two teachers' organizations: the Korean Association of Private Secondary School Principals (KAPSSP) and the Korean Federation of Teachers' Associations (KFTA). Both are established for the promotion of mutual understanding and improvements in the socio-economic status and professional competence of teachers (MOE, 1997).

KAPSSP is a fraternal association formed in 1919 to promote friendship and cooperation among principals of private schools. It has been a major source of solidarity among those responsible for private school administration. It numbers 1,600, nearly 100% of private school principals. Its principal activities are:
a) proposals for the operation of private secondary schools;
b) training and welfare of members;
c) research and development;
d) international exchange programmes;
e) granting scholarships;
f) awards for meritorious accomplishments;
g) strengthening international ties between private school educational institutions

(MOE, op. cit.: 107).

The KFTA, founded in 1947, is the largest teacher organization and represents all kinds and levels of teachers in the nation, from teachers in nursery schools to professors in colleges and universities. Its membership comprises about 72% of the nation's total teachers. Its principal objectives include:

a) mutual cooperation and solidarity among members;
b) improvement of teachers' economic status and welfare;
c) protection of teachers' rights;
d) enhancing of the professional competence and promotion of teachers;
e) international exchange of educational and cultural activities;
f) publication of educational materials;
g) exchange and cooperation with other organization;
h) all other matters necessary for attaining the objectives of the KFTA

(MOE, op. cit.: 106).

Both these lists of activities include general as well as sectional interests which are related to professional improvement. However, in the early years, most teachers had no interest in the trade union type of association and showed a low degree of political awareness. Only in the 1960s did the idea of teachers' unionism develop. The first such union was established in 1960 at the time of the April students' revolution for democracy. It was crushed by the May military coup in 1961 and its members were imprisoned.

Teachers organized the 'National Teachers' Association' (Chunkyohyep) in 1987 as
part of the socio-political democratic movement, and it developed into the ‘Korean Teachers’ Union’, KTU (Chunkyojo) in 1989. The main goal of the KTU is ‘naturalistic, democratic and humane education’. Their objectives represent the degree to which they conceptualize their professionalism in terms of their role in negotiating conditions of service and their demand to influence educational policy. Official labour union status was not granted to the KTU, because Korean teachers are considered to be civil servants and thus, under Article 56 of the civil servants’ law did not have the right to form a union. It was also seen by many as not good for the public image of teachers that they engaged in collective bargaining for active involvement in political matters, whereas Korean society emphasized the traditional honoured status of teachers, and the government exercised strict control over every aspect of teachers’ work and conditions of employment leaving no room for any initiative by the unions.

Teachers have continued making efforts to legalize Korean teachers’ unions. Teachers demonstrated for the right to form the union in 1989. The government suppressed teachers’ efforts, dismissed over 1,492 teachers and imprisoned 107 of them on charges of illegal assembly and demonstrations. This period seemed to be a watershed for teachers in their relationship with the government (Journal of KTU, 1999). Since then, although there have been some KTU activities, it is difficult to find sources about them.

In 1991, enacting a special law for the improvement of the socio-economic status of teachers, the government gave the right of negotiation and consultation to the KFTA, which has negotiated for better treatment and the improvement of working conditions of teachers twice a year. However, according to the definition of matters for negotiation and consultation in Article 12 of this law, the management of school administration and curriculum implementation should not be questioned.

The seventh Republic, a freely elected civilian government, allowed 1,329 dismissed teachers (83%) to be reinstated in their positions in 1993 (op. cit.). The OECD examiner’s report commented on the situation of teachers’ unions in Korea:

---

40 The aims of the KTU included improving salaries and working conditions for all teachers and reforming the MOE.
During our visit we met the President of the KFTA... We were not, however, able to assess the extent to which the Federation, as the only recognized teachers association in Korea, represents the full range of opinions and aspirations of Korean teachers. There is also a Korean Teachers' Union, but it is not recognized by the MOE. We understand that in earlier years teachers who belonged to this union were dismissed, though most were later re-engaged. We think that the Korean government should reconsider its stance on the recognition of teachers' organizations: recognition should be accorded any properly constituted, law-abiding association of teachers that has the confidence of its members. In our view, an education reform dedicated to participation, choice, and competition in the pursuit of excellence should also express those values in policies for the teaching profession by acknowledging the internationally recognized right of freedom of association within the law (1998: 181).

Influenced by this OECD report and KTU teachers' continual efforts, the current government\(^{41}\) announced that teachers could organize unions legally and prepared to revise the laws accordingly in 1998, and to abandon any kind of obstruction to teachers' right to organize. It went on to prepare various means to provide channels for teachers' autonomy and expertise. However, while some teachers who were involved in KTU as a moderate force naturally have welcomed this policy, the majority, including several teachers' associations like KAPSSP and KFTA, have actually demonstrated against it, insisting that 'teaching is not a worker's labour but professional and sacred.' Their claims were summarized as follows (Chosun Daily Newspaper, 17/11/1998):

a) The establishment of teachers' unions has not been initiated by teachers. It is only a governmental decision, in order to rationalise teachers' dismissal according to the Labour Law, so that there is no job security any more.

b) Traditionally, teachers as representatives of the community have been highly respected. The socio-economic status of teachers as civil servants has been guaranteed by law.\(^{42}\) Teachers are not labourers but are seen as a model for the community.

---

\(^{41}\) Kim Dae-Jung, the veteran democracy campaigner, was elected president in December, 1997. The election was the first peaceful, democratic transition of power from the ruling party to the opposition in Korean history.

\(^{42}\) By the 'law of teachers' status and salaries', teachers are secured in their job until the age of retirement. Teachers work about 9 months and receive 12 months salary paid monthly by the government.
next generation.

c) Teachers witnessed the chaos of the overwhelming ideological, political and illegal activities of teachers' unions in the 1980s. Teachers already have the KFTA as an institution for raising their voice with the government. Allowing the establishment of teachers' unions may only cause another problem in education.

d) If the government allowed several teachers' unions, we would have at least four fragmented teachers' unions depending on their own sectional interests. Fragmentation of teachers' unions will be a major factor obstructing systematic and stable educational culture.

This response of teachers created a very confusing situation. Most teachers talked about the status of teachers as having dignity and job security, but giving up the right to influence educational policy in a professional way. Older and senior teachers, in particular, believed that unionism would erode the honoured status given to teachers. Unlike England, where teachers' unions are both powerful and sometimes disruptive, Korea has had no tradition of unionism for teachers.

At the beginning of 1999, a law for the establishment and management of teachers' unions was passed. Accordingly, the KTU was immediately recognized as a lawful union, and the Hankook Teachers' Union (HTU) was created under the Korea Labour Union (KLU) in May 1999. However, this law still does not allow the right of industrial action, and limits some matters for negotiation. These features maintain the 'civil servant' status. Despite teachers' lack of interest, the legal recognition of teachers' freedom to create unions has special meaning not only in education history but also for Korean democratic society. The day after the law was passed, in a press interview the leader of KTU stated its significance:

When Korea joined OECD in 1996, we were promised teachers' unions. But, in those days, it was difficult to pass the law because our socio-political trends flew in a different direction from the internationally approved rights of labour which allow teachers to have the right to negotiate on matters of not only their socio-economic status, but also educational policy. Now, finally we are recognized by the law, in which our rights are still limited, though. It has a really significant meaning by which teachers are recognized as a central force in education. It is time for teachers to be owners of education. We are not just obliged to follow the order of authorities any more...KTU has existed as an illegal association for the last ten
years, in which we could not get any support from the public. Now we are finally recognized. This is just a starting point which has been achieved through our teachers’ painful efforts. We have to overcome many other barriers to reach the final point. I am sure the situation will be better in the near future (Journal of Our Primary Education, February, 1999: 45-7).

Before its recognition, 2% of all Korean teachers participated in the KTU. Currently its membership has increased to about 15,000, which is 4%. It aims to expand its membership to 50% (Journal of KTU, 1999), but few teachers seem interested in the union (Journal of Newsmaker, 13/5/1999). This indifference may be explained in two ways, as already intimated. Firstly, most teachers give priority to the traditional view of teachers as respected for their dignity rather than as interest groups who raise their voice for their own interests. They think of themselves as different from other workers, and enjoy their preferential treatment as civil servants. Another reason could be the present economic crisis in Korea, reflected in the increase in the rate of unemployment and the government’s reduction of the retirement age for teachers. In this circumstance, participating in the union with its connotations of worker rather than civil servant status, makes teachers doubt the government’s will to safeguard their position. Teachers’ past experience and observation of teachers who were dismissed because they were involved in unions are also reflected in this view.

4.1.2 Professional power and status

**Hierarchy in schools**

The organizational pattern is similar throughout primary schools, with small variation for the size of each school. The headteacher is assisted by a deputy headteacher and six master teachers who are responsible for school affairs, discipline and guidance,

---

43 Only 0.2% of teachers participate in HTU.

44 In 1971, the government established a ‘master teacher system’ in order to provide opportunities for advancement, and encourage ambition among teachers to strive at standards of excellence. Article 3 of the ‘Master Teacher Employment Regulation’ defines their role. The chief of each division in the school organization is called a ‘master teacher’. The master teachers usually have more than 15
research, environment, science, and athletics. These arrangements are intended to ensure the efficiency of school administration, which lead to the accomplishment of educational goals. This structure is organized according to administrative needs and not to the curriculum. The organization of a primary school is thus as in Figure 3.

Figure 3 The Organization of a Primary School in Korea

As informal organizations outside this system, there are also five advisory bodies which have professional functions: the planning committee, the grade-level council, the whole staff meeting, the school operation advisory committee and the personnel advisory committee. These bodies function not as decision-making but only for consultation.

The hierarchy of the school is regulated in the law and ordinance. Article 75 of the Educational Law defines the headteacher’s role as leading and supervising teachers and administrative personnel and educating pupils, and defines headteachers’ hierarchical relation to teachers:

The headteacher shall control all school affairs, supervise school personnel, and educate pupils...The headteacher is a manager responsible for planning, controlling, and encouraging organizational behaviours, an advisor with regard to the instruction of subject matters, and the facilitator of school-community collaboration...Teachers shall teach pupils under the direction of the headteacher.

This implies the school’s linear dependence on the headteacher’s individual authority.

years’ teaching experience. They are required to have an appropriate assortment of managerial and teaching skills. Their role assumes importance as the mediators between the headteacher and classroom teachers (KEDI, 1988).
Under this article, only a headteacher has the right to decide on school affairs. The headteacher, for example, appoints master teachers in each division. Teachers aspire in particular to become master teachers, since doing so is directly related still to their promotion to higher positions.

Classroom teachers in Korea have little or no autonomy since all educational issues are decided within such a linear hierarchy (Ahn, 1996a). The defined function of the headteacher means that emphasis is placed more on managerial and administrative functions than on teaching-related ones. The characteristics of each school depend largely on the headteacher’s will. The extent of teachers’ autonomy in the classroom really depends on the willingness of headteachers to allow it. Korean teachers’ professionalism is thus not based on their freedom to define or redefine curriculum and teaching methodology, but more on their obedience to the authority or headteacher’s will. Thus, we might surmise that ‘a professional teacher’ would be defined as a person doing school administrative jobs in the way that the headteacher has designated, more than as one who possesses suitable knowledge and methodology and is able to transmit knowledge to the pupils.

*Supervision* and inspection of teachers

Monitoring teachers in Korea is supervised by the government. The independent division of supervision was established under the MOE in 1963 and since the 1970s, ‘the elementary and secondary education office’ and ‘the higher education office’ have had separate supervisory roles. In 1982, new directions emphasized comprehensive supervision depending on the specific circumstances of individual schools. Supervisors are

---

45 The function in Korea which corresponds most closely to the English ‘inspection’ is described by a Korean word ‘Janghak’ which translates into English as ‘supervision’

46 MOE is divided into 3 offices and 4 bureaus, under which there are 21 divisions, and 1 independent division (MOE, 1997):

a) planning and management office, elementary and secondary education office, higher education office;

b) educational planning bureau, local educational bureau, lifelong educational bureau, educational information management bureau;

c) general affairs division.
now required to tailor supervision towards individual teachers at the request of schools. More fully supervision is defined in terms of:

a) the implementation of educational policies;
b) assisting in class instruction;
c) identifying examples of success;
d) assessing the implementation of specific projects;
e) assessing the reorientation of values (APEID, 1984b).

Supervision in Korea could be characterized as degenerating into excessive control, unjustified intervention and orders, imposing a heavy liability on schools (Kim et al., 1994; KEDI, 1988; 1986): it has had a regulatory rather than a research or an advisory function. The duties of civil servants, of course, tend to subordinate teachers to the government. Schools are supervised once or twice a year, either fully or partially. Full supervision deals with the overall administration and management of school, whereas part-supervision focuses on the evaluation of curriculum implementation for an individual school (Kim and Lee, 1994). In addition, an individual school may ask for a supervision at any time.

The supervision is distributed among the hierarchical levels of administrative authorities; the MOE, the MPEA and DOE. Within the MOE, the Office of Supervision formulates and controls supervisory policy. The supervisory roles of the MPEA and DOE are related to educational activities in schools. In this regard, supervisors are direct local representatives of the central government. In primary schools, the role of supervisors is stipulated by law as follows:

a) guidance regarding curriculum operation;
b) guidance of school and supervisory activities;
c) evaluation of teaching quality, competency and services;
d) guidance regarding educational events;
e) off-campus guidance;
f) guidance regarding audio-visual education, shop and library;
g) guidance and supervision of pre-school education;
h) other matters pertaining to primary education (Kim and Lee, op. cit.).

Generally, the focus of supervision is the appraisal of schools on the basis of bureaucratic criteria of compliance rather than criteria of the school’s educational effectiveness. There is no detailed rating form and, in practice, appraisal consists of ensuring the conformity of teachers’ administrative practice in school to the official orders, rather than their effectiveness in raising pupil performance. Supervisors aim at ensuring the conformity of the school to the official educational policy, the National Curriculum and the official textbooks, and teachers’ obedience to the statutory order is crucial in their appraisal. The hierarchical transfer of the National Curriculum decisions, surveillance of the timetable and guidance of the teachers on when, what and how to teach are the main issues in the reports by the supervisors to the government. No feedback is provided to schools, except warnings or instructions regarding findings which do not conform to the statutory order. Unsurprisingly, research has shown that most teachers regard supervision as more authoritarian than supportive (KEDI, 1992).

In practice, the focus of supervision is the school and individual teacher appraisal is carried out in terms of ‘performance rating’ or ‘efficiency rating’ by the headteacher. Article 42 of the law for teachers as civil servants regulates that teachers be appraised on their performance, which will be the data for being promoted. Only the headteacher has appraisal power over teachers. Many teachers hold that their promotion depends on scrupulous management of their credit with the headteacher, not on their teaching performance (KEDI, op. cit.). An initiative in extra payment for long-term service from 1996 states that 10% of all teachers are nominated every year for excellent performance and paid a merit bonus of 50 - 100% of their monthly basic pay. The government also intends to change the time-honoured, age-related progression of salary and promotion to positions of responsibility. Generally headteachers evaluate, and decide who will be the excellent performers and who will gain promotion. Furthermore, since teachers’ appraisal is characterized by vague criteria, teachers feel all the more that the headteachers’ decisions are determined not by the individual and collaborative work of teachers, but according to teachers’ administrative position in the school.
Korean tradition strongly favours education, and many Koreans consider schooling as a critical factor for an individual’s upward social mobility. Parents place first priority on their children’s education, often sacrificing their own standard of living, whatever their socio-economic background. In this regard, their educational zeal often leads to excessive private tutoring in ‘cramping’ schools and competitive college applications, as I mentioned in Chapter 3. Underwood\(^\text{47}\) commented on this zeal for education among Korean parents, which was reflected in all aspects of Korean school life, as follows:

> The Korean people’s eagerness for education is in many ways an eagerness for status rather than content, for certification rather than for education, for membership in an elite department of an elite university rather than following a particular field of study...Starting at the kindergarten level, parents try to enter their children in “prestigious” schools in order that they may eventually have a better chance to enter a prestigious university (1991: 63-4).

In spite of this zeal for education, officially parents have hardly participated in school practices. Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) were introduced into Korean schools in 1945 to increase parents’ participation in school affairs and to solicit their help to supplement inadequate teacher salaries and improve school facilities, but mainly to provide financial support to raise extra funds. In 1949 when compulsory primary education was inaugurated, to raise extra funds the policy of collecting ‘school fees’ in accordance with parents’ economic status was adopted. The parents were requested to pay varying amounts, which were first judged by classroom teachers and finalized by the headteachers. Despite these subjective and arbitrary criteria, parents remained highly co-operative with the schools, since they cherished traditional obedience to school authority and respect for teachers’ judgements (McGinn, et al., 1980). Since then, although there have been several changes in policies, PTAs in practice operated merely as financial support agencies.

To establish active participation of parents in school management, through the local

---

47 Horace G. Underwood, whose grandfather was one of the pioneer American Christian missionaries in Korea (1885), has spent his life as an advocate for Korean culture and independence. He has been a long-time observer of Korean society, a professor and also president of Yunsei University in Seoul.
educational governance system which has been in operation since 1991, the government required, as of the second semester of the 1995 academic year, that all public primary and secondary schools organise ‘School Management Committees (SMCs)’, consisting of parents, teachers, headteachers, community leaders, alumni representatives, and educational specialists. The new committees were distinguished by their wider range of functions:

- a) budgeting and settling school accounts;
- b) selecting elective courses and extracurricular programmes;
- c) formulating the school charter or regulations;
- d) establishing and operating a committee to recommend prospective headteachers or teachers;
- e) raising and utilising school development funds;
- f) collecting and managing community contributions;
- g) operating and funding after-school activities (OECD, 1998: 41).

However, the participation of parents in these committees is still not very active. Many parents regard their role in them as limited to funding, and, moreover, feel uncomfortable about, and not accustomed to, expressing their opinion in front of their children’s teacher. Sometimes, they worry that their criticisms or suggestions to the school or to teachers may affect their children negatively.

The culture of relationships between teachers and parents in Korea could be explained in terms of the expression ‘exceeding gratitude,’ in Korean ‘Chonji.’ Chonji given to teachers by parents is prohibited by the law but is still regarded as natural and common. Hong (1996: 107) pointed out its power to corrupt and damage:

In some cases, parents meet teachers periodically to hand over their ‘bribe’ money as a token of great gratitude. Parents give money or expensive gifts, expecting teachers’ special attention and care toward their own children at the expense of other classmates. If a teacher gives special attention to certain pupils, the teacher’s limited attention and caring power are monopolized by those affluent pupils. Usually pupils know well “whose mom did it” and “why the pupil is especially affected by their teacher.” Pupils feel their teacher’s biased attention and feel deeply hurt. The practice has spoiled some teachers and destroyed the sound relationship between teacher and parents and among pupils.
Parents' overheated educational zeal, which is expressed in the form of 'Chonji', is incompatible with appropriate relationships between teachers and parents. Unlike England, where there are official and regular parents' evenings for discussion of their children's school life and academic progress in addition to school governors' meetings, in Korea parents in general have no official chance to meet the teacher of their children. In this circumstance, the majority visit teachers unofficially to show their face and give 'Chonji'. When they visit teachers, they dress carefully and prepare expensive gifts or money as 'Chonji'. One English headteacher's\textsuperscript{48} impression of Korean parents in England reflects this:

\begin{quote}
Usually, are all Korean people well dressed? When they [Korean parents] visit my school to meet me or other teachers, they always dress nicely, I mean, very formally and bring something. Now, I am very much accustomed to this situation.
\end{quote}

Although there have been several campaigns by teachers and parents such as the 'No Chonji Movement' to correct these malpractices and establish sound relationships, this situation still continues.

Parents' excessive educational zeal contributes to inappropriate relationship between parents and teachers in other ways also. In particular at the primary level, parents believe that private tutoring in cramming schools, which mainly focus on test-driven and rote-memorization learning, is effective for children's academic achievement in schools.\textsuperscript{49} Most parents do not have much concern about what should be taught in school, and how, but expect their children to gain high scores in teachers' assessment. Since the sixth National Curriculum reform, paper-pencil tests were abolished and replaced by performance-related assessment through teachers' observation at primary level. Teachers' judgement and

\textsuperscript{48}
Since there is a large Korean community in Surrey, England, many Korean children attend school in this area. I have a son who attends school in this area. I have had several chances to talk with his headteacher when I attended the governors' meetings and parents' evenings during 1997-1999.

\textsuperscript{49}
More than 95\% children in affluent areas and 75\% in poor areas are involved in private tutoring after school. There is tuition in English, maths, computing, fine art, piano and violin etc. However, parents give their priority to academic areas such as English, maths and computing (KEDI, 1993). As of 1994, tutoring and other out-of-school supplementary education alone took up 2.7\% of the GNP at primary and secondary level (MOE, 1994).
assessment have become a more critical factor, and this strengthens the existing Chonji culture; most parents believe that Chonji will affect teachers' subjective judgement of their children more than before (KEDI, 1993).

In 1999, the primary headteachers' association in Seoul decided that all primary schools in Seoul should close on Teachers' Day\(^{50}\) (Chosun Daily Newspaper, 12/5/1999). Officially, it was stated that teachers deserved a holiday, but privately, the headteachers wanted to prevent any problems caused by Chonji since Teachers' Day has generally provided a good opportunity for parents and teachers to give and take Chonji. This situation shows how the relationship between teachers and parents is distorted and lacking in trust.

4.2 Teachers' Professionalism in England

4.2.1 Political power and status

*Hierarchy in society*

Elementary education\(^{51}\) developed from charities initiated by religious bodies which funded the education of some of the poor and working classes at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Teachers at this level were required to have only some knowledge of reading, writing and simple arithmetic, only slightly more basic knowledge than their pupils and so they were trained as skilled workers rather than professionals. Many of them were semi-skilled craftsmen, shopkeepers, clerks, or 'superior' domestic servants who considered teaching a 'respectable second job'. In the public eye, their status was not

---

\(^{50}\) Since 1981 the government has designated the fifteenth of May as 'Teachers' Day'. It is annually sponsored by the both government and the KFTA. Usually, the day starts with 'the thanks song for teachers' performed by pupils, and pupils pinning a red carnation, which has the meaning of 'thank you', on the teachers chest to express their thanks to their teacher.

\(^{51}\) At the beginning of the twentieth century, there was still a division in the education system: elementary schooling, eventually up to age fourteen, for the working classes and secondary for the middle classes, although this was not determined officially.
generally very high. Also, their social origins tended to be low (Tropp, 1957). According to Floud and Scott (1961), the social origin of elementary school teachers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was mainly lower-middle and working class.

The social status of elementary school teachers differed from that of secondary school teachers up to 1944. They were allocated to different schools with different tasks, and trained in different establishments. Elementary teachers generally came from lower-middle class backgrounds, were trained up to post-primary level until the 1920s and to post-secondary level from the 1930s, and taught mainly pupils from the lower social class levels. Secondary teachers, on the other hand, were trained in the exclusive universities of the time, were far fewer in number and taught children mainly from the middle class.

The English teaching profession developed under the aegis of various religious bodies, the universities and government. Baron and Tropp (1961: 546) commented on this:

> At all times in England, behind the local grammar school stood the universities of Oxford and Cambridge; behind the elementary school great religious voluntary societies in the nineteenth century, and from the 1830s a central government department.

Thus the position of teachers in England was rather similar to that in Korea, in the sense that they never managed to free their occupation from outside domination. However, unlike modern Korea, where the central government has always run education, the role of the central government in England has fluctuated and has at some periods been quite minimal.

---

52 Since the researchers asked the teachers to describe the occupations followed by their parental grandfathers as well as by their fathers, they analysed movement into the profession over three generations. The occupational classification used in this study was based on the socio-economic categories used by the Registrar General in the 1951 census of Great Britain:

a) Professional and Administrative
   - upper professional, upper administrative and substantial business
b) Intermediate
   - farming, teaching, lesser professions, lesser business, clerical work, personal service
c) Manual

53 As I pointed earlier, unlike in Korea, in England prestigious private schools were provided for well-to-do children. So elementary teachers taught children coming mainly from the lower social class who had little opportunity to continue their education at secondary level.
At the beginning of the nineteenth century, a rise in the demand for elementary education and the establishment of the first training schools for elementary teachers brought central government into elementary education. It gradually became actively involved in the financing of training courses, the creation of a teacher certification system, subsidy for teachers and schools, and the establishment of an Inspectorate. The Revised Code of 1862 set up a system of annual payments to each school on the basis of pupils' performance and attendance. In this way, the government tried to control teachers. Teachers became dependent upon school managers and inspectors. Their position as employees was uncertain; they were neither civil servants nor private employees (Tropp, 1957). The Newcastle Commission (1861) clearly pointed out that teachers should not be regarded as 'civil servants'.

Local School Boards, which could collect a special rate, were established to set up and control schools in 1870 and elementary teachers then became employees of these newly established Boards. Local government authorities established scales of salaries after the 1902 Education Act. Furthermore, in this period, there was a significant movement of organized teachers to set up a self-regulated profession. Organized elementary teachers even demanded a single system of access from elementary to secondary level for both pupils and teachers. The Bryce Committee proposed this in 1895 and recommended a single register for both certified and graduate teachers (Bryce Report, 1895). This proposal, which would have been a most important step to improve the status of elementary teachers, was not accepted then - it had to wait for another half-century until the 1944 Education Act.

As a result of the 1902 Education Act, School Boards were abolished and the Local Education Authorities replaced them. The Teachers' Registration Council set up a dual approach to registration, one for certified teachers and the other for graduates, maintaining the difference of social status between elementary and secondary teachers (Parry and Parry, 1974). A new Registration Council was established in 1907, but the government remained reluctant to transfer control over entry to the profession to a Teachers' Council. All these conditions of teachers, in terms of employment, training, and the official difference from secondary teachers, had a continuing fundamental impact on the social position of elementary teachers.
A new structure of relationship between teachers and government was set out in the 1944 Education Act which also introduced secondary education for all. The Act created a balance between three partners: central government, local education authorities and teachers. Teachers became, as it were, the executive directors, the local education authorities the managing directors, while the central government played the role of drawing the boundaries of their activities, rather than prescribing them. The balance of this partnership operated consensually until the 1970s. Then, from the late 1970s, economic recession and an alleged decline in educational standards were attributed by some to teachers' inability to meet national expectations. A remarkable shift occurred in the balance of interest-group power allocation. A Green Paper issued in 1977 showed the government's clear concern about the curriculum and the management of the teaching body, and its determination to enter an area that had long been the exclusive concern of the LEAs (DES, 1977). By the 1990s, the most important means by which the central government has limited teachers' autonomy has been the National Curriculum. The strengthening of central government has been matched by a diminishing power of local government and of teachers, who have been limited in their degree of autonomy. New political, economic and social conditions had brought about these changes in the relationship among teachers, local government and the central government.

Very recently, in late 1998, the present government has published a Green Paper (DfEE, 1998c) which promised higher salaries for some teachers, but in the form of performance-related pay. Teachers would be appraised by their senior manager, then the headteacher would review the teacher's performance and recommend to the governors how much the teacher should get paid. It was feared that performance-related payment could mean a return to the long discredited system of payment by results (Ahn, 1999b). In a discussion of 'performance-related payment' with the Secretary of State for Education, David Blunkett, staged by the Guardian newspaper and London University's Institute of Education in 1999, Peter Mortimore, the Director of the Institute, commented about the current status of teachers:

Teachers' pay and status have fallen out of kilter with comparable occupations. After five years of service, their pay has increased at only half the rate of other graduates. Their status is often derided and teaching is seen by many of the well-qualified middle classes as little more than a second-best occupation. The
profession is increasingly worn out by top-down diktats and ever-increasing demands. Morale is low: unprecedented numbers of teachers have taken early retirement and recruitment is on a downward slope (Guardian/Institute of Education Debate, 25/1/1999).

According to a survey by the National Union of Teachers (NUT), the majority of teachers considered this policy as a bureaucratic action with a view to strengthening central control; one teacher’s view was typical:

The proposal is very divisive and will put even more pressure on teachers. It will further erode morale and will not encourage teacher recruitment... If the government’s proposals are accepted, I and many others, will reconsider our teaching careers. It seems to me that everyone is out to give us a hard time and not appreciating the difficult job that we are doing... Too much power is being devolved to management within schools, making the way clear for inappropriate political decisions to be made (Journal of NUT, May/June, 1999).

When a similar policy was introduced in Korea, 1996, as I mentioned earlier, the reaction of Korean teachers was different. The majority regarded it neither as offering incentives nor has a threat to their professionalism, but as a pension system, especially for older teachers who would retire soon. Korean teachers are used to a hierarchical reward policy which is always determined not by their performance but by administrative position or seniority. By contrast, English teachers saw the policy as an authoritative control device since performance could not fairly be attributed to individual teachers.

*Gender differences in the teaching profession*

As in many other countries, including Korea, teaching attracts a large number of women in England. Since the nineteenth century, it has been considered an avenue of upward mobility, especially among girls from lower-middle and working class origins (McLennan et al., 1984). In this century, the establishment of ‘normal’ schools for training teachers was a major factor in making teaching more attractive to females. Kellagan et al. (1985: 3) indicated their particular attraction:

These schools [normal schools] rejected the view that all that was required of a teacher was that he or she should be a ‘master’ of subject matter. Instead, they
emphasized the need for a period of preparation for teachers during which they would become familiar with techniques of teaching and the care of children. The 'normal' school attracted young women in a way that the traditional college, which had mainly been the preserve of men, never did.

The teaching profession has become increasingly feminized and the proportion of women teachers has steadily increased in primary schools in particular. In 1966, 75% of primary school teachers were female (HMSO, 1966), 77% in 1975 and 81% in 1991 (DES, 1991). However, female representation decreases as the education level gets higher: in 1998, 83% of primary teachers, 52% of secondary teachers (DfEE, 1998d), 43% of further education teachers (Further Education Funding Council, 1998), 25% of university academics and 9% of professors (Universities' Statistics Record, 1998) were women.

The larger proportion of females in teaching is not reflected in the proportion holding positions of authority (Acker, 1983). When the proportion of females in primary schooling was 75% in 1966, only 47% of headteachers' posts were held by females (HMSO, op. cit.). This had increased to 56% in 1998 (DfEE, op. cit.), but though females had increased their representation relative to males in primary teaching, the proportion of females who held headteachers' posts had actually decreased. As Bergen (1982: 14) indicated, the over-representation of females in the profession has been a contributing factor in the inability of teachers to raise their position:

The low social status of elementary teaching combined with the lack of alternative work opportunities for women produced a female-dominated occupation. This disparagement, in turn, contributed to the continued low status of elementary teaching and its failure to achieve the status of "profession".

Deem (1978) investigated the suggestion that career discrimination against female teachers is closely related to their low job commitment. Their under-representation of promoted posts might also be expected to contribute to some lack of motivation on the part of female teachers to improve primary teachers' status.

Organized teachers

In 1870 the National Union of Elementary Teachers (NUET) was established with the main purpose of setting up a unified body capable of bargaining with the School
Boards, formed as a result of the Elementary Education Act of 1870. In 1889, the title of the union was changed to National Union of Teachers (NUT) since the word 'elementary' was considered 'degrading'. The objectives of the NUT, in addition to claims of professional status and demands for trade union rights, were as follows:

a) more stringent requirements for entry into the teaching profession;

b) the official registration of teachers in order to maintain teaching standards and to protect children from unqualified practitioners;

c) the right of teachers to promotion to the Inspectorate;

d) the right of appeal against an Inspector's recommendation to cancel a teacher's certificate;

e) the restoration of an adequate superannuation or pension plan;

f) the abolition of the system of payment by results (Open University, 1981: 15).

As can be seen from this list, the main concern was to create a unified profession to raise the status of teaching and to resist greater government control of the education system. These objectives of the NUT have not changed for a century.

However, the emergence of several other teachers' organizations created a challenge to professional unity. Throughout the twentieth century fragmentation has taken place according to the sectional interests represented by types and levels of school, sex, and

---

54 The NUET was not recognized until 1890, under the name of NUT.

55 When the present study deals with teachers' unions within the English context, it will mainly focus on the NUT, because it has the longest history among teachers' unions in England and is the largest teachers' union and covers all different levels and types of schools.

56 The Association of Headmistresses in 1874; the Incorporated Association of Headmasters in 1890; the Association of Assistant Mistresses in Secondary Schools in 1884 and the Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools in 1891. With the emergence of comprehensive schools in the 1960s, the former two became the Secondary Heads Association (SHA), and the latter the Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association (AMMA). Today, in England, there are six unions: National Union of Teachers (NUT), National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers (NASUWT), Association of Teachers and Lecturers (ATL)-formerly AMMA, National Association of Head Teachers (NAHT), Secondary Heads Association (SHA) and Professional Association of Teachers (PAT).
education of teachers. There have been some attempts at organizational unity but they all failed. Recently, the two largest teaching unions, NUT and NASUWT, were on stage debating professional unity, in one of a series of Guardian/Institute of Education Debates in London (11/8/1998). The NUT general secretary stated the position that unity was vital as teachers faced ‘the most powerful government’ in English history:

The government is determined to persuade the public that teachers are failing. The six unions could come together and prove that it is not the case.

The NASUWT\(^57\) general secretary opposed the notion that ‘the teachers unions should amalgamate into one’:

We hold different views of how teachers should be organized. The most important characteristics of a good union are not size but being effective, united, with clear aims, pursuing the right policies supported by the right action at the right time. We do not confuse the role of a trade union with that of an education lobby.

The NUT is the only association that has moved closer to the ideal of one all-embracing teaching body, including in its ranks teachers from all types and levels of schools. It considers that the way to strengthen the bargaining position of teachers is professional self-government and organisational unity. Its objectives and the network of contacts by which it can influence educational matters approximate those of a professional association, and it has had considerable impact upon teachers’ professional claims and status since its establishment. It is not affiliated with any political organization though it supports the election of teachers to Parliament so that the voice of the profession may be heard in the House of Commons. Its rule about strikes is that teachers ballot in each school and if a majority of two thirds is registered then a strike can take place if it is then further approved by the Action Committee of the NUT (Roy, 1983).

Government in England has frequently used formal committees as channels of communication with teachers. The most important of these are or were the LEA

---

57 Women teachers broke away from the NUT as a result of the latter’s refusal to fight for women’s equal pay and formed the NUWT, late UWT. When equal pay was achieved, the UWT joined the National Association of Schoolmasters (NAS), and since then they have both, as the NASUWT, became the second largest teachers’ union in England.
committees, the Burnham Committee and the Schools Council. All LEA education committees have teacher representatives who are elected by their local unions. The Burnham Committee, established in 1919 and abolished in 1987, consisted of two panels of representatives - the management panel, with LEA (employer) representatives, and the teachers' panel with teachers' organizations' representatives. The Schools Council, established in 1964 and abolished in 1988, contained representatives of all the professional associations of teachers, DES representatives and universities, parents, industry and commerce. It worked on major educational issues related to curriculum development, examinations, teaching methods and in-service training.

Since the 1980s, the teachers' relationship with the central government has been unstable and often antagonistic. In 1987, the Secretary of State introduced a Bill in parliament about teachers' pay and conditions, which abolished the Burnham Committee and established an Interim Advisory Committee to advise him on teachers' salaries. This destroyed the linkage between the government and the organised teachers on salary negotiation and replaced it by direct governmental control. The view of teachers' organizations on this centralizing trend had been summed up in a NUT document in 1985.

...the present Government seeks to exert influence and control over the education service from Whitehall, and thereby to destroy the partnership with the teaching profession, on which the service traditionally has been based... (Journal of NUT, January/February, 1985)

Again, even before the 1988 Act, the NUT resisted the imposition of an externally determined curriculum:

Teachers must retain the right to exercise their professional judgement in identifying the needs of the young and in determining teaching methods and the content of the curriculum (Journal of NUT, March/April, 1978).

Since the National Curriculum was implemented, all six teachers' unions boycotted national curriculum assessment in 1993, took industrial action against excessive paperwork in 1998, and protested against performance-related pay in 1999.
4.2.2 Professional power and status

**Hierarchy in schools**

Traditionally, schools in England have enjoyed a high degree of autonomy in comparative terms. As one aspect of this, headteachers appeared often to carry out their role in isolation, aloof from the external world. Day-to-day organization, curriculum, and teaching methods were largely their responsibility. Their functions were defined by law and, strikingly, emphasis was placed on their teaching-related function: they were required to demonstrate leadership not only as managers but as teachers. In relation to the organization and operation of curriculum, they exercised an almost absolute formal authority prior to 1988. However, they were also invariably required to make adequate and suitable arrangements for consultation with teaching staff. Between the 1944 and the 1988 Acts, in particular, claims to professionalism rested on the very large measure of autonomy which teachers had in determining the content of the curriculum and teaching method. The collegial nature of relationships was an increasing emphasis in that period (Gibson, 1980).

The imposition of the 1988 Act has forced great changes which have transformed the functioning of school organizations and, with this, relationships between headteachers and teachers. The introduction of whole-school planning, appraisal and, the prospect of local bargaining and performance-related pay indicate a shift in the nature of staff management and labour relations in schools (McHugh and Mcmullan, 1995; Menter et al., 1995). Central government has limited teachers' autonomy in classroom through the National Curriculum, which has had profound and important effects on what teachers teach. Moreover, the curriculum leadership role of headteachers has been reinforced:

Primary headteachers must take the leading role in ensuring the quality of curricular provision and they cannot do this without involving themselves directly and centrally in the planning, transaction and evaluation of the curriculum (Alexander et al., 1992: 46).

There has been increased headteacher control within the context of Local Management of Schools (LMS) and within the framework of the National Curriculum. Not only do headteachers have the power to decide general guidelines for implementing the curriculum,
but also they may attempt to lay down the actual content of the curriculum based on the National Curriculum in their schools. A recent study has described the changing role of teachers in curriculum decision-making, now dependent on headteachers, as follows:

...there was less overall consultation with the whole staff before changes were implemented. In addition, this tension led to situations where individual teachers and groups of teachers renegotiated initiatives and redrafted documents until they were acceptable to headteachers and their vision of school development (Webb and Vulliamy, 1996: 303).

**Inspection of teachers**

The central inspection system in England has had a long and varied history. In this century, it was further developed after the establishment of LEAs in 1902; Her Majesty’s Inspectorate (HMI) kept the state informed about the achievement of existing primary schooling. A cycle of full inspections was established: initially in secondary schools every five years and in elementary schools annually. By 1922 this had become every ten years. As Lawton (1987) pointed out, in this period HMI acted as facilitators of the ‘partnership’ scheme. By the end of 1960s only a small number of schools would have experienced a full inspection, and inspectorial work was mostly a broad sampling process.

Contrasting with Korea where the monitoring system is controlled by the government and the educational hierarchy, the English Inspectorate was not politically attached to the government and had an established independence. Its roles were defined as having a comprehensive knowledge of the education system, evaluating its effectiveness and providing advice to local education administrative authorities, headteachers and teachers regarding all aspects of education (DES, 1982). In appearance, this resembled the role of Korean supervisors; however, one difference was that the English Inspectorate could be critical of and provide advice about instruction, but at that point their roles terminated; they could not order schools to accept their advice. The headteachers had to judge the rationality, relevance and legitimacy of advice and make final decisions as to whether to

---

58 In 1839, HMI was established to superintend the allocation of the first grants contributed to elementary schooling.
accept it or not, though the teachers whose instruction was critically commented on were supposed to answer the Inspectorate’s inquiries.

From the 1980s the role of the Inspectorate began to expand in various ways. Not only would they implement full inspections and inform the government about what was actually happening in schools; they would also inform the public about the schools’ achievement. In 1983 HMI began to publish their reports. The Education Reform Act in 1988 established the National Curriculum with an associated system of national assessment. LEAs were to be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the National Curriculum. HMI continued to inspect schools as before, but now with a strong focus on the implementation of the National Curriculum and the concern for improved educational performance.

Following from this, the Education Act of 1992 created a non-governmental department, the Office of Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector (HMCI), to manage a national programme of school inspection. The department is called the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) and is headed by HMCI. Now LEA inspections are greatly diminished, but all schools are inspected every four years. The main intentions of Ofsted are to improve standards of achievement and quality of education through regular independent inspection, and informed advice according to Ofsted’s mission statement (Southworth and Fielding, 1994). Ofsted has the general duty of keeping the government informed about:

a) the quality of the education provided by schools in England;
b) the educational standards achieved in those schools;
c) whether the financial resources made available to those schools are managed efficiently and
d) the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils at those schools (DFE, 1992a; DfEE, 1996).

To allow a full assessment by the inspectorial team, the school must offer the following, according to the 1992 Education (Schools) Act:
...necessary documents, ready access to lessons and school activities and discussions with individuals and groups of governors, staff and pupils (DFE, 1993).

In Korea, although the sixth National Curriculum encourages the school-based curriculum for individual schools, the forms and contents of the school-based curriculum are still indicated by the government. Thus, there is no need to scrutinise all documents, but only to make sure of conformity with the directions from the government. In England, since each individual school has its own interpretation and management flexibility under the National Curriculum, they are all special cases. Therefore, all the school premises and documentation need to be made available to the inspecting team, to give a full account of the actual practice.

The new arrangement emphasizes that 'inspection must lead to a full report...which evaluates the school...identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the school and gives...a clear agenda for the action required to improve it' (Ofsted, 1994b: 8-9). As in Korea, the main focus of the inspection is the individual school rather than individual teachers. However, in England the inspection is to evaluate the school and demonstrate success or failure in terms of academic standards, and accordingly the school can be rewarded or penalised through changes parents’ choice and consequent state funding governmental funding.59 By contrast, in Korea monitoring aims to ensure the conformity of the school and teachers to the government directions and accordingly the school more directly affects the promotion of the headteacher.

Teachers’ relations with parents

The Education Act 1944 required that every maintained primary school should have a properly constituted ‘board of managers’,60 working in accordance with rules of

59
Under the Parents’ Charter (1992) the publication of the inspection report is compulsory.

60
For a maintained school the number of managers and governors, and the method of their appointment were decided by the LEA. For a voluntary controlled school two thirds of the managers of governors were appointed by the LEA, and one third by the body owning the school premises. Unless invited by the authority to take part, these boards had no control over the appointment of teachers to their school. Boards of voluntary controlled schools had a voice in the appointment of
management. However, the partnership the Act established between teachers, central
government and local educational authorities meant that governors played little or no role
in educational policy and neither did parents (Bogdanor, 1979). However, parents have
been given considerable statutory rights lately, on the grounds that they have a legitimate
interest in ensuring that the teaching force is well motivated and effective. The official idea
of parent participation in education has developed since the 1960s. Young and Jackson
(1967: 5) commented on this at the time of the Plowden Report:

For the first time here is an official report [Plowden] which gives great prominence
to parents. This is a remarkable change. When the first issue of Where was
published in the summer of 1960 the idea that parents should be recognised as
partners of teachers was a little bizarre, and it has taken time to make the bizarre
one degree less so. The mood has now altered.

In the 1960s, parental participation meant chiefly a demand to be better informed by the
LEAs. However, parents became more politically conscious by realising their right to be
involved in educational policy and parental choice between a larger issue with the
establishment of the comprehensive school model.

The 1980 Act defined parents as teachers’ clients. It and subsequent Acts recognised
parents’ rights at the national level, included them in the revised constitution of governing
bodies, and embodied the principle of accountability through provisions for parental
choice: parents were to be allowed to send their children to schools of their choice
(provided those schools had free places) and to be informed about their children’s progress
(Beattie, 1985). According to the Kogan et al. study (1984), the strategies used by parent
governors to canvass parental opinion included PTAs (Parent-Teacher Association)

‘reserved’ teachers, that is, teachers appointed specifically to give religious instruction; but none
in the dismissal of any teachers.

In the Act of 1980 the term ‘board of managers’ was changed to ‘board of governors’:

a) the managers of primary schools should in future be known as governors;
b) all schools should have at least two elected parent and two elected teacher governors, except in
   the case of schools with fewer than 300 pupils, which need have only one teacher governor; head
   teachers, unless they otherwise decided, would be governors ex officio;
c) all schools should have their own individual governing bodies, except that at the discretion of the
   LEA two primary schools might be grouped under one board of governors, and the Secretary of
   State could make other exceptions.
meetings, attending teacher-run parents' evenings and meeting parents at the school gate in primary schools. Unlike in Korea, where there are fewer ways to communicate with school and teachers, English parents can contact schools and raise issues through themselves represent their own children. One of the key features of the 1986 Act was increasing parental governors representation in schools62 and decreasing LEA representation (Deem, 1990). The responsibilities of governors have been enhanced by the 1986, 1988 and 1992 Acts. However, their statutory powers are limited. Governors do not ordinarily interfere with the day-to-day organization of school life or with the curriculum and teaching methods.

Although central government provided parent activity with a high degree of legitimacy, this does not necessarily mean in practice a genuine parents' role. Legitimation at the national level may imply recognition of involvement, but not necessarily of control. Deem (ibid.: 153) identified the significance of this shift as 'enhanced consumer power':

It is hard to see how anyone can possibly expect voluntary governing bodies and lay governors using their 'spare' time actually to control and run schools. However, the replacement of producer power [that is, teachers and LEAs] by consumer power [parents, employers, the community] is one of the major planks of the Reform Act and nowhere is this enhanced consumer power more evident.

A main feature of the 1988 Act which is relevant to school governors is the National Curriculum. However, the amount of room for curriculum manoeuvre available to governors is reduced, although they are still able to amend LEA curriculum policies within the constraints of the National Curriculum. Governors have the responsibility of ensuring that their school's curriculum and assessment arrangements conform to the National Curriculum.

As I have discussed in the previous section, under the Parents' Charter of 1992 parents are entitled to information which would assist them in making choices in the educational market place. Parents should receive the results of standard assessments, performance indicators on attendance and truancy, and 'league tables' enabling them to compare the performance of one school with another. However, parents in England have

62 The parental governor representation increased from two to five at schools with over 600 pupils.
achieved these rights not through prevailing with their own demands, but as a result of the legitimization of their rights at the national level and, arguably, as a government strategy to reduce the powers of both local authorities and teachers.

4.3 Conclusion

In Korea, the Confucian tradition provides the foundation for the social outlook of teachers. In particular, a respect for and obedience to elders and superiors and an unquestioning attitude towards the authority of the teacher and the presented curriculum have been great influences on educational culture. Since teaching has traditionally been regarded as a dignified profession which cannot be estimated by its money value, teachers have continued to be respected. Another factor contributing to the respected image of teachers is their civil servant status, so that they are regarded as leading social figures by the public. As civil servants they have always had a quite powerful and respectable formal status. On the other hand, this status has prevented teachers from exerting their professional control in an autonomous way. In this respect, unlike in England, the accountability of Korean teachers is seen in terms of a bureaucratic audit. They are accountable to the central government, which is the provider of their employment, and must perform their contractual duties in a way strictly defined by it.

In England, elementary education began as education of the poor and working classes. The public image of elementary teachers suffered from the contrast with the co-existing elite private and secondary school systems. It was of people who had lower-middle class backgrounds, did not receive their training in the university, and were teaching mainly pupils of lower social class levels. However, the gap in status between them did not survive long, once secondary education became compulsory from 1944. Unlike Korean teachers, their English counterparts experienced only minimal intervention from the government in the ensuing forty years and enjoyed considerable professional autonomy. The changes introduced in the 1988 Act have brought important shifts in professional conditions of teachers. This is ostensibly, at least, associated with maintaining teachers' standards in order to protect consumers' rights, rather than the central government's own interests as is the case in Korea.
Teachers' organizations in both countries represent channels of influence in relation to the central government over occupational demands. These have been put forward by an organization more favourable to the government in Korea, and by the more 'professional' unions in England. Interestingly, when the government allowed the creation of teachers' unions in 1998, the response of Korean teachers showed little enthusiasm and interest (KTFA, 1999). Most of all, teachers felt insecure with the concept of workers involved in a union as opposed to civil servants working for government, under the circumstance of the current economic crisis in Korea where the rate of unemployment has increased. Although teachers' unions in England started with the notion of improvement of teachers' social and economic status, they have had a major role in representing the needs of the public and in stabilizing the state education system. However, in England, the fragmentation of teachers into several unions has been a major factor obstructing the establishment of a self-regulated and united profession. In Korea, on the other hand, the teachers' inability to exert pressures on educational authorities, since they are civil servants, is the main difficulty in enhancing teachers' unionism.

The predominance of women primary teachers in both countries has been striking, and has been seen as a contributing factor in the past to the failure of teachers to achieve full professional status. Moreover, the unequal opportunity offered to women teachers also influences their professionalism. About three quarters of primary school teachers are women in England, as are four in five in Korea, but there is a higher proportion of male teachers in privileged managerial and leadership positions in both countries.

Authority relationships in all sectors of public life in Korea are replicated in the relationships between teachers and the central government, and between teachers and headteachers. Teachers remain subordinate to both the government and headteachers in school. The Korean central government exerts a large control over every aspect of teachers' work and conditions of employment, and this is basic in its relationship with teachers. In England, bluntly stated, both the headteachers and the government are being more intrusive and authoritarian than in the 1980s.

In the name of supervision, the Korean government aims at 'guiding' teachers in the implementation of educational policy. The focus is monitoring the school and teachers to ensure their conformity with the National Curriculum. The report of the supervisors is
absolutely confidential and not revealed to the public. By contrast, in English education, the inspection which is contracted out to a team which is formally independent from the government, aims at evaluating the overall performance of a school’s pedagogic practice. The publication of the inspection report is compulsory, which enables everybody to know something of what is actually happening in the school. It might be said, therefore, that monitoring in England aims primarily at placing the school under public judgement, whereas in Korea it aims primarily at valuing the school for its obedience to the government.

Teachers’ relations to parents are significantly different in the two countries. In Korea, traditionally, teachers have been treated with respect and the public has been obedient to their judgement without question. The main function of PTAs or SMCs is financial support for schools and teachers; and excessive gratitude (Chonji) has become the main means for parents and teachers to communicate with each other. In this situation, teachers feel themselves as disgraced and distrusted, and parents feel many burdens when they meet teachers. Almost all educational reforms have attempted to get rid of this Chonji problem; but it still remains the main feature of teachers’ relation to parents. In this circumstance, there has been no tradition of developing appropriate relationships to communicate with each other.

In England, by contrast, a series of central government initiatives from the 1980s have had important implications for the form of teachers’ relationship with parents. The central government in England has also strengthened its own position through emphasizing consumers’ right and choice and boosting the position of parents. This shift, brought about by legal means, in particular the 1992 Education Act, has increased the rights of parents. Thus, teachers are not only increasingly controlled by the central government by legislative and administrative means but also have new relations to parents under the pressure of accountability. However, the parental role is still largely limited to being informed rather than having real influence on policy or management in schools.

It would be impossible to analyse how professionalism functions unless the meaning of the concept is analysed with reference to each country’s cultural background. In particular, it has a different meaning for the teachers in the two countries, deriving from the nature of their relationship with the government. For Korean teachers, the traditional
status of the teaching profession, from being respectable civil servants remains prominent. The strong linear bureaucratic hierarchy in society and school where the teachers are subordinate members of the official hierarchy, also contributes to maintaining those traditional values. By contrast, in England, the status of primary teachers, no longer associated with pupils' social background, has been conditioned by central control over the curriculum since 1988. This has been accompanied by control over employment conditions, so that teachers have been subject to increased government control, as well as being opened up to parental scrutiny.
Chapter 5 Methodology

5.1 Research Foci

The key foci for this empirical study of teachers, professionalism and government are:

a) teachers' own conceptions of curriculum development and professionalism in practice;
b) the characteristics of teachers' and governments' curriculum roles and responsibilities as practised and perceived by teachers;
c) the relationship between professionalism and government intervention in curriculum development as perceived by teachers.

These issues are addressed through data collection relating to key features and indicators. The indicators of teachers' curriculum practice and professionalism around which data were collected were semi-constructed, but also result from eclectic, broad and open-ended questions and observations. They include the following: teachers' age, sex, training and experience; their use of curriculum-related terms and their definitions of these; their professional viewpoints and statements about the National Curriculum and teachers' professionalism; each school's delineation of posts of responsibility in the organization of the school; school curriculum policies, guidelines and published schemes of work, their curriculum priorities; their curriculum planning, delivery and records; their daily routines and timetables; the extent of curriculum differentiation; teachers' descriptions of themselves as professionals; their relations to the government in issues of curriculum development.

5.2 Research Process

My field study was carried out between November 1997 and May 1999. First, I started working with questionnaires and interviews in Seoul, Korea in December 1997,
because I was more accustomed to Korea's situation. After analysing the results of questionnaires and interviews, later I observed a particular Korean school for a case study in July 1998. I also interviewed some of the same teachers again by phone and fax to update the information, especially, in relation to the new educational policy in 1999. Similarly, I worked with questionnaires, interviews and a case study, in that order, in London, England from April 1998 through to May 1999.

5.2.1 Entry

In order to find out which schools and teachers should be included in the Korean sample, I consulted one curriculum co-ordinator from the MOE, one researcher of the KEDI with experience of both curriculum development and school visits, and one primary headteacher who was previously involved in research on the management of a primary school. With their help, I selected six primary schools in Seoul according to the socio-economic areas of the schools. In each school in December 1997, I gave questionnaires to twelve teachers and the headteacher, and I interviewed one teacher, or one teacher and the headteacher. This meant that the total of questionnaires would be seventy-eight and there would be nine interviews.

For the first stage of the study, I contacted each school, identifying myself as a former researcher who had worked in KEDI, which is a government-funded institute. In all of the cases this was very useful to get the attention of the headteacher. But this type of presentation also had its risk: if teachers perceived me as a representative of the government, they could modify reality to tell me the story they thought the ministry would want to hear. Because of such risks, I took special care to explain that in my research I was not working for the government. Especially I stressed that I was involved in a research project for my own thesis in England. The investment of time, explaining who I was and what I was doing, resulted in very positive rapport with headteachers and teachers.

Nevertheless, I had some problems in securing a broad access for a case study in July 1998 in the second phase of my Korean fieldwork. Besides observing several classrooms,
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Unlike England, Korea has only one type of public school, which is controlled by the central government.
I also asked to attend a staff meeting and to have the supervisor's report on the school. However, the headteacher was very apprehensive about my participation in a staff meeting and refused to show me the supervisor's report. Finally this headteacher told me that she did not want me to observe the staff meeting, but she would give me a copy of a document which explained the results of that meeting.

For the fieldwork in England, I had the help of my thesis advisors and one primary education expert, who is working as a lecturer in the Institute of Education, University of London, in selecting the appropriate schools. I needed help since I did not have sufficient knowledge of English schools. Thus in May 1998 I wrote a letter to six schools chosen considering, as in Korea, the socio-economic areas of the schools and awaited their replies. I was distressed because each request was rejected and it seemed difficult to know how to proceed.

Apparently, English primary schools were all too accustomed to having visitors. Thus, saying 'no' at this time could be understood as 'not in current circumstances'. English primary schools were then undergoing a period of implementing change. First, since the National Curriculum was introduced in 1988, there had been great change in curriculum practices. The curriculum was severely overloaded and teachers felt under siege. Besides the National Curriculum, the government has imposed SATs and inspection by Ofsted. In particular, SATs were being held just as my requests were received in the schools, so understandably my requests were rejected.

Secondly, at that time, one of the teachers' unions, the NUT, was 'working-to-rule' in protest at the increase in paperwork. My questionnaires would increase this pile of paperwork.

Thirdly, my choice of numbers of staff members per school was unrealistic in the English context. Primary schools vary in size and some had only a small number of pupils and staff, especially compared to Seoul where the primary schools do not vary so much in size. The point was really the small size of the English schools in comparison to Korea.

Finally, my initial contact with each school was directing with the headteacher, who naturally wanted to protect the staff from extra work. In particular, one headteacher pointed out that whilst I was interviewing a staff member the class would have to be taught by himself. This headteacher wanted me to compensate the school financially for taking staff
In some despair, I felt I had to approach the situation another way. I followed the advice of one primary headteacher to select nine instead of six schools, and to reduce the sample sizes in each school for the questionnaires and interviews. The nine schools included seven LEA-maintained and two voluntary schools, and three schools from each of the three broad socio-economic categories. I hoped to observe as many lessons as possible in the schools in question. So, in July 1998, I sent out personal letters, with the help of my advisor, to these nine schools. As these reached the schools almost at the end of the academic year, I was only able to conduct my research in two of the nine schools before the summer holiday. The questionnaires and interviews for five of the other schools were conducted in October, November and December when the next academic year was running. The last two schools agreed that I could conduct my fieldwork in January 1999. Later, after analysing the results of questionnaires and interviews, I returned to one of the schools to conduct a case study in March and May 1999.

It has been fascinating to see the different reactions of schools to my request for fieldwork access in the two countries. The Korean teachers are civil servants, who are controlled by the government in a bureaucratic system. Contacting schools was not very difficult for me because they recognised me as a former researcher who had worked in a government-funded educational institute. That the English schools and teachers were initially less accessible witnesses not only to their relative autonomy but to the pressures they currently experience. However, once I was able to meet English headteachers and teachers face to face, I found a profound and sincere response, and willingness to help with my research.

The different reactions of headteachers in both countries already suggested different concepts of professionalism. Korean headteachers perceived obedience to authorities or following orders from the hierarchy as a professional attitude. Even though I was not working in KEDI any more, they identified me as a representative of the government and accepted me without hesitation. Whereas English headteachers perceived protecting their staff within their own territory from outsiders as one aspect of their professionalism. So,
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naturally, when asked by an outsider, a foreign researcher, to arrange for detailed questionnaires and interviews, they felt able to decline the request. In particular, they considered that the English educational system was undergoing profound change and the teachers felt under tremendous pressure.

5.2.2 The sample

This study focused on teachers within the capital city of each country, the city and surroundings of Seoul and the London inner city and suburbs. Although the nature of each city is different, Seoul being mono cultural and London multi cultural, presumably capital cities have some common features such as progressive educational and cultural leadership.

I was aware of the different environments in which the individual schools were situated. I have tried to select a cross-section, to include schools in upper-middle and middle-middle income,\textsuperscript{65} mixed, and lower income areas. The sample was representative of the main social-economic areas, including middle, mixed and lower areas. In Korea, the initial sampling of schools was from a list of all Seoul primary schools obtained from the MOE, which classifies schools into three categories: schools in affluent areas (‘Ga’ class), average areas (‘Na’ class) and poor areas (‘Da’ class). The inequalities are evident in the facilities, parental support and school environment. ‘Ga’ class schools compose 16%, ‘Na’ class 76% and ‘Da’ class schools 8% of all public primary schools in Seoul (MOE, 1997).

Although I needed a critical mass, I was less interested in the incidence or frequency of each type than in acquiring the full range of teachers’ views. Therefore, I randomly selected two schools from each category to represent all of them equally but not proportionately, amounting to six public schools representing the three socio-economic categories.

In a second sampling within these selected schools, all six headteachers were included, and seventy-two classroom teachers were randomly selected from alphabetically ordered name lists, including at least two teachers per grade in each school, to receive the questionnaires. This would mean that I would have a sample of two members of staff from each Year group. I also planned to interview three out of the six headteachers and one or

\textsuperscript{65} For convenience, I will present this category (upper-middle and middle-middle income) as ‘middle income’ areas.
two additional teachers in each of the six schools who were teaching either Year One (the seven-year-old age group) or Year Five (the eleven-year-old age group). Thus, three headteachers from schools in three different socio-economic areas, and nine teachers who were not selected for questionnaires, in due course completed in-depth interviews.

In England the primary schools in the public sector were divided into three different types: LEA-maintained, voluntary, and grant-maintained. LEA-maintained schools are run by the local education authorities, while voluntary schools have been established by voluntary bodies, mainly religious denominations but are principally financed by the State. Grant-maintained schools are self-governing and receive their funding direct from central government, through the 'Funding Agency for Schools'. I should add that 63% of public primary schools are LEA-maintained, 34% are voluntary and 3% are grant-maintained (DfEE, 1998d). Since grant-maintained schools had only a small place in the English primary school system, I left them out. I chose to study seven LEA-maintained schools and two voluntary schools, to produce the correct balance in relation to the whole school population. The seven LEA-maintained schools were representative of the three main socio-economic areas, two from middle income areas, three from mixed income areas and two from lower income areas. The two voluntary schools were representative of middle and lower income areas.

Unlike the case of my Korean fieldwork, I asked the headteacher and two or three teachers in each English school to complete the questionnaires. As indicated above, I
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66 Year One and Year Five in Korea are equivalent to Year Two and Year Six in England.

67 Under the 1988 Education Reform Act, all LEA schools, with the exception of special and nursery schools, could apply for grant-maintained status. The 1993 Education Act provided, for all schools, including special and nursery schools, to apply for their own delegated budget with effect from 1 April 1994. The 1998 Education Act set out the new framework for maintained schools, namely: a) community schools; b) foundation schools; c) voluntary schools; d) community special schools; and e) foundation special schools. In these new categories, county, voluntary or maintained special schools are classed as 'community schools' and grant-maintained or grant-maintained special schools are the 'foundation schools' (Waterman, 1998). Since this thesis was already under way before the 1998 Act, I will retain the terms 'LEA-maintained schools', 'voluntary schools' and 'grant-maintained schools' for the study.

68 I understand that many pupils attend independent schools, 7% of pupils including those at secondary schools (DfEE, 1998d). But as I am comparing English and Korean public schools, I have not investigated the independent sector. However, if I had, the result might be different.
reduced the sample size of each English school both to gain access and because English schools are usually smaller than in Korea. For interview, I chose the headteacher and one or both of a Year Two and/or Year Six teacher. This would have meant a total of twenty-seven questionnaires (as well as the eighteen interviews) as against the seventy-eight questionnaires completed in Korea. The research design did not demand the same number of questionnaires in both countries. The parallelism could not be maintained in all respects, because the two systems are not themselves exactly parallel; for example primary schools are different in size, and as a Korean educationalist my relationship to each system was different as also was my ease of access. Yet to keep the parallelism as close as I could reasonably make it and to compensate for the discrepancy, I distributed additional questionnaires to twenty-three students on the MA course in primary education in the Institute of Education, University of London. These students are already experienced and qualified primary teachers who are adding to their qualifications. I asked them to describe the type and socio-economic areas of the schools in which they have taught and then I selected eighteen questionnaires from the twenty-three, which were appropriate to the categories of the samples in the research. Finally, the total of questionnaires would be forty-five in England, against seventy-eight in Korea, and even this discrepancy was further compensated by interviews: six more in-depth interviews in England than in Korea. Based on the analysis of questionnaires and interviews, one school in each country, from the mixed socio-economic category, and in the English case LEA-maintained, was selected for case study.

69 Although MA students may not be typical teachers, they are likely to reflect well current changes in primary schools.

Classification of Interviewees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Country / Income Areas</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle &amp; middle-middle-income</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>a1 (H)*, a2, b1, b2</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas (G 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Income Areas (G 2)</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>a1 (H), a2, b1, b2</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Areas (G 3)</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>a1 (H), a2, b1, b2</td>
<td>A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Headteacher
5.2.3 Instruments for data collection

*Mixed method design*

This thesis seeks to indicate the most important features of two populations of contemporary teachers' perceptions of curriculum practice, and of their sense of their professional roles and responsibilities. Such general patterns can appropriately emerge not from a very small sample or an ethnographic qualitative study, but from a quantitative study, one which gathers information that can be quantified and presented in the form of discrete units that can be compared with other units by using statistical techniques (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994). Though largeness of scale in quantitative studies may offer a more secure base for identifying patterns, the sample size of this study and its coverage of a range of types of school and social classes in both countries, is sufficient for significant patterns to present themselves.

However, the empirical concerns of this thesis are not restricted to the identification of predominant patterns in teachers' perceptions. The study also seeks to identify and contrast particular types of teachers with relation to their perceptions. Already a quantitative approach may succeed in thus classifying teachers into types, but a qualitative approach enables me to identify examples, or near examples, of these types among my interviewees, and, more generally, to clarify the experiences, feelings or judgements of individuals taking part in the investigation (Verma and Mallick, 1999). It allows this thesis to explore in depth the meanings teachers gave to their perceptions.

In relation to the types of evidence to be collected and the modes of analysis to be used, the mixed method, which contains elements of both 'quantitative' and 'qualitative' approaches, makes an important contribution to the investigations in this thesis. Tashakkori and Teddlie (1998: 4-5) mentioned this approach as extending the methodological bridges that were under construction between the quantitative and qualitative research tradition:
methodology or methodological mixes), which contain elements of both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

In this respect, Green et al. (1989) listed the purposes of a mixed approach: a) triangulation, or seeking convergence of results; b) complementarity, or examining overlapping and different facets of a phenomenon; c) initiation, or discovering paradoxes, contradictions, fresh perspectives; d) development, or using the methods sequentially, such that results from the first method inform the use of the second method; and e) expansion, or mixed methods adding breadth and scope to a project. Creswell (1995: 177) defined four types of mixed method studies:

a) two-phase studies: the researcher first conducts a qualitative phase of a study and then a quantitative phase, or vice versa. The two phases are separate;
b) parallel/simultaneous studies: the researcher conducts the qualitative and quantitative phases at the same time;
c) equivalent status studies: the researcher conducts the study using both quantitative and qualitative approaches about equally to understand the phenomenon under study;
d) dominant/less dominant studies: the researcher conducts the study within a single dominant paradigm, with a small component of the overall study drawn from an alternative design.

To achieve the main concern of this thesis, which is the identification of predominant patterns and types of teachers' perceptions of curriculum practice and professionalism in relation to government intervention, a quantitative approach was first used, followed by further qualitative data collection after the data were analysed. In this application, the qualitative data would be drawn on to give more meaning to the 'quantified' data. The qualitative approach clarified teachers' perceptions and beliefs about their curriculum roles and practices, and the impact of initiatives concerning curriculum control and change. In this way, the results from qualitative data would inform and refine the quantitative data, so that the conclusions drawn were more meaningful, precise and representative.

As well as being 'two-phase', in Creswell's term, this study falls into his 'dominant/
less dominant' category inasmuch as the broadly quantitative data 'out-bulk' the qualitative.

**Triangulation**

Mixed method studies are the more likely to use triangulation techniques (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998). According to Denzin (1988: 511), 'triangulation is the application and combination of several research methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon'. The use of multiple methods enables the researcher to address different complementary questions within a study rather than focusing on a single, specific research question (Robson, 1993). Denzin (1978: 304) discussed five basic types of triangulation:

a) data triangulation - involving time, space, and person (a variety of data sources);

b) investigator triangulation - using more than a single observer;

c) theory triangulation - using more than one theoretical scheme in the interpretation of the phenomenon;

d) methodological triangulation - using more than one method;

e) multiple triangulation - combining multiple observers, theoretical perspectives, sources of data and methodologies.

Because of the main concern of this study, which aims to indicate prevailing conditions or particular trends, and to reconcile or manifest discrepant findings or interpretations, data and methodological triangulation were adopted. This study was concerned with providing information not only about population characteristics but also the characteristics of individual teachers as typical members of sub-groups: it attempted to reveal both the differences and similarities between teachers in the two countries and those between different teachers within each country. Surveys are appropriate for thus defining generalized statistical patterns of population characteristics. Following questionnaire data, interviews and case studies were adopted sequentially. Questionnaires were used to figure out the general patterns of teachers' perceptions. However, the findings of questionnaires do not tell us 'how' teachers hold a particular view on a particular issue.
(Verma & Mallick, 1999). In-depth interviews and case studies were used to understand the contextual meanings of the teachers' perceptions. Information obtained from the questionnaires was utilized to develop the semi-structured interviews, which were administered to headteachers and teachers, and also to set the categories of the case study. In addition, some elements of theory triangulation were adopted for interpretative purposes (see Chapter 2).

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were a vital source of data. They were presented for review and approval by advisors in the curriculum studies group in the Institute of Education, University of London. I adopted the format and something of the 'snappy' style, of the questionnaires, but not the questions, used in 'Case Studies of Catholic Secondary Schools' (Flynn, 1993) and Walsh's (2000) forthcoming study. The questions fell into two types: 'closed' and 'open'. Closed questions were expressed as a statement with which the respondent was given an opportunity to agree or disagree, defined at levels of enthusiasm. Written instructions and five Likert-point scales appeared at the beginning of each part. Respondents were asked to select the one out of five points on the scales which best reflects their perception. Open-ended questions, which allowed the respondents to answer in as much detail as they wished without prompting, appeared later in the questionnaire.

It was crucial that the meaning of the questions found in the questionnaire should not be lost in translation. The original questionnaires were in English, derived from Western culture and ideology; therefore steps had to be taken to refine the wording and to ensure the validity of the questionnaire for use in Korea. Upon completing the translation, five Korean teachers were asked to comment and the Korean version of the questionnaire was derived from this examination. The final version was also checked with a researcher of KEDI to determine if the items represented its content adequately.

A Pilot test of the questionnaire, conducted to evaluate its validity and reliability, was administered to five Korean and four English primary teachers, none of whom was part of the main sample. These teachers were requested to respond to the instrument and evaluate it through written responses to the following questions: is the language of the
questionnaires appropriate and understandable? Are the directions clear and easy to understand? How long does it take to complete the questionnaires? I also held discussions with the teachers after they had responded to the draft questionnaires. The results of the pilot test were analysed to ascertain the need for any additional changes to increase clarity and enhance content validity.

A cover letter states the purpose of the study and that the data would be treated confidentially. The questionnaire\textsuperscript{71} is then divided into five main parts, i.e., personal information, curriculum development and professionalism, the National Curriculum, the government’s and teachers’ roles and responsibilities, and general opinions on curriculum development and professionalism.

Part one requests information regarding gender, position, number of years in education as a teacher, grade level, training and qualifications. Respondents answer by ticking the appropriate line.

Part two requires participants to state their opinions on curriculum development and professionalism in general. This part contains items 6 to 27.

Part three asks participants to identify their feelings about their National Curriculum and its practices. This part contains items 28 to 51.

Part four asks respondents to state their opinions of the government’s and teachers’ roles and responsibilities in curriculum development. The areas investigated here are: the relative roles and responsibilities of government and teachers for the curriculum, levels of influence in deciding curriculum and pedagogy, the ideal level for determining the curriculum, the level of their own knowledge and competencies in curriculum development,\textsuperscript{72} and their description of themselves as teachers. This

\textsuperscript{71} See Appendix 2

\textsuperscript{72} This part is based on Campbell’s classification. Campbell (1984: 347) divided the skills of curriculum development into a broad two-fold classification, with five subdivisions. The two categories are: a) Curricular skills, that is those skills and qualities involved in knowledge about the curriculum area for which the postholder has responsibility; b) Interpersonal skills, that is those skills and qualities arising from postholders’ relationships with colleagues and other adults. The subdivisions are: a) Curricular skills (i) knowledge of subject: the postholders must keep up-to-date in their subject, must know its conceptual structure and methods etc.
part contains items 52 to 109.

Part five asks respondents to express their own opinion regarding their final goals in their career and their general ideas about the issues, by answering two open-ended questions; items 110 and 111.

The questions can also be classified into two types: factual, and evaluative or requiring opinions, though the distinction is not always clear cut, and factual questions may conceal evaluative or value-aided questions. An example of the factual type is: ‘do most teachers integrate subjects into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate?’, and of the opinion/evaluation type: ‘should teachers be civil servants?’

Interviews

Interviews, based on responses to questionnaires, provided a second source of data. Interview are often used to obtain qualitative data so as to explore in greater details and in depth some particularly important aspects covered by a questionnaire (Verma and Mallick, 1999). A major purpose of these interviews was to obtain data from headteachers and teachers regarding the specifics of teachers’ roles and responsibilities in curriculum development. A second purpose was to gain insights regarding the influence of governments and how they affected teachers’ roles and responsibilities in curriculum development.

Interviews were conducted after collecting the questionnaires, but with different respondents. They were face-to-face and semi-structured. I asked the participants some detailed questions, to probe their perceptions and expectations of curriculum development

(ii) professional skills: the postholders must draw up a programme of work, manage its implementation, maintain it and assess its effectiveness.

(iii) professional judgement: the postholder must know about and discriminate between various materials and approaches in her subject, must relate them to children’s development stages, manage the school’s resources, and achieve a match between curriculum and the pupil’s abilities

b) Interpersonal skills

(iv) social skills: the postholder must work with colleagues, leading discussion groups, teaching alongside colleagues, help develop their confidence in their subject, advise probationers, etc.

(v) external representation: the postholder must represent her subject to outsiders (other teachers, advisors, governors, parents, etc.)
and professionalism, and then invited them to express their beliefs about curriculum practice and professionalism and give reasons for them. Many questions were open-ended and exploratory. I feel that all participants in both countries had a genuine opportunity to express their thoughts and feelings, and were encouraged to describe in detail their curriculum practice.

Interview was individual and lasted approximately one hour. I taped them after asking the respondents for permission to do so - since I wanted to capture teachers' perspectives as faithfully as possible and taping enabled me to preserve the exact words which each teacher used.

The interview schedule had two parts, 'Teachers, National Curriculum and Government' and 'Professionalism', and some eleven questions designed to give more in-depth data about the teachers' perceptions of their curriculum practices and professionalism. Interview questions concentrated particularly on the ways in which centralization and decentralization in the process of curriculum development reform had influenced teachers' professionalism. My concern was to figure out the ways in which these reforms transform the work of teachers in the school sector, and how teachers experienced those changes. Naturally, questions were adapted to the status of the respondents, whether headteachers or teachers. Questions for headteachers mainly focused on their curriculum management and their evaluation of teachers' professionalism in their own schools, while the questions for teachers focused on their own point of view about present curriculum implementation and teachers' professionalism. In addition to the prepared open-ended questions, I gave interviewees additional time to talk freely about whatever they chose.

Case study

In addition to questionnaires and interviews, special case studies were carried out in two schools. For the purpose of my thesis, I was defining a case study as an inquiry that investigates a phenomenon within its real-life context; thus it enabled 'the presentation and

73
See Appendix 3
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interpretation of detailed information about a single subject or event' (Runyan, 1982). When the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, the case study is essentially research in depth rather than breadth. Whilst my questionnaires were focused on teachers’ perceptions of curriculum and professionalism, the case study could identify the teachers’ curriculum practice in relation to their environment in specific classrooms and schools.

In this thesis, the case studies were used much more to reveal the ways in which events or situations come together to create particular types of outcomes (Hitchcock and Hughes, 1989), than to focus on a specific instance or situation. Generally, a case study enables including the element of ‘school effect’ on the practice and views of teachers, but the ‘school effect’ is not a main focus of this thesis. Rather, my case studies provided data from observation to explore the precise meanings which might be behind general comments. Furthermore, their utility also relates to the frequently cited gap between teachers’ perceptions of their curriculum practice and their actual practice. The examination of data in the classroom context had some validating effect in relation to the conclusions of my thesis, inasmuch as it is in the classroom that the teacher’s curriculum practice is realised. Observation in classrooms enabled the relationship between stated perceptions and practice to be explored to an extent.

The approach adopted for classroom observation was that of a non-participant observer. Non-participant observation is a method of obtaining information in which the researcher observed and recorded activities but played no part in them (Verma and Mallick, 1999). Whilst guidance questions for the case studies were prepared and used according to the categories used in the questionnaires and interviews, a flexible and informal approach was adopted in the classrooms. This approach also allowed the nature of the curriculum as practised in each school to be explored, rather than only teachers’ own views and beliefs about their curriculum practice and professionalism.

The classroom observations facilitated the recording and analysis of teachers’ activities in the classroom. In addition, in the English case study observation of staff meetings facilitated the recording and analysis of teachers’ participation in the meeting. Some information, including each school’s plan or documentation, and the results of questionnaires and interviews, was collected in advance of the observation visits. I
observed six classes, Year One through Year Six, in action within six days, spending one whole or half of a day in each Year's classroom. In the English school, I observed three staff meetings including two regular short meetings in the morning and one curriculum related meeting in the afternoon.

The Korean case study was conducted in July 1998, and the English one in March and May 1999. Both were conducted in the middle of the school academic year.74

5.2.4 The data analysis

I started the analysis with a careful preparation of the data, and followed by coding the responses to the questionnaires, writing up the interviews and, later, the case studies which included analysing the written documentation from schools.

*General patterns of teachers' perceptions: percentage and mean*

The data from the individual items of the questionnaires were entered on a computer to assess the frequency distribution for each response. The Excel Programme was used for the survey to analyse the percentages and means in the data. Answers to the questionnaires were coded on a five point Likert scale, where 1 = certainly false or not important and 5 = certainly true or most important. When the data were analysed, responses 5 and 4 were combined to form the 'agree' or 'very important' response in the tables, while 2 and 1 were combined to form the 'disagree' or 'not important' response, so that I could contrast 'agree/disagree' or 'very important/not important' in more manageable percentage terms. The mean of all the responses of the total group in each country was found by adding the scores and dividing by the number of participants. I expressed the data in two ways:

(a) in percentage and mean terms for the whole national sample;

---

74 The Korean academic year starts in March and ends in February of the next year. It has two semesters. Between these there are a summer holiday from July to August, and a winter holiday from December to January. There is no such thing as a half-term holiday as in English schools. In England, the academic year starts in September and ends in July of the next year. It has three terms. Between these there are summer, Christmas and Easter holidays, and three half-term holidays.
b) in percentage and mean terms by socio-economic school group, to detect significant differences across these groups.

I disregarded individual school effects. In the case of Korea, presumably the quality of teachers cannot be very different in each category, since teachers transfer among schools within the Seoul metropolitan school district every three or four years.\(^{75}\) In addition, when I experimentally compared two different schools in the same category in terms of mean and standard deviation on all questions, there were no significant differences between them. In the case of England, since 40% of the participants (18 out of 45 teachers) were from every different schools and there were no more than three participants from any school, it was not possible to figure out school effects.

The analysis of data was constructed according to the following three basic areas, which reflected the main sections of the questionnaire: teacher's concepts of curriculum development and professionalism; curriculum practices; and teachers' opinions on professionalism and government intervention. Responses to the questionnaires were classified in accordance with these three areas, though with some responses being judged relevant to more than one area.

*Types of teachers: correlation*

A correlation computation\(^{76}\) was attempted according to the results of the questionnaires in order to typify teachers in terms of their profiles of views of the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention. The term

\(^{75}\) According to the teacher transfer rule and law (Article 5-16), teachers cannot be assigned to the same category of schools within eight years. If there is competition among applicant teachers, more experienced teachers with longer residence in the area have priority.

\(^{76}\) The coefficient of correlation is a statistical measure of the degree of relationship between two sets of scores or measures for the same group of individuals. It does not imply that one variable causes the changes in the other variables. It simply describes the patterns of variations. The correlation coefficient most frequently used in education research is known as the Pearson 'r' or as the product-moment correlation. Coefficients of correlation can have values rating from "-1" (inverse relationship), through "0" (showing no relationship) to "+1" (positive relationship) (Verma and Mallick, 1999; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998).
'correlation' refers to a measure of the degree of association between two variables. ‘Two variables are said to be correlated when certain values of one variable tend to co-occur with particular values of the other’ (Thorndike, 1994: 1007). I used correlation computations for every item of the first section of the questionnaire on teachers’ conceptions of the terms ‘curriculum development’ and ‘professionalism’. From these computations, I identified correlated items which could identify types of teachers. I then computed correlations of these correlated items with every item in the second and third sections of the questionnaires. The upshot of this exercise was that I identified three - or perhaps four - types of teachers in the two countries combined who approximated four different but coherent sets of responses throughout the questionnaires.

The data from the interview tapes were transcribed to show each individual answer for each interview question. The main points of the interview data from the Korean fieldwork were translated from Korean into English. Having presented the descriptive statistics pertaining to each item, the related interview data will then support the discussion of the individual categories and items of the questionnaire. Interview data importantly facilitates the comparison between distinct types of teachers, who represented different attitudes to curriculum practice in relation to the government.

Since these types are more complicated in reality than in theory, I define them not as ‘Categories’ but as ‘Models’. A ‘Model’ here is an ideal, or idealized, or purified representation of a type which accentuates the coherence of the type and underemphasizes its ambiguities and internal contradictions. It represents a weaker claim on the data than would ‘category’, but nevertheless has considerable power to illuminate the data.

*The case studies*

These are presented separately from the survey data. The main sources of evidence for them were:

a) school documentation: relating to curriculum policy, and teachers’ duties and responsibilities;

b) staff meetings and classrooms observations: teachers’ roles, responsibilities, involvement, decision-making and strategies relating to curriculum
implementation and management, and this related to discussions I had with the observed teachers.

Like the interview data, case study data are also used to support the arguments and the analysis of types of teachers derived from the questionnaire data and it will inform and help to develop further understanding of the curriculum and of professionalism as practised in individual classrooms. Needless to say, however, statements made in the case studies must not be taken as statements about all primary schools or teachers in general.

The data from the case studies were presented under three sub-headings in order to simplify discussion of the findings:

a) the school;
b) the school-based curriculum and teachers' responsibilities;
c) teachers' curriculum practices and professionalism in the classroom.

The last two are in many ways interdependent and overlapping; however, this method enabled particular influences, curriculum priorities and practices to be identified.

**Similarities and differences: comparative enquiry**

The main purpose of this thesis is to investigate teachers' perceptions of their professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum development in both Korea and England. The investigations in the two countries run parallel to each other (except for the important fact that my own relationships to the two systems are quite different - insider versus outsider). However, this parallelism is itself often illuminating for one investigation or the other and that fact already suggests the further purpose of some more systematic comparison between the two systems. The comparison of different situations has been a useful technique in social sciences (Togores, 1975). Since it is not possible to compare two things that are either absolutely identical or utterly different, they must have some common features and some differences to enable comparison. This study will then finally search for similarities and differences in the two countries in terms of
Comparative study is a type of research in which attempts are made to ascertain common factors or relationships among phenomena (Verma and Mallick, 1999: 196). In this sense, Holmes (1978: 147) defined three objectives of comparative studies as follows:

The first was to collect and classify educational information in ways which would enable national systems to be described and compared. The second objective was to explain differences by identifying the antecedent "cause" which had produced them. The third task was to discover general principles which govern the development of all national systems of education.

Holmes also emphasised that comparative studies, as a special field of scientific enquiry, were characterized by concern with the problems which educationists have thought to be important:

These may arise within educational systems through dysfunctional relations between sub-institutions. Or they may be the result of dysfunctional relations between educational and other societal institutions. Another possibility is that problems arise as a result of inconsistencies in the normative pattern or because of lags between educational aims and institutional practices. All these problems are the consequence of synchronous societal change. They can be analysed and compared.

The main assumption of a proper comparative approach is that "an educational system can be best analysed and most fully understood in relation to its total cultural setting or social context" (Stroke, 1982: 39). There is no general agreement on a basic methodology of comparative studies (Hardwick, 1982), but one of the traditional methodologies of such studies is to facilitate a comparison of the norms of different societies by exploring in each society specific patterns of relationship between education and the larger society. In other words, the traditional conception of the comparative approach is: "searching for similarities and differences, and explanation or interpretation in the light of cause and cause-effect relationships among the factors" (Togores, 1975: 20). To facilitate such a comparative study similarly (on the whole) balanced samples and the same instruments of data collection and analysis were used in Korea and England. However, this study might not be identified as a conventional kind of comparative study, inasmuch as it focused more on offering "an interactionist and case study account which
could compare the subjective realities of different populations’ (Broadfoot et al., 1993: 10).

There is also my own subjective reality to consider and the fact, in particular, that I interpret the Korean data to English audiences from my internal viewpoint as a Korean educationalist; and I interpret the English data from my external viewpoint as a visitor to the English system. There are then two different points of view as well as two different cultural settings and two different data sets related to these two settings.

Mindful then of the difference of perspective, I explore insights into the special situation of each body of teachers. I present significant examples from both to highlight the more subjective realities of the different populations in terms of their differences and similarities with each other. Thus I attempt a comparative study as an investigation of different professional groups which aims not only to explore causes of differences but to develop some insight into the relative characteristics of the groups compared.

The fundamental problem of cross-cultural comparison is the need for a strong sense of contextual differences between countries (Bradburn and Guilford, 1990). As I have pointed in Chapter 2, different cultural contexts contribute to teachers’ perceptions of their relationship with the government in each country. Such perceptions affect not only their curriculum practice but also in the long run, their professionalism. A clear understanding of cultural differences is therefore needed to explain the contextual differences between the two countries. In this regard, the analysis at the comparative stage of this study (Chapter 8) will dwell strongly on how teachers’ perceptions are shaped by their cultural contexts.

---

77 In this respect, she argued that the comparative study of education is ‘more a way of life’: ‘rather it is a passion to explore the constituents and significance of culture as the driving force of experience using the unique potential of the comparative way of life’ (Broadfoot, 1999: 30).
Part II The Findings of the Empirical Studies

This part, three chapters, 6, 7 and 8, is the heart of this thesis. It is devoted to a discussion of what teachers' professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum development means to teachers. In both Korea and England there have been important changes in the role of the government in curriculum: in Korea some decentralization, in England more centralization. This part examines the perceptions that teachers in the two countries have of these changes. By examining empirical data, it attempts to reveal both differences and similarities, first, among teachers within each country and, then, those between teachers in the two countries.

In chapters 6 and 7, teachers' perceptions of curriculum development and professionalism in Korea and in England are analysed. These chapters will broadly match each other in their structure reflecting the similarity of the methodology and the instruments I employed in the two countries. This, however, should not conceal the large difference in researcher perspective between the two cases. In particular, I interpret the Korean data from my internal viewpoint as a Korean educationalist, in Chapter 6. Here I may think of myself as an interpreter of Korean primary teachers for English readers. In Chapter 7, I interpret the results of the English study from my external viewpoint as an outsider to the English system, and I may think of myself as struggling to interpret it to a Korean readership.

The structure of each chapter is as follows:

a) conceptual understanding of curriculum development and professionalism;
b) perceptions of curriculum requirements in practice;
c) perceptions of the relationship between teachers and government;
d) case study.

In both chapters, all items from the questionnaire and interviews are examined in detail with reference to the main concerns of this thesis. What are the conceptual understandings of curriculum development and professionalism held by these teachers? What are their perceptions regarding their own practices in their new curriculum contexts? How do they perceive the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention? These three general concerns overlap with each other, of course, and some
questionnaire items are referred to in several contexts.

Case studies are described separately in more detail in a section of their own. Organizational features of the case study schools are explored empirically through studying teachers' planning for curriculum development in school and classroom, and teachers' delivery of the curriculum. The types of teachers identified from the questionnaire and interview data receive some further characterization from the case studies. The fundamental questions are: what kind of curriculum do these types of teachers actually create and implement in each school? What features of this school's environment and relationships influence the different types of teachers? How and why do these factors support or discourage teachers' professionalism? The data from the case studies are presented under three sub-headings:

d1) the school;

d2) the school-based curriculum and teachers' responsibilities;

d3) teachers' curriculum practices and professionalism in the classroom.

Based on these separate analyses of Korea and England (more exactly of Seoul and London) in chapters 6 and 7, which involve contrasting points of view as well as different cultural settings, Chapter 8 tentatively compares teachers' perceptions in Korea and England, while taking into account the characteristics of each country's cultural context. This approach is adopted to understand each body of teachers better not to reach for general laws or principles. In particular, I present significant examples highlighting the more subjective realities of different populations in terms of differences and similarities, the aim of comparison is not simply to find contrasts or parallels between the perceptions of teachers in the two countries, but to show how these perceptions vary in specific ways with their different cultural contexts.

Chapter 8 is divided into two main sections. The first compares some selected variables between the two countries where it is the differences which seem most significant to identify and highlight the reasons why teachers' perceptions in each country function as they do. But some common patterns between the two sets of teachers can also be observed in the data. The second section identifies some of these similarities of teachers' perceptions.
Chapter 6 Korean Teachers’ Perceptions of Themselves, Curriculum Development and the Government

This chapter presents and analyses data from questionnaires, interviews and a case study carried out between November 1997 and July 1998 with teachers and headteachers in six public primary schools in Seoul, Korea.

6.1 Conceptual Understanding of Curriculum Development and Professionalism

Table 5.1 shows the results of questions about the conceptual understanding of curriculum development and professionalism held by the Korean teachers. Table 5.2 presents these results by school groups. Some items in Table 5.2 are emboldened and underlined to emphasize the size of the inter-group differences in those cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. As a teacher I should plan the contents, teaching, and assessment for my own class.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My role as a teacher is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The professional teacher is good at managing prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The professional teacher is always punctual.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘Professionalism’ is more a matter of competency than status.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers have a higher status now than they used to have.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1 consists of teachers from schools which are located in upper-middle and middle-middle income areas. Group 2 consists of teachers from schools which are located in mixed income areas. Group 3 consists of teachers from schools which are located in low income areas (for details see Chapter 5).
15. The government gets in the way of good teaching. 42 21 3.0

16. The professional teacher works well in a team. 58 29 3.5

17. The professional teacher is a good manager of the classroom. 80 13 3.8

18. Subject knowledge is the most important thing for a teacher. 97 2 4.5

19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly. 57 39 3.4

20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively. 14 80 2.1

21. Teachers deserve to be paid more. 96 3 4.6

22. Society does not respect teachers enough. 96 1 4.7

23. If I were to start again, I would still be a teacher. 97 2 4.4

24. There is not enough joint planning by teachers. 43 22 3.3

25. Teacher appraisal is a positive contribution to professional development. 36 59 2.7

26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers' professional pride. 63 14 3.6

27. The essential component of teacher appraisal should be self-assessment together with appraisal by senior-colleagues. 88 9 4.2

Table 5.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Curriculum Development and Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I proceed now re-present and discuss these responses in appropriate and manageable segments, while also drawing on interview data.
6.1.1 Curriculum development

Table 5.1.1 Teachers' Perceptions of Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. As a teacher I should plan the contents, teaching, and assessment for my own class.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My role as a teacher is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The professional teacher is good at managing prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2.1 Groups' Perceptions of Curriculum Development (% of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Substantial majorities believed that teachers should plan the content, teaching, and assessment for their own class and that their status role goes beyond methods. This coheres with a large majority being certain that teachers perform better if given a role in curriculum development. However, nearly half identified curriculum development as a task for educational experts. This ambivalence is probably due to many teachers' restricted sense of what it is to have a curriculum role; that might be confirmed by the fact that four in five teachers considered that the professional teacher was good at managing the prescribed curriculum in classroom. So the half who valued their own decision-making for the curriculum rather than that leaving it to experts may have included many who took it for granted that curriculum development for teachers meant no more than to plan something for the classroom within the prescribed curriculum. Certainly, there was a strong positive

Several supplementary tables (ex: Table 5.1.1, Table 5.1.2...Table 5.2.1), which are a part of the original table (ex: Table 5.1, Table 5.2), will be presented for the convenience of discussion in this chapter. These later tables will deliberately sequence and discuss the items according to their interrelationship, based on the following:

a) those which were overwhelmingly recognized;

b) those which were generally recognized, but with significant assenters or dissenters;

c) mixed responses.
correlation between items 7 and 8 (r = .423). The 21% who agreed that 'the teacher's role is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching' were mostly among the 43% who believed that 'teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts'.

As shown in Table 5.2, the means for the three groups for most items were not very different. However, there was some disagreement among groups in two items, 7 and 8 (Table 5.2.1); overall, nearly half of the teachers responded positively that teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts (item 8), but while 64% of teachers in Group 2 had this opinion, just 40% in Group 1 and 24% in Group 3 had the same opinion. Furthermore, 48% of Group 2 were certain that the teachers' role is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching (item 7), while only 8% of teachers in both Groups 1 and 3 believed this.

Teachers in Group 2 were selected from schools which were located in mixed income areas. Compared with teachers in other groups, they held a conception of curriculum development which corresponded more with a 'restricted' notion of responsibility (Hoyle, 1980) in curriculum development, in which their curriculum practices were contained within the classroom. More teachers in Group 2 than in other groups seemed satisfied with the curriculum as 'an authority of experts'. It is possible that the National Curriculum is more suitable to the children in average schools, in which teachers needed to make less effort and felt comfortable about implementing the curriculum.

In the interviews, several teachers argued that curriculum development for teachers did not mean creating everything from nothing; rather it meant interpreting and deciding what to teach at the classroom level within prescribed curriculum guidelines. The majority

Correlation deals with the agreement between two variables. 'r' is a correlation coefficient. I use the correlation tools to determine whether certain items of data could together be a base to identify some types of teachers. 'Correlation coefficients are usually arranged to have a maximum value of 1, which indicates perfect agreement. This decreases to 0, indicating a situation in which there is no agreement, and in some situations high scores on one test are associated with low scores on another, and in these cases the correlation coefficient is negative and is described as inverse (as opposed to direct)' (Selkirk, 1981). Generally correlation coefficients are interpreted as follows (Kang and Kim, 1999):

a) 1 ~ .7 (-1~-.7) very strong correlation
b) .7~.4 (-.7~-.4) strong correlation
c) .4~.2 (-.4~-.2) some correlation
d) .2~ 0 (-.2~ 0) no correlation
Implementing the sixth National Curriculum is really confusing to teachers. I do not know what it wants from us... We teachers need more detailed guidelines... We could cook the fifth one at classroom level. But I have to buy some ingredients by myself for the sixth one. I need more energy and time to do that. I am not sure that this whole process is needed for teachers. Isn't this the job of curriculum experts? (My emphasis) (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

Absolutely, teachers should be the owners of curriculum development. The question is the appropriate role for teachers... Anyhow, we need an agreed national baseline for the curriculum. If I am asked to create my own curriculum without such a baseline, I could not concentrate on teaching and manage my job efficiently. (My emphasis) (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Teachers need the national standard for teaching which is set by experts. Without this guideline, teachers are perplexed. We have enough flexibility at the individual classroom level within the National Curriculum. Although I fully understand the intention of the sixth National Curriculum, in practice it gives teachers more work, the same as copying what has been given by the government before the sixth National Curriculum. (My emphasis) (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Teachers' conceptual understandings of curriculum development seemed to have been held back by a general lack of opportunity to participate effectively in decision-making in curriculum development up to now. Overall, the teachers' perceptions of their role in curriculum development corresponded with the meaning of 'restricted autonomy'. Restricted autonomy is considered to mean the control of teachers over their own teaching in the classroom, in which they attempt to follow the official curriculum as closely as possible (Darling-Harmond, 1989). One teacher asserted:

A teacher should be a centre of curriculum development. The most important role of teachers in curriculum development is flexibility in practice. Education is not for an individual's own concerns and interests but for the public. In that sense, we teachers need a prescribed curriculum and standards at national level. Our main job as teachers is teaching. Teachers are more concentrated on teaching and pupils. We don't have enough time to search for sources for what should be taught. We need more prepared materials and sources for teaching. We need lots of options to choose by ourselves. (My emphasis) (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

On the other hand, another interviewee held a conception which corresponded with the meaning of 'extended autonomy' in discussion of curriculum development. Extended

---

81 For the classification of teachers in interviews, see footnote 70 in Chapter 5.
autonomy refers to the desire of teachers to direct their own behaviour and make their own professional decisions without pressure from outside sources (Romberg et al., 1988). Thus it has been considered to require teachers’ involvement and decision-making about the curriculum beyond the classroom level:

It demands more involvement of teachers in curriculum development at the national level, even though developing curriculum is not solely the teachers’ job. Teachers should decide what is taught and how, by themselves. I mean giving freedom with no conditions or restrictions imposed on teachers... In the process of curriculum development at the national level, teachers should be major decision-makers. (My emphasis) (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

On the whole, although the great majority of teachers believed in the importance of their own role in curriculum development, the notion of ‘restricted autonomy’ was typical of the Korean cohort. Most interviewees explained their notion of the teachers’ curriculum control as the extent to which a teacher can handle his or her work at classroom level. Another description of this restricted role:

Although a teacher should be given freedom in teaching a subject, teachers must refer to some approved sources to figure out curriculum practice. I think teachers should have freedom in the way they teach at classroom level. This does exist in a sense. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Many argued that Korean teachers could actually teach the curriculum content in the way they felt appropriate, but within the limit of the National Curriculum. Perhaps this helps to explain how, virtually unanimously, respondents believed that teachers would perform better if they were given a role in curriculum development, whilst one in two respondents still regarded curriculum development as the job of educational experts. This might be interpreted as confirming that most, or at least half, of the teachers perceived their role in curriculum development as corresponding with the notion of ‘restricted autonomy’.

Table 5.1.2 Teachers’ Perceptions of Their Role in National Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agreed</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More than half thought teachers' implementation should be unquestioning and a large majority (ambiguously) disagreed that 'creative' implementation was possible. These results also reflected Korean teachers' limited sense of their curriculum role as merely 'restricted autonomy'. In this respect, a headteacher argued that teachers did not and should not have the freedom to design their preparation file any way they wished. Rather, they should write it according to the general guidelines based on the National Curriculum. There was no claim of absolute curriculum control for teachers, since teachers could not go beyond the framework of dictated regulations.

Interestingly, there was some positive correlation between items 12 and 19 ($r=.206$), and items 8 and 20 ($r=.337$): so, significant proportions of the sample simultaneously believed that ‘teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development’, but they should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly’; and, again, they believed that ‘teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts’, but ‘they can implement the National Curriculum creatively’. These features also pointed to the teachers’ ambivalent stance: although they valued their essential role in curriculum development, they fairly generally thought that this role was separated from the role of educational experts.

Overall, then, the respondents varied in their views of the government being the final authority on what should be taught in schools. The majority, however, did not actually make their own decisions or participate in choosing the content which they taught, and, also, they did not think they could implement the curriculum creatively. There is no doubt that these views reflect in great measure the curriculum control mode in Korea. Curriculum development in Korea has been the responsibility of the government; and the National Curriculum has made decisions on what and how teachers teach. In other words, teachers do not have any involvement in decision-making regarding curriculum development but only in implementation or delivery. It is obvious that, although nearly half disagreed that curriculum development was the responsibility of high officials and educational experts, the general understanding of Korean teachers about their role in curriculum development is that it is limited to 'restricted autonomy'.
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6.1.2 Professionalism

Table 5.1.3 Teachers' Perceptions of Government Impact on Their Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The government gets in the way of good teaching.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Mandated textbook are a good idea.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[In contrast with the conceptual understandings of curriculum development, there were no large differences among teachers of schools on the issues of professionalism (see Table 5.2)].

More than half disagreed that 'teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach'. The majority of interviewees argued that to a certain extent government control would provide the teacher with knowledge that would have a positive impact on curriculum practices and encourage professional progress. Interestingly, teachers seemed to see advantages in centralized curriculum control, rather than in an autonomous role free from the government. Yet, only one in five of the cessionaire respondents disagreed with the judgement that 'the government gets in the way of good teaching'.

One interviewee even asserted that it was wrong to allow teachers to do whatever they wanted, whether in planning or in teaching the curriculum that they chose. Rather, to assure harmony within the system, teachers should teach under the control of the government or other authorities, at least to a certain extent. However, at the same time, teachers complained that they were required to do too much. Duties outside the classroom, such as recess duty and paperwork, prevented them from giving their full attention to their teaching.

---

82 Although, this item will appear in Table 9.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers' professionalism.

83 Although, this item will appear in Table 10.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers' professionalism.
Half of the respondents had a positive view of mandated textbooks, and two in five a negative view. There was also an even split on this among interviewees, and I suspected that this might be very significant. One teacher who approved of mandated textbooks commented:

Just as we still need national guidelines in curriculum, we teachers need textbooks which are government-approved to set the standard of teaching. So long as we use textbooks in the classroom, we can have more flexibility. That is enough for a teacher. A textbook is a good source of instruction. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

On the other hand, another teacher thought that mandated textbooks were a main barrier to professionalism.

I have never understood the reason why each time the curriculum is changed the government has to change it and the mandated textbooks. There is still too much interference from central government, although I do feel the sixth National Curriculum is giving teachers the opportunity for a little more independence. One main reason for dysfunctions of the National Curriculum is the mandated textbooks. Mandated textbooks can make the teacher-involved curriculum meaningless. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Textbooks in Korea interpret the National Curriculum officially, are approved by the government, and handed down to teachers and pupils. They give little autonomy to teachers, and in fact teachers traditionally lack the opportunity to interpret the National Curriculum directly; they just reinterpret the textbook author’s interpretation of it. Textbooks have always defined and directed their teaching practice. In spite of the sixth National Curriculum introducing a system which allows teachers much greater involvement, they have still textbooks which remain the same style as before. This helps explain why so many complained about the mandated textbooks, though nearly half remained in favour of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers have a higher status now than they used to have.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers deserve to be paid more.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Society does not respect teachers enough.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If I were to start again, I would still be a teacher.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In regard to status, teachers’ views mixed the negative and the positive. Virtually all felt underpaid and under-respected and rather more believed their status was in decline than the opposite. However, they almost unanimously expressed positive judgements that if they were to start again, they would still be a teacher. It seemed that they enjoyed being teachers more than they would have enjoyed the higher status of any other profession. This last response might be affected by Korean tradition and the public expectations of teachers, in which teachers were regarded as very respectable and honourable people. Recent research has shown that teachers had the ‘sacred’ view of the teaching profession, valorizing their affection for pupils and sacrifices for their calling (KEDI, 1992).

Table 5.1.5 Teachers’ Perceptions of Professional Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The professional teacher works well in a team.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. There is not enough joint planning by teachers.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher appraisal is a positive contribution to professional development.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers’ professional pride.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The essential component of teacher appraisal should be self-assessment together with appraisal by senior-colleagues.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to items 16 and 24 may be seen as a general acknowledgement, though a somewhat grudging one, that collaboration as a professional value is under-exercised in the Korean system. The other questions relate to more hierarchical interactions. A significant majority believed that ‘the essential component of teacher appraisal should be self-assessment together with appraisal by senior colleagues’, and nearly two thirds were strongly critical of present forms of both teacher appraisal and school inspection. These results from the questionnaires were confirmed by the interview findings that the teachers supported the value of interaction with other teachers, and generally agreed that sharing ideas and learning from one another were necessary. One teacher commented on school

84 The study of Reynolds and Farrell (1996: 54) pointed this aspect as a factor responsible for the high achievement scores of Pacific Rim societies: ‘the high status of teachers within Pacific Rim societies that, because of their religious and cultural traditions, place a high value upon learning and education...’
inspection, contrasting it with voluntary appraisal by colleagues. He accepted appraisal of professionalism only if it came in the form of advice and guidance, and then only on a one-to-one level:

School inspections, which happen regularly, are none of our business. They never concern and consult the individual teacher. The headteacher and senior teachers are more concerned about the inspection. But it is just a ritual rather than having practical efficiency for school improvement. Sometimes, we young teachers exchange experiences and advice about teaching with colleagues and observe colleagues' classrooms to achieve feedback for our own teaching. It's really helpful for our professional development. Unfortunately, we don’t often have enough time to do this, and also some teachers are not comfortable being observed in their classroom. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

Another teacher complained about the current situation of teachers’ appraisal operated only by headteachers:

Only headteachers are responsible for individual teacher appraisal. I do not consider this to be just, as only one person evaluates an individual’s work. It would be better to have the opinion of more than one individual, as one person may give a biased view. Officially a headteacher is supposed to evaluate a teacher's performance and try to help him. However, in practice, teacher appraisal is not a matter of teachers' professionalism but only of their administrative efficiency. Teacher appraisal should be an individual teacher’s self-assessment. This kind of system would allow one to be a professional teacher. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

The bureaucratic nature of the Korean school system seems to be responsible for this kind of negative response about the current appraisal system. Traditionally, in Korea, the headteachers have been largely responsible for the behaviour and quality of teachers, and all teachers have a large degree of obligation and responsibility towards the headteacher. The results of teachers’ appraisal based on the headteachers’ judgement critically influence their promotion. Thus, the main function of the appraisal is to manage the hierarchy of the teaching profession rather than the professional development of teachers. In addition, school inspectors’ supervision focuses on the school and hardly ever on the individual teacher. These inspection and appraisal systems explain the teachers' negative responses on their role in professional development. Under central control of the profession, teachers themselves are mainly in charge of developing their own professionalism.
Table 5.1.6 Teachers’ Perceptions of Professional Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. The professional teacher is good at managing prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The professional teacher is always punctual.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘Professionalism’ is more a matter of competence than status.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The professional teacher is a good manager of the classroom.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Subject knowledge is the most important thing for a teacher.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject-specialists.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, large majorities were certain that professionalism was more a matter of competence than status, that the professional teacher was a good manager of the prescribed curriculum and the classroom, and that subject knowledge was the most important thing for a teacher. This last perception was consistent with the notion of professional knowledge as a central criterion of professionalism.86

On the other hand, some interviewees indicated that the competence of professional teachers was a matter not only of subject knowledge but also of dedication and commitment to their job and being a caring, helpful and moral person. They valued the notion of professionalism as demanding a strong ethical commitment to the interest of clients (Campbell, 1997). One teacher commented on this point as follows:

Professional teachers should have specialized knowledge in their subject. But professional teachers must be distinguished from people who join the profession for the sake of money, incentives and their own interests. Professional autonomy is important, but first of all, professional teachers join the profession with interests and concerns for working with young people. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

---

85 Although, this item will appear in Table 9.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relatedness of teachers’ professionalism.

86 Bottery (1998; 1996) explained the idea of professionalism in relation to three areas: the notion of teachers’ knowledge, the notion of attitude and responsibility, and the notion of the significance of autonomy for effective practice (for detail see Chapter 2).
A headteacher clearly indicated that a good generalist class teacher who related well to children and their learning needs was the one whom she most valued and would recognize as a professional teacher:

I don’t think a teacher who is fantastic at subject knowledge would really be good enough and professional. I think that it is much more important to relate well to children, understand children’s needs, and how children learn. A teacher having an MA or PhD degree can be a brilliant scientist and may not be a professional teacher. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

The respondents were generally agreed that primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject specialists. On the other hand, as we have seen, they also valued subject knowledge as the most important thing for a teacher. In this respect, one teacher, who was in charge of 11-year-old children, admitted that he could see the need for specialization because of the demands of specific subject content:

I see some need for specialization in some aspects of the primary school. This is necessary in areas such as science where many of the typical class teachers would not have the knowledge. They would need to be re-trained to cope with the new curriculum. First of all, teachers should be specialists. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

A particular subject identity, however, is not usually uppermost in the professional identity of primary teachers. The great majority of the 98% who thought subject knowledge most important can be presumed have been thinking of the knowledge skills and procedures they used in teaching across subjects. It remains that Korean teachers clearly connected professionalism strongly with classroom competence and expert knowledge. There is no doubt that the type of training received by teachers, in which there is considerable emphasis on subject knowledge (see Chapter 4), contributes to the teachers’ perceptions of its importance.

In this context, participants were also asked about their confidence in their own knowledge and skills in curriculum development. Without qualified teachers who have the requisite knowledge and skills for curriculum development, it would seem to be futile to expect

---

(H) means headteacher.
teachers to be responsible for their own curriculum. Indeed, introducing the sixth National Curriculum has raised the issue that in schools there are few teachers who could do curriculum work (Ahn, 1996a). Respondents were then asked how they perceived their own knowledge and skills for curriculum development. Table 6.1 shows teachers' responses generally, while Table 6.2 presents these responses by school groups. They were asked about their own individual competences.

Table 6.1 Teachers' Perceptions of Their Own Individual Competences in Curriculum Development (N=78)

"Please indicate the level of your confidence regarding each item as follows."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83. Up-to-date subject knowledge</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Identifying conceptual structure of the subjects I teach</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Reviewing existing practice</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Implementing a programme scheme</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluating a programme scheme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Identifying links between subjects</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Ordering, maintaining resources</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Leading workshops and discussions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Liaising with the head and senior staff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Advising colleagues informally</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Teaching alongside colleagues</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Visiting colleagues' class to see work in progress</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Maintaining colleagues' morale, reducing anxiety etc.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Dealing with professional disagreement</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Consulting advisers, curriculum mediators etc.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Consulting teachers in other schools</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Their Own Individual Competences in Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Identifying conceptual structure of the subjects I teach</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Updating subject knowledge</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Ordering, maintaining resources</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluating a programme scheme</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Implementing a programme scheme</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Valuing a programme scheme</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Ordering, maintaining resources</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Implementing a programme scheme</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be convenient now to divide these competences into two categories, knowledge and interpersonal skills, and in each category to re-present them in rank order of confidence. [Group differences need not be further referred to because none seems really significant.]

**Knowledge**

Table 6.1.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Their Curriculum Knowledge: in Rank Order of Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Identifying links between subjects</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Identifying conceptual structure of the subjects I teach</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Up-to-date subject knowledge</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Implementing a programme scheme</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluating a programme scheme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Ordering, maintaining resources</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Reviewing existing practice</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority were confident overall about their knowledge in curriculum development as they understood it. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that interviewees did not
mention any lack of such knowledge. Of course, there were differences of degree, as displayed in the rank order above. And the comparative lack of confidence about reviewing existing practice is certainly worth remarking. On the whole, however, the respondents appeared to have great confidence about their knowledge in curriculum development.

Skills

Table 6.1.2 Teachers' Perceptions of Their Interpersonal Curriculum Skills: in Rank Order of Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98. Teaching alongside colleagues</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Visiting colleagues' class to see work in progress</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Maintaining colleagues' morale, reducing anxiety etc.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Consulting teachers in other schools</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Consulting advisers, curriculum mediators etc.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Dealing with professional disagreement</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Advising colleagues informally</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Leading workshops and discussions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Liaising with the head and senior staff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only half or fewer were certain about their own skills in advising colleagues informally, leading workshops and discussions, and liaising with the head and senior staff. This indicated a lack of opportunity to participate in curriculum decision-making processes effectively. It also reflected that under the highly centralized curriculum development system teachers did not have to deal with this kind of situation until now. Several interviewees commented on these issues:

There is a need for more experience in this. Our society, especially in the field of education, is a very conservative one. It gives scarcely any room for individuals to disagree with their superiors or even express their opinions to them with any confidence. So we can have very limited latitude in these processes. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

This is the very first time that teachers themselves have dealt with curriculum development. We lack experience, knowledge and skills to manage this. Until now, we did not have a chance to participate in the development of the whole curriculum. How should we begin? Frankly speaking, it just seems another obligation which we must accept. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)
In sum, the respondents had more confidence regarding what we have called the knowledge aspects than the skill aspects - particularly skills that go beyond their classroom roles - of curriculum development. This might be because they have had little chance to participate in wide curriculum development. Being controlled by government policy and conditions would seriously constrain their skills and attitudes in curriculum decision-making situation beyond the classroom.

Participants were asked how they described themselves as teachers. Their self-portraits reflected the directly practical nature of their work and professional concerns.

Table 7.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Themselves as Teachers: in Rank Order of Descriptions (N=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107. Teachers are essentially members of the teaching and learning community.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Teachers convey specialist knowledge to pupils in an objective way.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Teachers are authoritative managers of classroom and pupils’ learning.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Teachers are craftsmen or craftswomen who draw practical knowledge from their experiences for the benefit of their pupils.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Themselves as Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have seen earlier, the majority of teachers emphasized subject knowledge and experience rather than autonomous status. Interestingly, the self-description that attracted the highest support - virtual unanimity - was of teachers as essentially members of the teaching and learning community. This goes with the fact that they have readiness to join a professional organization for teachers which provides professional accountability, despite seeing some advantages in centralized curriculum development, and also despite accepting the limited sense of professionalism as a matter of competence rather than status. Compared with other definitions, a smaller proportion agreed that teachers draw practical knowledge from their experiences for the benefit of their pupils.
Interviewees were nearly unanimous that professionalism could only be attributed to those teachers who placed 'their own competence and the interests of their pupils' before their own autonomous status (for example, see an earlier quotation: Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2). In this respect, Korean teachers may still stand in the second phase of the history of professionalism, in which teachers are required to have craft knowledge and strong ethical commitment rather than autonomy for effective practice. As the above data show, Korean teachers tend to see their professionalism in terms of their professional knowledge and responsibility for their work.

In this section, I have discussed how Korean teachers understood curriculum development and professionalism. In short, it became obvious that they generally tended to define their role as the notions of 'restricted autonomy', particularly at classroom level, and their understanding of professionalism linked it to 'professional knowledge' and 'commitment', rather than 'autonomy', though there were quite numerous exceptions. They certainly did not generally feel that professional teachers should have to make all curriculum decisions according to a demanding ideal of autonomy.

We have noted distinctive tendencies among teachers on certain items which represent particular notion of curriculum development and professionalism. Thus, item 19, which represented the notion of 'restricted autonomy', that 'teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly', had a strong negative correlation with item 20, which might be taken to represent a much more open notion of autonomy, that 'teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively' (r=-.389). As for the conception of professionalism, item 11, which represented the 'professional knowledge view' that 'professionalism is more a matter of competence than status', had a strong negative correlation with item 13, which represented the notion of 'autonomy', that 'teachers cannot be professional if the government tells them what to teach (r=-.375). In addition, there was some correlation across these items: there were positive correlations between items 11 and

---

Bottery (1998; 1996) divided the history of professionalism into three phases:

a) expertise - the claim by an occupational group to exclusive knowledge and practice;
b) altruism - an ethical concern by this group for its client;
c) autonomy - the professionals' need and right to exercise control over entry into, and subsequent practice within, that particular occupation (for details see Chapter 2).
Therefore, two reasonably coherent types of teachers could be identified: Type I has a view which corresponds with the notion of 'restricted autonomy' in curriculum development and 'a matter of professional knowledge and commitment', in professionalism. Type II-k\(^89\) holds a conception which supports the notion of 'extended autonomy' in curriculum development as defining professionalism. Table 8 summarises these types of teachers who can be identified by a distinctive tendency on certain items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type I % Agree</th>
<th>Type II-k % Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Professionalism is more a matter of competence than status</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their conceptual understandings of curriculum development and professionalism, the majority of Korean teachers tended towards Type I. However, it should be noticed that there might be a significant minority who were Type II-k: some teachers might perhaps think the National Curriculum was just too tightly defined to implement it in the creative way they would regard as minimally satisfying, and some others might think it was going rather too far to say that teachers could not be professionals if the curriculum is prescribed. What I mean here is that Type II-k teachers might not be confined to those 14%\(^90\) or 25% minorities. The features of these types of teachers will be further identified in the following sections.

---

\(^89\) As I clarified in Chapter 5, these types are useful abstractions, not a certain number of real teachers. Also, Type II-k is different from Type II-e in the English case. We will see in Chapter 7 that it has a similar tendency, but a different context.

\(^90\) The 80% of Korean teachers who disagreed with this proposition might include two different groups; those who wanted a more creative implementation than the sixth National Curriculum allowed, and those who disapproved of being creative with this context.
6.2 Perceptions of Curriculum Requirements in Practice

Table 9.1 indicates the teachers' beliefs regarding the practice of the new curriculum in which they are involved. Table 9.2 presents these results by school groups.

Table 9.1 Teachers' Perceptions of Curriculum Practices (N=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. The National Curriculum has the support of teachers for its general principles.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The majority of teachers are familiar with and get to grips with the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I think the National Curriculum enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The planned and delivered National Curriculum has greatly improved standards.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The National Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The National Curriculum is the major influence over what is taught in the classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The &quot;command-and-control&quot; approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Assessment arrangements are the most important part of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. National assessment should rely more on teachers' judgements.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Teachers have continued to adopt formal teaching methods because of the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The ethos of the classroom has been changed by the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Korean questionnaire, it was made clear that the National Curriculum meant the sixth National Curriculum.

The emphasis of the new curricula concerning pedagogy is different in Korea from England: it suggests less formal teaching rather than more formal teaching. Therefore, in the English questionnaire, this question was slightly modified as follows: "Teachers have been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum."
42. Teaching was just a job before the National Curriculum.

43. As a result of the National Curriculum, teachers work and plan more together.

44. Assessment of standards should be done by national testing.

45. There has been inadequate resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum.

46. Mandated textbooks are a good idea.

47. Primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject-specialists.

48. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration.

49. Most teachers integrate subjects into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate.

50. The major aim of primary teachers is the promotion of basic skills.

51. The National Curriculum is appropriate to promote the basic skills of young children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Curriculum Practices

These responses and associated interview data will now be discussed in three categories: general framework and principles; contents, pedagogy and practices; and assessment.

There have been important changes in the role of the government in curriculum in both countries: in Korea some decentralization, in England more centralization. Therefore, in the English questionnaires, this question was modified as follows: “Teaching has become just a job since the National Curriculum.”
6.2.1 General framework and principles

Table 9.1.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of the Value and Worth of the National Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. The National Curriculum has the support of teachers for its general principles.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The majority of teachers are familiar with and get to grips with the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I think the National Curriculum enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The planned and delivered National Curriculum has greatly improved standards.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The &quot;command-and-control&quot; approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2.1 Groups’ Perceptions of the Value and Worth of the National Curriculum (% of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around half of the respondents believed that the teachers supported the sixth National Curriculum principles and got to grips with it, also that it was a good framework for teaching and educationally enriching for pupils. However, three in five still believed that the ‘command-and-control’ approach to its introduction had left no space for professional discretion. The means of these items were around 3, and there were many neutral responses.

As shown in Table 9.2.1, there was huge group variation on the two questions which directly related to the educational value of the National Curriculum. Support for this value declined substantially among Groups 2 and 3 schools. Most dramatically, against 76% of teachers in Group 1 schools, only 16% of Group 3 teachers believed the National Curriculum enriched and broadened the educational experience of children. These results suggested a reasonably clear picture of the differences which were produced by the conditions of teachers’ working lives. The practice of the National Curriculum was likely to disadvantage the teachers in low income areas (Broadfoot et al., 1993).

In general, most of the favourable interviewee comments referred to the goals of the National Curriculum and the intention of giving more flexibility to teachers: goals which
focused on creativity and moral education, and the innovation of giving teachers some options about courses. Interviewees who might be identified as Type I agreed with the necessity of the National Curriculum as a good framework being controlled by government or local authorities to some extent.

Teachers need some sort of guidelines at national level, because we need clear educational objectives and standards to be defined for pupils. If teachers had to make every decision in curriculum planning, they could be very confused and out of their depth. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

The sixth National Curriculum is a useful framework. It's actually what we need, although it is still too specific and does not give enough flexibility to individual teachers. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

One in five did not believe that most of their colleagues understood and got to grips with the new curriculum (item 29). This might be related to one type of teacher reaction to the curriculum. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, some teachers saw decentralization in curriculum policy primarily as imposing extra work and burdens on them as teachers, because they did not have sufficient previous experience of curriculum development. One interviewee commented in this vein:

The introduction of the sixth National Curriculum is too new to assess its impact on teachers' decision-making in curriculum development. We do not have enough information and resources to make it work. Actually I have no idea about the sixth National Curriculum except it is new. It seems to give us extra work. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Others, however, criticised the new curriculum for the superficiality of its intention to decentralize. There was no real room for freedom or flexibility of teachers in curriculum development and there was little difference from the previous practices and approaches adopted by teachers. One interviewee showed the tendency of Type II-k:

What is new? There has been change in some contents as usual. Besides that, I do not see any difference from the fifth National Curriculum or the other earlier ones. Decentralization or giving power to teachers? I do not see any changes at all. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

There was some negative correlation between items 33 and 36 ($r=-.221$), which reflected these two different perceptions. Many teachers (54%) regarded the National
Curriculum as a good framework for teaching and encouraging good practice. Most of the others were among the majority (61%) who perceived it as a command and control device which cannot promote professional discretion. Here again we meet the two types of teachers distinguished earlier. Type I perceived the National Curriculum as a good framework to enhance their professionalism (correlation between items 19 and 33: r=.255), Type II-k perceived it as a command and control device to deprive them of their professional autonomy (correlation between items 20 and 36: r=.317). 94

6.2.2 Contents, pedagogy and practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The National Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The National Curriculum is the major influence over what is taught in the classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The &quot;command-and-control&quot; approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the attempt at decentralization as a major intention of the sixth National Curriculum, the teachers perceived little or no effect at the practical level (62%), and some interviewees opposed even the attempt at decentralization:

One of the good points of the sixth National Curriculum is that it gave individual teachers more scope to fashion the curriculum with their own pupils in mind, as no two pupils or schools are exactly the same. However, I have come to know that the Annual School Plan and Curriculum of each school are very similar. There are not such great differences, not only among schools but also between this and the prior curriculum. (My emphasis) (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

In Korea our contract means we change school every four years. This means that the standard of teachers’ lessons is as similar as possible in every school. Therefore, I feel that as a civil servant and a teacher I do not need the diversity which is assumed to be allowed in the sixth National Curriculum. I do not

94 From now on, the Type I tendency will be identified by correlation with item 33 (the National Curriculum as a framework), while that of Type II-k will be identified by correlation with item 36 (the National Curriculum as a command and control device).
understand that every school should have a different perspective and a different activity in their curriculum. (My emphasis) (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

Korea is a small country with one nationality and we do not have a national melting pot as in America. It means that we do not need their diversity, which can cause confusion. Most of all we need national standards in every sense of the word. (My emphasis) (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

The teachers' transfer system in Korea may be a distinctive condition which influences teachers' negative responses to the decentralizing intentions of the new curriculum. Teachers have continued to move among schools and within each school, so that they considered a school as a temporary working place. This circumstance inhibits teachers from developing or implementing the curriculum in their own ways. They are unable to develop any sense of 'curriculum authority'. The still more frequent transfer of teachers in low income areas might be another reason why those teachers agreed less with the perception of 'the sixth National Curriculum as a good framework for teaching' (see Table 9.2.1).

Two thirds of those questioned felt that the curriculum was too detailed and created an overloaded, over-demanding schedule, although it had in fact tried to some extent to remedy this, and a similar proportion agreed that the 'command and control' approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum left no space for professional discretion. As might be expected, there was a positive correlation between these two sets of responses (r=.285). An interviewee commented:

Even so, the idea of the National Curriculum for academic excellence is good but not the way it has been implemented. We are very accustomed to the 'command and control' system not only in curriculum but also in all educational matters. This is the problem. We don't have to work on professional development and thus cannot be professionals. We are safe if we just follow the orders and direction of authorities. As far as I understand it, the sixth National Curriculum is one step towards less central control. However, even though I have already spent four years with the new curriculum, I could feel no difference in practice. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

95 In the public schools teachers are transferred to other schools every four years, but in low income areas, teachers are rotated every three years. Since few teachers want to work in low income areas, the government set this policy to give some incentives for teachers who work in those areas. Within schools, every year teachers teach a different grade from the previous year for the purpose of equalizing teaching loads. Teaching loads in a week are from 24 through 28 periods of 40 minutes each, depending on grades of teaching (see Chapter 3).
A teacher, who, like the preceding one, could be identified as Type II-k, explained this resentfully:

If I plan my work for teaching around the concepts and skills which are surely the essence of the sixth National Curriculum, I still feel the individual teacher is not given enough space for his own interpretation of his work. There is no doubt that I cannot help following the sixth National Curriculum although it gives little room for teachers’ choices. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

On the whole, interviewees thought that even though the sixth National Curriculum had adopted a more decentralized administration, it was unrealistic to affirm the existence of independence for teachers. Teachers still had considerable difficulty not only in designing but also in modifying the curriculum to best serve their pupils. Many thought that lack of independence, with the long history of centralized administration of teachers, stifled the sense of creativity among teachers. A headteacher, who might be typical of Type I, pointed out that teachers might not be ready to take some responsibility for curriculum matters:

A teacher does not have independence but follows certain plans set by the government, local authorities, and school administration as well. The sixth National Curriculum is the only curriculum. The more teachers receive power to decide the curriculum, the more insecure they are about their own ability to decide the curriculum. This is the truth and the present situation. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

Table 9.1.3 Teachers’ Perceptions of Changing Classroom Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Teachers have continued to adopt more formal teaching methods because of the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The ethos of the classroom has been changed by the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Teaching was just a job before the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. As a result of the National Curriculum, teachers work and plan more together.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. There has been inadequate resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Mandated textbooks are a good idea.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Most teachers integrate subjects into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three in five participants agreed that the ethos of the classroom had been changed by the National Curriculum. A headteacher made this comment:

In fact, something has been changed in classrooms since the new curriculum. First of all we try to change the arrangement of the classroom for group work. Children are more encouraged to express themselves freely and allowed to express more individuality. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

Another teacher gave an example of more flexibility in the classroom:

In my class one boy does not wish to concentrate or attend to the work on hand. The new sixth National Curriculum has allowed me to treat him more as individual. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Perceptions of changes in the classroom ethos had a high positive correlation with the view that teachers worked and planned together more as a result of the National Curriculum ($r = .490$). It was obvious that such changes were regarded as positive:

A headteacher encourages the teachers to work together, especially joint work in curriculum development. We try to follow it and apparently it's getting better. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

In the grade meeting, we discuss methods of teaching, the curriculum contents, and discipline and education-related matters. Those meeting are more dynamic since the introduction of the sixth National Curriculum. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Still, however, one quarter disagreed that teachers worked and planned together more than before and this view, too, was found among interviewees:

Originally, we have to accept the curriculum decisions of the most senior member of the teaching staff who can impose their points of view. However, obviously the more senior members can lack flexibility, which can be frustrating for the younger staff. I am not quite sure whether the meeting is for the view of all teachers to be heard. Lack of group work and discussion is common in teacher society. Until now, we have not been invited to discuss together; rather, we have valued authoritative decision-making. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Young teachers with less experience need to pay attention to the implementation of the curriculum in their individual classroom. Consequently, it is difficult to pay a lot of attention to overall school curriculum development and there is lack of group work in the school in general. Some teachers don’t even care what’s going on in the school plan. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)
More than half thought that 'their school divided the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration'. One interviewee, who might be Type II-k, regarded the sixth National Curriculum as a superficial phenomenon without tangible results and suggested it was more practical to introduce group work methods with smaller classes:

I hear advice by educationalists, especially in INSET programmes, with theoretical back-up about changing teaching methods. In the situation of crowded classrooms and lack of resources, their advice may be just rhetoric... Anyway, I adopt group work whenever I feel it is appropriate. However, neither excellent children nor children who academically under-achieve can get anything from group work. I cannot find enough time and space to consider each group of children. I think that group work, which is based on each individual's interests and ability, is good in theory. Look at the situation of our classroom. In practice, it's impossible to manage group work with forty-two children. Inevitably, what goes on in group working periods is more chaotic than during the ordinary periods based on an entire class. A formal approach is better for academic excellence when one is instructing so many children. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

There was virtual unanimity that there had been inadequate research and resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum. Teachers felt that their efforts to achieve the intentions of the new curriculum were being frustrated by not having enough teaching materials and having to deal with large and overcrowded classes. A teacher had experienced a difficulty in being more spontaneous in her teaching:

It is hopeless to try to introduce these plans for group projects and scientific experiments which are demanded by the sixth National Curriculum, which demands more individual work, without enough resources and smaller class sizes. To some extent, I choose my own contents and methods, and rely on my own professional judgement to assess pupils. In a sense, now, it's less prescriptive and we have the flexibility that we had not before. But our situation, for example, lack of resources and crowded classrooms, means that I am unable to use my judgement efficiently. Teachers also will have to be re-trained to cope with these ambitious objectives. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

The sixth National Curriculum was intended to produce a classroom ethos of flexibility and spontaneity, but in fact it was not easy for teachers to change their methods of teaching. It was clear that most teachers were in principle in favour of the new ways of teaching, such as integrated subjects and some group work. But when confronting the implementation of these methods in the classroom they felt pressurised, and they struggled
to keep abreast of the changes. One problem, familiar throughout the history of Korean education, is overcrowded classes attributed to inadequate funding (KEDI, 1994). As the above teachers commented, class size limited their choice of effective teaching methods.

There were some suggestive correlations between these items and those by which we earlier defined our two types of teacher. There were strong negative correlations between items 33 and 48 \( (r=-.233) \), and between items 36 and 43 \( (r=-.203) \). It might be interpreted that Type I approached project work and an integrated approach as simply that which the new curriculum requires, while Type II-k had a better grasp of what they really should be and could not perceive that there was now more co-operative work with other teachers. In addition, Type I correlated negatively with item 40 that 'teachers had continued to adopt more formal teaching methods' \( (r=-.235) \), while Type II-k had a strongly positive correlation with this item \( (r=.418) \). Again, we could see here the difference between a superficial and a deeper understanding of what the proposed new teaching methods really involved. These correlations add to our sense of coherence and consistency in the views of respondents.

6.2.3 Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Assessment arrangements are the most important part of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. National assessment should rely more on teachers judgements.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Assessment of standards should be done by national testing.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While, in Korea, the average size of a class is 42.8 in public primary schools (KEDI, 1995), in England, this is 27.7 (DfEE, 1998d). The number of pupils per class is much higher in Korean than in English schools.

33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.
34. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration.
36. The "command-and-control" approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.
43. As a result of the National Curriculum, teachers work and plan more together.
Only one third considered that assessment arrangements were the most important part of the National Curriculum. This result confirmed that the main characteristics of the National Curriculum in Korea have been curriculum contents and teaching methods. Interviewees also thought that the most important part of the National Curriculum was what should be taught in the classroom and its quality. A teacher remarked:

I think, the main function of the National Curriculum is the guidelines for subject content. Assessment is just arranged according to subject content. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

A substantial majority believed that assessment arrangements in the sixth National Curriculum should be changed. Nearly half believed that national assessment should rely more on teachers' judgements. Only 20% would support national tests. Although the participants preferred teachers' own judgement to national tests, half still disagreed that teachers' judgement on national assessment should be relied on more. A Type I interviewee made a judicious observation:

I absolutely agree that teachers should have the main role in the assessment and be in charge of it. But we need national standards to compare with others; comparison between schools, teachers, and pupil. This enables teachers to understand children and themselves as well. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

It remains to be seen whether the sixth National Curriculum's aspiration to give teachers major responsibilities for assessment will be fulfilled. Teachers should not be denied the right to make their own judgements of pupils. But the majority asserted that they had a difficult time in implementing the new assessment methods. They felt that diagnostic assessment, especially, was not easy with around forty pupils in one classroom. Several interviewees complained about the situation:

In theory, classroom-based and teachers' own diagnostic assessment is fantastic. It's a real chance to be a professional. But I am not quite sure how many teachers feel confident about it and can implement it. I discussed these changes with my colleagues. Keeping children in order in classroom is always a stressful duty for teachers. In reality, there is no space for considering and observing the individual child. If this is so, how can I manage a formative assessment? (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

As I indicated in Chapter 3, new assessment arrangements are to be diagnostic and formative than summative and evaluative, which encourage teachers' own judgement.
It takes a lot of time to keep records. Parents also are distinctly unhappy with diagnostic assessment because they think it cannot demonstrate the exact ability of their child. Sometimes they ask for the score or position of their child. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

In principle, it would appear that the sixth National Curriculum offers more flexibility to teachers. However, with the extra demands of diagnostic and formative assessment rather than paper and pencil tests, and for detailed record keeping, and for masses of paper work for reporting to authorities, it makes me wonder if I will have time enough to teach and take care of pupils. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

By tradition, teachers in Korea have received little training in formative assessment, especially in making frequent descriptive judgements of pupils’ performance. A gradual move in governmental policy was discernible, away from pencil and paper tests towards the evaluation of school performance and programmes. Under the sixth National Curriculum, teachers’ professional judgements were called for at the primary level. However, half of the teachers would still prefer the more traditional written test and annual report as before. They were not totally against the changes, but were embarrassed about implementing them.

Overall, and despite the differences we have interpreted as consistent with our view of two types of teacher, we have found that teachers generally approved the intentions and the principles of the sixth National Curriculum, but felt that these intentions had not made any difference, or had made disappointingly little difference, at the practical level.

6.3 Perceptions of the Relationship between Teachers and Government

Table 10.1 shows how the teachers have perceived the relationship between teachers’ professionalism and government intervention. Table 10.2 presents these results by school groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since the sixth National Curriculum.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers’ professional relationship to government has become more collaborative since the sixth National Curriculum.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
54. Teachers should be civil servants. 48 35 3.2
55. Government curriculum agencies (e.g. KEDI) have been a positive influence. 67 10 3.6
56. Standards in primary education are higher than they used to be. 80 15 3.8
57. The status of primary teachers has become lower in recent years. 44 37 3.1
58. The quality of primary teachers has been slipping since the government took over the curriculum. 23 55 2.6
59. Government supports teachers well. 22 66 2.4
60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET). 52 39 3.1
61. Recent government interventions in teacher education have been positive on the whole. 54 28 3.2
62. Teachers have more power than before. 30 41 2.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since the sixth National Curriculum.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers’ professional relationship to government has become more collaborative since the sixth National Curriculum.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers should be civil servants.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Government supports teachers well.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Teachers have more power than before.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will discuss these responses and associated interview data in two stages: teachers’ general relation with government and influences on teachers’ curriculum practice.

6.3.1 Teachers’ general relation with government

Table 10.1.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Their General Relationship to Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since the sixth National Curriculum.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers’ professional relationship to government has become more collaborative since the sixth National Curriculum.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers should be civil servants.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Government supports teachers well.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Teachers have more power than before.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sixth National Curriculum officially promotes collaborative work between government and teachers as a central objective. However, only a small minority positively believed that the relationship of teachers to government had changed and nearly half disagreed with this, while only one third thought that teachers’ professional relationship to government had become more collaborative and nearly half definitely disagreed with this. In particular, only 8% of Group 3 reacted positively to the changing relationship to the government. Teachers of schools in low income areas were particularly unlikely to acknowledge any differences in their relation to the government or to notice any more collaborative relationship with government. One such teacher, probably Type II-k, expressed his opinion:

I am not really aware of changes in the relationship of teachers and the government within curriculum areas. We are made aware of changes, but... please stop paying lip-service to teachers. Nothing can be changed. The minds of teachers in this kind of school are far away from the school. Since almost all teachers are waiting for a transfer from this school, there is no way to develop a particular school-based curriculum with these teachers... What’s the big deal? What’s a professional relationship? To be perfectly honest, there are no changes at all in the sense of teachers’ professional autonomy, but only another obligation. In reality the government is still in overall control. Even after the introduction of the sixth National Curriculum, the government still requires more and more reports about what we have already decided for ourselves. In this situation, the intention of the sixth National Curriculum would be useless, if it really attempted to introduce a more cooperative relationship between teachers and the government. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

As we have seen, teachers in low income area schools transfer every three, rather than every four, years. They may be said to work in more unstable conditions, because every year one third to one half of the staff leave. Newly transferred teachers to these schools take time to learn the acceptable routine and expected standard of teaching, by which time they may be already looking forward to leaving. In this circumstance, it is difficult really to engage in school-based curriculum development in their own ways. The data provided a clear picture of this rather unhappy situation, and even of the sense of frustration which many teachers feel regarding it.

It was notable that, although the sixth National Curriculum was intended to give

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers more powers for curriculum development, nearly half of the respondents did not actually feel that teachers had more power than before. There was an intention to ensure a less authoritarian approach, and a more creative and positive acceptance of a degree of autonomy for teachers, but many teachers perceived themselves as still in a position of dependency on a centralized bureaucracy which sent them pre-packaged curricula and textbooks. One teacher, Type II-k, commented this:

I know the sixth National Curriculum tries to give more power to teachers in curriculum decision-making. Our power should mean curriculum decision-making at national level and school level as well. We have such a long history of a centralized bureaucracy. The situation has not changed very much. We teachers are still discouraged in our efforts to influence curriculum change. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Around half were positive about being civil servants, but it seems quite significant that one third had a negative view of this. Considering that Korean teachers have always been civil servants and that their status is generally supposed to be bound up with this, it is surprising that so many now doubt its value. A still more definite indication of teachers dissatisfaction with government is the response to item 59. Three times as many did not feel well supported by government as did feel well supported: 66% against 22%. We may recall that earlier twice as many agreed with the proposition (item 15) that the government got in the way of good teaching as disagreed: in that case 42% against 21%.

Type I was positively correlated to the 48% who favoured civil service status (r=.225), but there was no correlation with Type II-k (r=-.053). Type II-k had a strong negative correlation on the issue of the government’s sufficient support for teachers (r=-.243). Type I teachers generally responded very positively on the issue of teachers’ collaborative relations with the government (r=.316), but Type II-k showed no correlated response (r=-.084). However, as we might perhaps expected, item 62 provided the strongest ‘double’ correlation with our two Types: Type I had a strong positive correlation with the view that teachers’ power had increased (r=.279), and Type II-k had completely opposite relations with this item (r=-.299). Here, the two types of teachers showed their own consistent and coherent tendencies in their different senses of teachers’ relationship to the government. On this matter, the views of the two types, Type I and Type II-k, were contrasted very sharply.
Table 10.1.2 Teachers’ Perceptions of Specific Government Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55. Government curriculum agencies (eg. KEDI) have been a positive influence.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Standards in primary education are higher than they used to be.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The status of primary teachers has become lower in recent years.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The quality of primary teachers has been slipping since the government took over the curriculum.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET).</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Recent government interventions in teacher education have been positive on the whole.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although only a small minority had felt that the government supported teachers well, around half felt positive about the government’s role in INSET and about recent government interventions in teacher education, and two thirds were positive about the government’s main curriculum agency (KEDI).

Though Type I had showed no correlation in their responses to the issue of government’s sufficient support, in general (r=.115), there was some positive correlation with their responses on these more specific government intervention and roles in INSET (r=.285), in teacher education (r=.263) and through KEDI (r=.451). A senior teacher who could be identified as Type I expressed this view:

As a school curriculum co-ordinator, I took part in INSET offered by government as usual. I was in charge of explaining the sixth curriculum and its implementation for colleagues in my school. Especially, this time, I wanted to figure out what we should do, what we were allowed to do, how much flexibility we had. I could give them the information about the goals of the new curriculum and its implementation. We should develop our own school-based curriculum based on the new curriculum. In this regard, I was quite sure that I could get much useful information about its new implementation. Generally the INSET programme for the new curriculum is the most essential programme for teachers. I think the government plays an important role for teachers. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Some interviewees, however, did not see the INSET given by government as a significant source of professional knowledge. A teacher who could be identified as Type II-k expressed her feeling:
Government provides INSET to teachers. However, there is a lack of connection between INSET programmes and the reality that we face in the classroom. Usually the lecturers are elitist professors, who neither know nor have any concerns for children, teachers, and schools. We don’t like lectures on all sorts of objectives and abstract theories. Especially, we want to know how to select and organize the sixth National Curriculum at classroom level, practically. We want to know how this will help me in reality...When the new curriculum came out, this kind of INSET programme was offered. As far as I know, the intention of the sixth National Curriculum is quite different from the prior one. That’s why I expected to learn something from INSET. In INSET for new curriculum, even the instructor mentioned that the new curriculum was not so different from the previous one. He was sceptical about the new curriculum. I could not fully understand not only the necessary procedural methodologies but also the intention of the instructor. Still, INSET programmes seems to me just one of the obligations which the government offers and I have to do it. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

Only one in five thought that the quality of primary teachers had declined while the government controlled the curriculum. This question also succeeded in broadly dividing Type I (r= -0.334) and Type II-k (r= 0.320). Type I might think that the quality of teachers was not diminished by government control. Their perceptions of their relationship to the government in curriculum development would be one explanation of this. As previously indicated, these teachers had restricted views of their role in curriculum control: they accepted the notion of ‘restricted autonomy’ rather than ‘extended autonomy’. They took for granted their limited role and government intervention. So, they did not see the quality of teachers as dependent on their autonomy of status.

As already indicated, two thirds were positive about government curriculum agencies and only 10% were definitely negative. Type I correlated strongly with the positive view (r= 0.451) and Type II-k less strongly with the negative views (r= -0.221). One interviewee, Type I, described how KEDI functioned positively:

I think KEDI is a good research institute. It develops curriculum, textbook, and in-service training programmes etc. On the whole, in that sense, it has positive functions. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Another teacher, Type II-k, had a different view:

KEDI is remote from teachers; it is just one part of the government. In this sense, I am not sure it has a positive function for teachers. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)
6.3.2 Influences on teachers' curriculum practice

**Actual influences**

Teachers are subject to influences from both inside and outside the school when they make decisions on curriculum and pedagogy. Participants were asked how much in fact they considered each of the following. Table 11.1 presents the items in the order from the most selected item to the least. Table 11.2 presents these results by school groups.

Table 11.1 Teachers' Perceptions of the Actual Influences on Curriculum Development: in Rank Order of Significance (N=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Very important</th>
<th>% Not important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67. School policies (e.g. School Development Plan)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Characteristics of pupils</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Your own beliefs and conceptions</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Previous educational experiences</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The interrelationship of different subject matters</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Textbook requirements</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Government policies and advice</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Local authority policies</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Views of parents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Preparation for standardized tests</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Requirements of the Inspectorate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. School governors' policies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.2 Groups' Perceptions of the Actual Influences on Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Very important</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Very important</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Very important</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. School policies (e.g. School Development Plan)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Your own beliefs and conceptions</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Textbook requirements</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Local authority policies</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. School governors' policies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Requirements of the Inspectorate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This includes 'most' or 'very' important.

This includes 'little' or 'no' importance.
These were more or less strong influences from both inside and outside the school. All mean scores were above 3. What emerges clearly is that though teachers perceived the government as having a strong influence, it was by no means alone in this. For example, it had less perceived influence than their own beliefs and conceptions. On the other hand, in Korea, school policies and textbooks directly reflect the government’s policies and these were recognized as having the same order of importance as their own beliefs and experiences by a large majority.

A large majority believed that both government (80%) and local authority policies (70%) have strong influence. However, interestingly, almost no interviewees saw any significant difference between these. By tradition, under the highly centralized education system in Korea, local authorities had mainly the role of agents subordinate to the government. Although now called upon to carry out new roles such as being the ‘legitimate’ judge of the school-based curriculum process and its content, teachers did not perceive any significant changes in their role. Some interviewees commented:

There is no doubt that government and local authority policies have the greatest influence over school policies and finally influence what is taught in its classrooms. Actually the local authority policy is the same as the government policy. Textbook requirements come from the government. School governors’ policies are just the same as school policies. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

The government is the greatest influence and we are just supposed to please them. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

Two thirds believed that parents had an important influence on what was taught in school. A greater proportion of Group 1 (80%) believed this. This result might be interpreted as meaning that parents who lived in affluent areas were more involved and influenced school affairs more than those in other areas. However, as a teacher in Group 1 explained, parents were mainly interested in extracurricular activities rather than other subject matters which could not be changed by their requests. Since Korean parents’ main concern has been always to have an ‘academically excellent child’, they request teachers to teach academically related activities even for extracurricular work, such as English, Computing, Chinese characters and Math skills:

Parents never challenge the National Curriculum. But they know that the school has a choice of extracurricular activities. For that, they ask for what they want.
Nowadays they are crazy for learning English. They ask for, or even push, schools to give English lessons to their child. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

The heavy dependence of schools on the National Curriculum and its textbooks means that parents do not expect, and could not request, any other curriculum.

In addition, parents' selfish and pathological educational zeal for their children causes an inappropriate relationship between them and teachers, in particular, by the give-and-take of 'exceeding gratitude (Chon-ji)'. Unlike Korea where parents do not have to take their children to school, parents are responsible for picking up their children at the beginning and end of the school day in England, and this procedure seems to contribute to developing good and close relationships between teachers and parents. Although it was only a brief opportunity to see each other and consult about problems, parents could feel that the school is open to their concerns. Such informal contacts, in association with more formal meetings such as parents' evening and governors' meetings, might be a corner-stone in the promotion of a satisfactory partnership between parents and teachers.

Ideal influences

In parallel, participants were asked how important ideally they considered each of the following in determining the curriculum. Table 12.1 presents their perceptions in order, from the most supported item to the least. Table 12.2 presents these results by school groups.

Table 12.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of the Ideal Influences on Curriculum Development: in Rank Order of Significance (N=78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Very important</th>
<th>% Not important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80. The Teacher</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. The Pupils</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Government</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Local Authority</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Parents</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. The Headteacher</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. School Governors</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. The Inspectorates</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An enormous majority believed that teachers should influence the curriculum and a large majority that the government should have some influence.

Two comparisons between actual and ideal influences

Table 13 Comparisons of the Teachers’ Perceptions of Actual and Ideal Influences (% selecting as very important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Actual influences</th>
<th>Ideal influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all teachers strongly believed both that they should have and that they did have an essential role in curriculum development. A majority 71% also accepted a role for government, though perhaps experiencing more control from the government than they wanted. A measured comment:

From the sixth National Curriculum, teachers increasingly have more influence on what is taught in the classroom. There should be room for the teachers’ own input. But we only have limited knowledge to make judgements on curriculum matters. I think we need the role of government in determining the curriculum. The problem lies in to what extent and how much it is involved. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1)

We have noticed earlier that many teachers seemed, in fact, to fear the enlargement of their responsibilities. The impact of the history of their exclusion from curriculum development in Korea was represented through some reluctance to add their responsibility for the curriculum.

In sum, there were no very large differences between teachers’ perceptions about

---

Since none of these group-differences are significant, I need not refer to these below.
actual and ideal influences over curriculum development when, as here, these influences are described in general, summary and rather crude terms. Substantial majorities believed that the government, of which the National Curriculum and its textbook are parts, affected and should affect their decisions. Again, with virtual unanimity the teachers thought that their own beliefs, conception and experiences were, and should be, immediate and direct influences. It is interesting to note how the teachers in a largely centralized curriculum system rate their own beliefs, conceptions and experiences as having a strong influence on decision-making in curriculum and pedagogy. Of course, as the teacher just quoted pointed out, and as our more nuanced earlier data made abundantly clear, the difficulties, the criticisms, and the divisions of opinion appear as soon as we ask 'to what extent'?

6.4 Case Study

The first set of visits took place in the second half of the autumn term, 1997 and the second in the first half of the spring term, 1998. This second set was an opportunity to update personal information and to ensure that I gathered a full picture of one academic year (two semesters). Altogether, I spent six days observing classrooms in this school. One each of six classrooms, from Year One to Year Six, was observed during a whole school day. However, there did not appear to be any patterns which related grades to teachers' curriculum practices. This is partly because, in Korea, every year class teachers usually teach a different grade from the previous year. In this case study, I shall explore the precise meanings of each type's views (Types I and II-k) within its real-life school context.

6.4.1 The school

The school is situated near the inner city, in a catchment area which has a mixed middle and working class population, in a quiet residential area. A brick-built four-storey modern building, it was established in 1986. There is a headteacher's room, a staff room, a reception room, thirty-six classrooms, a science room, a curriculum resource room and a computer room, a library, a broadcasting room, and a dining room. In each classroom, six basic teaching aids; a cassette recorder, OHP, screen, TV, VCR and computer are provided.
Its forty-two staff members include a headteacher, a deputy headteacher, master teachers of six school departments, classroom teachers, a school nurse, and the clerical staff. Thirty-one out of forty-two are women. This school has a female headteacher. There are thirty-six classes, six of each grade, and 1,261 children. It is a medium-sized school in terms of schools in Korea. The main criterion for registration groups in this school is that of a homogeneous age-cohort/year-group. Classes are taught separately from Year One to Year Six. Class sizes in the school range from thirty-seven to forty-four children.

6.4.2 The school-based curriculum and teachers’ responsibilities

Who has the major responsibility for school-based curriculum development?

The development of the curriculum within this school might be described as essentially the responsibility of the headteacher. The majority of the teachers I interviewed confirmed this. Particularly, most teachers showed no interest in school-wide curriculum development. They felt individually responsible for teaching their children. The headteacher seemed to approve this individualism. Most of all, the headteacher herself emphasized this situation with reference to Educational Law as follows:

According to Article 75 of the Educational Law, the headteacher should control all school affairs, supervise school personnel, and educate pupils. Teachers should teach pupils under the direction of the headteacher... The teacher who cooperates well with policies of both national and school level is a real professional teacher. In other words, a professional teacher will follow the National Curriculum or the school-based curriculum very effectively... Implementation of the curriculum itself is not easy work... having autonomy in all decision-making does not mean being professional... I think the main responsibility of teachers is teaching. The others which relate to school work should be controlled by myself, the headteacher. School-based curriculum development is one of the areas for which I should take main responsibility.

14.5% of headteachers were female in Seoul in 1994 (KEDI, 1995).

Teachers’ word are shown in a dark shaded box ■, and my comments follow in a plain box □. Later, in this case study section, my classroom observation notes will be presented in a soft shaded box □.
She has been a headteacher in three different schools for over 9 years, including 2 years at this school. Obviously, she believed that the school-based curriculum should be developed or controlled not by an individual classroom teacher but by herself as a headteacher. She seemed to regard the development of the National Curriculum as the job of educational experts. Accordingly, she believed that school-based curriculum development did not mean that teachers made all decisions for the curriculum. She was a very typical authoritarian administrator, identifiable as Type I, in that most of her views would match the bureaucratic demands of the curriculum policy and a restricted autonomous role for teachers.

What is the structure of the school-based curriculum?

The school-based curriculum framework, of which the format was nationally determined, could not extend beyond the National Curriculum documentary guidance. It was shaped by the definitions in the National Curriculum and the views of the headteacher, who should sincerely carry responsibility for it. In this school, 'The Curriculum Guidelines' were divided into four parts (School-based Curriculum, 1998):

a) basis of school curriculum;

b) school curriculum framework;

c) school curriculum implementation plan;

d) appendix.

The first two parts were a summary of the headteacher's educational philosophy, and of the organizational principles of the school curriculum based on the objectives of the National Curriculum and the guidelines of local educational authorities.

The 'school curriculum implementation plan' consisted of six sections based on six administrative departments: school affairs; curriculum; research; information; environment; discipline and extracurricular activities. The 'curriculum' section of this contained the time allotment, the yearly timetable, a monthly educational plan by grade and subject, and a plan for the school's discretionary time. It had very specific curriculum implementation and organization plans. The other five sections covered school events, inservice training and supervision plans, playground arrangements, furnishing facilities and equipment plans, and individual teachers' research plans etc. All teachers hold posts of
responsibility in one or other of the six administrative departments. Following the sixth National Curriculum, the school made its own decisions on extracurricular activities and optional courses. Apart from these, in fact, the teachers merely specified in detail instructional and evaluation plans for the subject matter already indicated in the National Curriculum. The school-based curriculum had guidelines for each year and month in which subject contents and time allotments were strictly indicated. Formerly, teachers were never allowed to go beyond such foundations and plans in organizing their delivery in individual classrooms. In some ways, the mechanisms by which the curriculum was delivered were also indicated. Even now, despite the implication of a decentralized approach in the sixth National Curriculum, delivery was planned simply by reorganizing the guidelines of central and local government without much modification.

What is the process for developing the school-wide curriculum?

The headteacher had created a School Curriculum Organization and Implementation Committee (SCOIC) which included herself as chairperson, ten subject co-ordinators and six grade level co-ordinators, most of whom she appointed. The grade level co-ordinators collected opinions from all the other teachers and brought them up for discussion. The process of school-based curriculum development in this school could then be summarised as follows:

a) conducting through questionnaires a basic survey of children, parents and teachers;

b) deciding the basic format of the school curriculum;

c) writing the draft of the school curriculum;

d) reviewing, revising and deciding the final draft of school curriculum (School-based Curriculum, 1998).

While the headteacher described the school-based curriculum as her responsibility mainly, she claimed to be actively working on its development through SCOIC:
Headteacher

All teachers including myself are aware of what is done in the school-based curriculum. There is a lot more getting together and we have got a whole school approach. The school-based curriculum is made to fit the guidelines of the sixth National Curriculum which we are encouraged to match to the actual situation of my school. The whole work of the school is closely based upon the opinions of children, parents and teachers. The essential feature of ours is that we encourage all-round development through a variety of activities. An integrated curriculum is based on concepts and skills, individualised work is suited to individual needs, and interests and abilities are emphasized more strongly.

According to her comments, in principle, participation was to be open to all teachers. School-based curriculum development was as a collegial activity in school, with headteacher and teachers discussing together the development of the curriculum in the school context. She fully understood the new intentions of the sixth National Curriculum: encouraging teachers' participation, recognizing the needs of parents and children, seeking an integrated curriculum and emphasizing ability-group based teaching. She proudly showed me the results of the questionnaire for teachers, parents and pupils as evidence of how she considered the needs of these people in curriculum development. Primarily development was with reference to the opinions of her staff, but as she emphasized earlier the teachers were under her control in the process. She perceived her job as related to a school-based curriculum within a governmental framework.

Teacher A

sex/age female/35
teaching experience 10 years
position Year Two class teacher

I started my teaching career in 1987. I have had experience of the fifth and sixth curriculum. I think, teachers, including myself, do know what is going on the sixth National Curriculum...in that we are encouraged to get ourselves together and talk this through as a whole staff. But that's just something we have to show off to the government. It is the situation in which schools must create a curriculum on our own. In fact, it can only be done by headteachers and senior staff, so ordinary teachers like me consider that it is not ours but theirs like before. We are still not the important decision-makers. Discussions about the school-based curriculum have not really included us as they should have done. I must carry out what the school-based curriculum indicates...Actually this is what the National Curriculum says, although it says teachers have flexibility in doing it. So I do not see any differences at all between the fifth and sixth one in terms of teachers' participation in the process of curriculum development. Teachers should be a major decision-maker in the process. In this respect, there is no difference between the National Curriculum and the school-based curriculum. This was and is our life.
She has worked in three schools and was transferred to this school last year. She is in charge of school admissions, transfer and other school events. She was quite familiar with the sixth National Curriculum and approved of the idea of decentralization, but she saw exactly the problem which caused teachers' indifference about the school-based curriculum. Her view to an approach to curriculum development in this school was fairly different from the claim of the headteacher. Her belief about teachers' essential role in curriculum development, and her sceptical view and indifference to the current situation, were the aspects found in Type II-k.

Despite the existence of SCOIC, the school-based curriculum was actually developed by a few senior staff. I was impressed that although the majority of teachers generally were aware of the intentions of the sixth National Curriculum regarding teachers' flexibility and professionalism, some of them still saw school curriculum development as not their business. The main influence towards this kind of thinking may be a bureaucratic and authoritarian school culture, which did not encourage anyone to express an individual view or a critical or radical opinion.

Teacher B
sex/ age male/ 45
teaching experience 21 years
position Year Six class teacher

Now, we have a new word in curriculum management: decentralization. I am not sure how I got through all these years without these skills...School-based curriculum development arose totally in response to the requirements of the National Curriculum, not the needs of individual schools. The headteacher and many teachers in this school defined the National Curriculum guidelines as the backbone or foundation for curriculum contents and practice within their school and classrooms. Actually most teachers do not have any interest in the school-based curriculum. They feel individually responsible for teaching the children. I do believe in the National Curriculum. We do not have to worry, because the curriculum is balanced. Everything is indicated in the National Curriculum. We just follow every single direction and give the allotted time to subjects and contents. All we need for the school-based curriculum is just to define or redefine the National Curriculum. If I have an open curriculum without basic guidelines for contents, I am lost...Personally, I do not see the necessity of the school-based curricula. Absolutely, I don't think I have lost creativity or spontaneity with the National Curriculum and gained some flexibility or autonomy with the school-based curriculum. I do not feel sorry about this situation. The less involved, the safer for my own sake. Anyhow, most of all, I have generally been happy as a teacher and enjoyed teaching.
He was educated at a two-year teachers' college and attended an additional course in a university to improve his career. His aim was to be a headteacher in the near future. He was now master teacher for school affairs. He might be a typical Type I. He was himself reluctant to move beyond the implementation role which he was used to before. He was politically sympathetic to and favoured by the school. He saw less advantage in decentralization. He felt the burden of some responsibility coming from decentralization and did not want to have extra work in dealing with the new situation. He believed that the National Curriculum should be implemented in all schools and there was no need for variation relating to different circumstances in individual schools. Always in a senior position, he might not want any new trial or any greater risk than what he was used to. He was in favour of the intention of decentralization, and conformed with what the sixth National Curriculum intended, but in an authoritarian way which was not different from the implementation of the prior curriculum.

What are the roles and responsibilities of teachers?

Each teacher had an identified aspect of the school's work for which they had a particular responsibility. All teachers, except the headteacher, deputy headteacher, and four part-time teachers who were in charge of particular subjects like music, fine art, and computing, had total responsibility for their classes. In addition to this teaching role, the school-based curriculum had assigned named curriculum responsibility and particular areas of administrative duties to all individual teachers.

Some responsibilities were for a particular curriculum area. Indeed, the majority of posts carried a subject label. Some teachers held co-ordinating roles, like subject co-ordinators or grade level co-ordinators, responsible for organising resources, co-ordinating the views and curricular practices of others, and having an advisory function. Such post holders were expected to organize curriculum guidelines for their areas and grades. Furthermore, all teachers, including those who had a responsibility for a particular curriculum area, were assigned administrative duties. In this regard, there were six main departments and six 'master teacher' posts of responsibility for them, organized along administrative, not curricular, lines. It was clear that the master posts associated with the holding of power within this school.

Individual class teachers were required to submit records of classroom-based curriculum planning and delivery to the headteacher and the government, just as before the sixth National Curriculum. However, the government demanded more detailed records in
the form of curriculum forecasts on a weekly basis. These were organized around a theme or topic along with subject headings, but structured strictly according to the time allocations and contents indicated by the sixth National Curriculum. Conforming to the instructional time in relation to subject headings were the main concern of teachers. One teacher described school-based curriculum development as ‘just extra paperwork’:

**Teacher C**

*sex/ age female/ 37*  
*teaching experience 11 years*  
*position Year One class teacher*

Everything is already determined by the National Curriculum. All we can decide is extracurricular issues. Not too much has changed in the sixth National Curriculum. We just have a chance to reorganize our own school plan under the National Curriculum. Anyway, the attempt is not bad. However, there is so much additional work we have to do. I think it is only to contribute to the official documents for the government. It wants us to present an even more detailed report of approval. I am not a person who is opposed to the idea of a national curriculum. I do not insist that teachers need a more autonomous role to develop the curriculum. I admit the idea of a school-based curriculum which allows us to reconsider our own situation in order to implement the National Curriculum. But the sixth one is nothing but more paperwork for teachers.

She has worked in three schools and was now appointed to two important posts; Year One co-ordinator and mathematics co-ordinator, she was in charge of the Year One group, which had less work than the higher grade. She was well placed to figure out what teachers were supposed to do for the school-based curriculum in practice. She perceived the sixth National Curriculum as having the possibility of reorganisation or redefinition for the school. She did not seem to ask for more alternatives and autonomy for teachers. The only problem for her was paperwork over-load. She was perhaps Type I. She related school-based curriculum more to implementing the National Curriculum than to greater teachers’ autonomy.

6.4.3 Teachers’ curriculum practice and professionalism in the classroom

*What do teachers do in school?*

In the following, one teacher described her overall routine and typical daily life in school:
The overall routine in the school

Teacher D
sex/ age Female/ 41
teaching experience 12 years
position Year Five class teacher

To begin with, I'd like to talk about the general work of teachers in school which, I believe, is very similar to other schools. All the teaching staff do their own classroom planning, prepare lessons, mark work, carry out assessment, keep records on children, have meetings with staff and parents, share some of the discipline duties, take responsibility for developing the school curriculum (I am in charge of art subjects), perform some administrative duties; have consultations with children who have some problems with friends or about their marks, share in the ordering of new equipment and take turns to keep the school clean and tidy, besides that, almost every teacher performs as a leader in an school extracurricular activity such as English reading, art, drama, choir etc. A Year Five teacher should teach for 31 hours a week; 6 hours for Korean, 5 hours for mathematics, 4 hours for social science, 4 hours for science, 2 hours for music, 2 hours for fine art, 3 hours for physical education, 1 hour for practical arts, 1 hour for moral education, 2 hours for extracurricular activities and 1 hour for an optional course. As an optional course, the headteacher has decided to do some field studies outside school. In this school, we have two subject specialists who are in charge of music and fine art. So each class has 2 hours of music and fine art taught by them. During this time I check and mark homework. In addition to a periodic meeting once a year, we have meetings with parents whenever they are necessary for the children. Occasionally, we have an unexpected meeting for special arrangements or activities from the government and many others. All teachers attend a lot of meetings every week:

Monday, 08:40-08:50 / 16:30-17:00
Full staff meeting for the week. At this time, general instructions for the whole week are given by the headteacher, the deputy headteacher and senior teachers who are representative of each department.

Wednesday, 15:50-16:10
Departamental meeting about the major administrative tasks which should be done by each teacher.

Friday, 15:50-16:10
Curriculum development meeting with some subject co-ordinators or co-ordinators for a Year group.

Anyway, I'd like to talk about one day in my working life in school.
**One day's life**

Monday, 13th April, 1998

06:30  (At home) Get up and prepare notes which will be needed this morning.
07:50 Leave home and drive to school.
08:10 Arrive at school.
08:15 Enter the staff room to sign for teachers’ registration records and to pick up some worksheets for children and letters for parents.
08:25 Go to the classroom to care for the children. During this time, before the first lesson is started, it is time for the children to warm up for the school day. For example, children do some work by themselves, such as reading a children’s newspaper or writing Chinese characters, which is our school policy. At the end of self-learning time, I check what children have done.
08:45 Go to my desk in the staff room and attend full staff meeting. Hear about lots of things which should be done during the week.
08:55 Come back to my class, call the register and make some announcements about the plan of the day and about other classroom matters.
09:00 Official start of school day. During work time, the children are expected to follow the whole class plan.
09:00-09:45 Mathematics; I prefer whole class teaching for mathematics. After I dictate several examples on blackboard and explain them, I order children to solve the rest by themselves.
09:45-09:50 Break. During this break, we have a Year group meeting to discuss today’s activities.
09:50-10:30 Korean; speaking, hearing and writing on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, and reading on Thursday, Friday and Saturday.
10:30-10:40 Break. During this break, children drink milk.
10:40-11:20 Moral Education; read official textbook and discuss it to encourage children’s morality.
11:20-11:30 Break.
11:30-12:10 Physical Education; various activities in the playground. Sometimes I include other activities which are not suggested in the textbook such as baseball and football.
12:10-13:10 Dinner time. Teachers should have the meal with their children.
13:10-13:50 Science; I rearrange the children’s groups to do some scientific experiments. If my class have the chance to use the science room, we have a lesson there. Otherwise, I bring some materials from the science room and do some work in the classroom.
13:50-14:00 Break.
14:00-14:40 Social Science; I prepare this subject by theme. I usually work in groups. I encourage all groups to present what they have learned.
14:40-15:30 Children leave school, except a few children who have to clean the classroom. After supervising and looking after them, I send them home.
15:30-16:30 Come back to my desk in the staff room. After taking a rest for a while, I prepare for the following day’s lessons. I also do some administrative tasks.
16:30-17:00 Full staff meeting once a week.
17:00 I leave work and drive home. I sometimes bring work home with me.
She seemed satisfied with her job as a teacher. She felt some flexibility over some contents and the way of teaching in her classroom. She could manage the National Curriculum in her own way whenever she felt that it was necessary. Her personal beliefs and practice seemed to be quite consistent with the assumptions underlying the National Curriculum, which values a subject-based approach with some integration. She was a typical Type I accustomed to the National Curriculum and working in a restricted way to implement it in the classroom.

As she mentioned, this schedule was typical in the working life of a primary teacher in Korea. She was not given a significant amount of flexibility to control her own work time during the day. She worked about nine hours a day in school, dedicating the majority of her time to teaching in the classroom. Meetings which relate to the curriculum take about one and half hours per week. In her one hour of free time, she could prepare some work for teaching, but, usually, she did administrative work. She spent more time (about seven hours a week) on administrative work than on curriculum-related work.

The routine described above might reflect an important feature of teachers’ curriculum practice in classrooms. She was not involved in a really meaningful way in curriculum development. She wrote formal daily and weekly lesson plans which were predetermined by the National Curriculum. It seemed not easy for her to consider children’s interests and needs in her curriculum decisions.

How do teachers practise the National Curriculum in the classroom?

The following observations of two classroom sessions exposed a range of characteristics which typify the teachers’ curriculum practice I observed in this school and concurred with the findings of questionnaires and interviews I presented earlier in this chapter. These observations exemplified to a greater or lesser degree all the features of both types of teachers. In particular, the first observation showed the practice of a Type I teacher (Teacher B) with which most of the teachers were identified. The second observation is of an exceptional case which appeared to have aspects of Type II-k (Teacher A). Type I was dominant, while examples of Type II-k were rare, or only a small minority who could be identified in the data collected earlier as well as in this case study.

- Planning in the classroom

The priority in the sixth National Curriculum given to ‘modification of integrated courses and emphasis on direct experience and hands-on learning’ was reflected in the
areas prioritised for the school-based curriculum. Daily timetables were decided by all class teachers with the advice of the grade level co-ordinators according to the indications of the National Curriculum. Only one session per week (school discretionary time) remained blank. This was actually the space into which class teachers fitted their own classroom activities. Teachers planned the classroom-based curriculum in the form of forecasts on a weekly and daily basis.

Teacher B (Type I)

I make my own planning on a weekly and daily basis. But almost everything in curriculum planning is already set by the National Curriculum, and I stick to it. I could say that the main characteristic of our school-based curriculum is to integrate separate subjects.

Teacher A (Type II-k)

At the beginning of the new curriculum, I tried to plan a particular curriculum for my own class. But sooner or later I found that it was out of my control, just like it used to be. Because I cannot have enough time for planning and preparing resources, I would rather follow the direction of the National Curriculum than create something of my own. So the record of the classroom based curriculum is getting to be not for my own personal use but for formal presentation to the headteacher. It is just time-consuming to do the paperwork for it which we must submit to the headteacher. Do we have to do this kind of showing-off work?...The government always asks for the same objective, academic excellence, although the official concern of education has changed all the time, such as focusing on the affective domain in education or moral education, or creativity. So what's the difference? In the real situation, we teachers always do the same thing, which we regard as the right way.

- Implementing contents and pedagogy in the classroom

When I observed classrooms and teachers, in particular, I focused on how teachers implement these factors, drawn from school curriculum guidelines and their own planning, in classroom practice.
Observation : Teacher B (Type I)

*subject* Social Science  
*pupil's Year* Year Six  
*class size* 38 pupils  
*observation time* one whole session (40 minutes)

The teacher tried an integrated approach for a lesson on 'international society'. The whole class sat in six separate groups. He tried to cover all the contents that the National Curriculum indicated and considered every single need of the children during the session. However, this lesson appeared to lack a consistent approach to learning. For most of the time, the teacher made great efforts to control these groups and children appeared to waste considerable amounts of time.

There was a notable exception to the whole class teaching - one slow child who always did his own work, computing, separated from classroom-based work, because he was so far behind his peers, especially in his level of attention to work.

Although the teacher ostensibly followed the integrated curriculum guidelines of the new curriculum, it seemed to me that he actually treated each area separately for ease. However, he allowed one exceptional child to do his own work. As an observer familiar with the Korean scene, I was very impressed with this situation, because it had never been allowed to recognize an individual in a whole class situation before.

---

Observation : Teacher A (Type II-k)

*subject* Korean  
*pupil's Year* Year Two  
*class size* 37 pupils  
*observation time* one whole session (40 minutes)

The atmosphere was pleasant, industrious. The classroom had rows of desks facing the front blackboard and was well organized and structured.

The teacher began the unit on story telling by having children read a story. She asked children to make an oral summary of the story. The children raised their hands to present what they thought. She picked one child to summarise the story. Then, she discussed some details of the story with children and asked several questions about why a certain situation had happened in the story. After a few minutes of informal discussion about the story, she asked children to share ideas about the main characters in it. After completing this exercise, the teacher had children role-play these characters. This completed, the teacher again asked children to defend some behaviours of the main characters. She summarised the story, drawing on children's comments, and announced that the lesson was over.
Teacher A produced lessons that appear to be very coherent. Throughout the observation, the children remained at their desks all the time and were not allowed to leave. The content was predominantly delivered by teacher, under a subject concept, to the whole class, even though it was not planned using traditional subject headings.

Although the children were arranged for work in groups according to ability, actually the curriculum was not differentiated according to individual children's interest or need. She had tried thematic approaches and group work, but was not satisfied with these methods and questioned the results of this attempt. Most of the time, it was delivered with teacher-direction and control. It could be argued that this was in part a reflection of the long tradition of school teaching in Korea: subject-based whole class teaching.

Implementing assessment in the classroom

Another emphasis of the sixth National Curriculum, 'changing the nature of assessment' clearly appears to have already been taken on board, even though most teachers stressed the difficulties of applying it in actual classroom situations.

Teacher B (Type I)

I think the new assessment system is a desirable idea, although it is not easy to implement. I have really tried to do my best. I need more detailed guideline for this.

Teacher A (Type II-k)

The new system is an ideal for good educational practice. How can I manage in these circumstances: too many children, so much work...Frankly speaking, we have data for the assessment statements. Although these are just examples for the statements, I believe, most teachers simply use the data to assess children. Is this what really we have to do? It has nothing to do with teachers' professionalism.

Although the school's curriculum document reflected the goal of the sixth National Curriculum, which emphasized a progressive, child-centred and integrated subject approach, teachers in this school were highly likely to carry a subject-based responsibility and role. Most of all, the curriculum responsibilities of teachers were predominantly
assigned and labelled according to subjects. The continuity of primary teacher curriculum roles and practices was evident, despite the new intentions of the sixth National Curriculum. My observation turned up no significant difference in curriculum practice between Type I and II-k. As I pointed out in an earlier part of this chapter, Type II-k teachers, in particular, felt a discrepancy between their conceptual understanding of the teachers' role in curriculum development as 'extended autonomy' and their actual practice of it within the confines of a 'restricted autonomy'.

6.5 Summary and Conclusion

6.5.1 Summary

A majority of the Korean teachers agreed that teachers should plan the content, teaching and assessment for their own class, while also believing that the more fundamental aspects of curriculum development were the responsibility of educational experts or the government, although they themselves expected to have more flexibility than before. Their conceptions of their own professional role in curriculum development generally reflected a notion of ‘restricted autonomy’ (though there was a quite significant minority who seemed to take a different view). Whole curriculum coverage and responsibility and great educational knowledge of children were what professional teachers should offer. They gave priority to ‘professional knowledge and commitment’ rather than to ‘autonomy’ in judging professionalism. Within this restricted interpretation, the teachers were also generally more confident about their curriculum knowledge than about their interpersonal skills in the process of curriculum development. They did not have sufficient experiences as decision-makers in the long tradition of highly centralized government involvement in curriculum.

The teachers had become quite accustomed to the new intentions of the sixth National Curriculum. Their overall responses to its policy of promoting decentralized curriculum development could be described as positive about the principles involved (though with exceptions) but suspicious and sceptical about whether they were being realized in practice, or even could be realized in practice with present resources. For example, teachers predominantly planned the curriculum documentation according to
integrated activities and group works, as is now required, but in most of the classrooms investigated teaching by subject was predominant.

Since the sixth National Curriculum, individual schools and teachers might have some degree of flexibility in implementation, but teachers were still required to conform not only with the curriculum guidelines but with the official textbooks for each subject. In this circumstance, many still felt more 'subordinated' than 'collaborative' in their relation to the government. Yet, almost all teachers agreed that 'if they were start again, they would still be teachers. This study had exposed that the majority of Korean teachers' perceptions about their role and responsibility in curriculum development corresponded with limited sense of autonomy. Furthermore, some teachers showed an attitude of indifference to their new roles in curriculum development and considered it as only a formal fulfilment of the government requirement or another kind of administrative work demanded by the government.

Two types of Korean teacher were identified: Type I and Type II-k. The identification of these Types was a cumulative business through the chapter. In the part 6.1 I hit upon a small number of suggestive phases taken from questions which had produced divisions of response that correlated significantly with each other in statistical terms. In later parts, 6.2 and 6.3, I found further correlations with these initial sets - in effect, this meant I was now getting interim larger and larger definitions. Now, at the end, I am in a position to look for a more orderly and analytic pair of final definitions and clarification of the differences between the two.

Type I held a view which corresponded to 'restricted autonomy' in curriculum development, and valued 'professional knowledge' and 'commitment' (items 11 and 19). As a rule, they simply accepted the National Curriculum as their working framework to enhance teachers' professionalism (item 33), but many of them, too, thought the government was not sufficiently supportive or collaborative (items 53 and 59). They rated their beliefs and experiences as strong influences on their curriculum decision-making at the classroom level, but at the same time they accepted the role of government in curriculum development, perceiving it as 'power with' relationship (items 65 and 75).

By contrast, Type II-k believed that teachers should have an autonomous role in curriculum development. Professionalism was more a matter of 'autonomy' than
'professional knowledge' or 'responsibility to the public'. (items 13 and 20). The National Curriculum was seen by them as a kind of control device that deprived them of professional autonomy, leaving no real room for teachers’ professional judgement (item 36). Although they had a positive view of decentralization as a principle of the new curriculum policy, they felt a serious discomfort from the discrepancy between their viewpoint and their conditions of curriculum practice. They perceived the government as the over-dominant influence on curriculum, but they believed that teachers should have a major role in curriculum development (items 63 and 80). The government’s relation with the teachers was perceived as ‘power over’ by them. Table 14 is a summary of the perceptions of these two Types (in somewhat oversimplified terms).

Table 14 Summary of the Perceptions of Korean Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II-K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Understanding of Curriculum Development and Professionalism</td>
<td>Teacher's Role in Curriculum Development</td>
<td>restricted autonomy (items 7, 8, 19)</td>
<td>extended autonomy (item 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>knowledge/commitment (item 11)</td>
<td>autonomy (item 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Curriculum Requirements in Practices</td>
<td>General Framework and Principles of the National Curriculum</td>
<td>framework for practice (item 33)</td>
<td>control device (item 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contents and Pedagogy</td>
<td>attempted integrated approach (item 49)</td>
<td>retained formal approach (item 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>no need to change</td>
<td>x*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of the Relationship between Teachers and Government</td>
<td>Teacher's Relation with Government</td>
<td>less strained (items 53, 60, 61)</td>
<td>strained (items 15, 52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual Influences on Teachers' Curriculum Practice</td>
<td>teachers (item 69)</td>
<td>government (items 63, 68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideal Influences on Teachers' Curriculum Practice</td>
<td>include government (item 75)</td>
<td>include teachers (item 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Characteristics of Korean Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>a large majority of Type I and a significant minority of Type II-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* x No general or typical response or tendency

As I have pointed out in Chapter 5, these types are conceptual models not a certain number of real teachers: it is not pretended that every teacher belongs to one or the other. However,
generally, the large majority tend towards Type I rather than Type II-k, and a much smaller number tend towards Type II-k.

It is worth recalling here that many responses showed a high level of critical dissatisfaction with government and the system (e.g. items 15, 26, 30, 34, 38, 45 and 59). Although a teacher can be a critic without being a Type II-k, all the time, the high proportions of critical responses in these areas might support the idea that Type II-k were likely to be a significant minority, not a tiny minority.

6.5.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, I will here further discuss the following issues which appear to influence Korean teachers' perceptions of the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention: a) the teacher transfer system, b) the curriculum development tradition which excludes teachers, and c) the textbook-driven curriculum development.

Firstly, the frequent transfer system contributes to teachers' indifference about participating in school-based curriculum development. Teachers transfer between schools within the Seoul metropolitan school district every four or three years. In general, teachers make plans and prepare materials at the beginning of the new school year. However, that critical period may also be occupied by assignment to a new school or class. This is hardly compatible with what the sixth National Curriculum requires teachers to do. To accomplish its decentralizing intention, teachers need to devote adequate time and collaborative efforts to this work. However, teachers can rarely find enough time to involve themselves in the process of school-based curriculum development. Therefore, as my data showed, many teachers experienced this new attempt at decentralization as making them more burdened and troubled rather than more autonomous and professional. In this circumstance, it is not surprising that teachers do not want to participate in curriculum development and prefer
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15. The government gets in the way of good teaching.
26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers' professional pride.
30. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.
34. The national Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.
38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.
45. There has been inadequate resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum.
59. Government supports teachers well.
simply to follow the guidelines of the National Curriculum without consideration of their individual situation.

This situation is worse in schools in poor areas. Most teachers want to move to an affluent school, since these schools offer teachers better working conditions resulting in better pupils' performance, and parents are highly educated and cooperative. Conversely, in poor areas pupils' achievement gaps are large and parents are comparatively less enthusiastic and cooperative toward schooling, so that teachers have much difficulty in doing their work. To equalize opportunities and give incentives for the teachers in poor schools, the government has shortened the transfer period in those schools from four to three years and many teachers are unable to make any contribution to school-based curriculum development in such a short period of time. It is not at all easy to develop the notion of 'teachers' curriculum ownership'.

Secondly, the long tradition of teachers' exclusion from curriculum development has a profound impact on the way teachers continue to perceive their role in curriculum development. The Korean school system has always been highly centralized and policy has been set by the central government. The dominant tradition has been that the curriculum is not a concern of teachers. In particular, the bureaucratic and hierarchical nature of the education system makes teachers take for granted their exclusion from fundamental curriculum development. Also, Korean teachers are civil servants, who did not have unions until 1999, and they have a strong sense of obligation and responsibility towards the government, which is confirmed by law. Teachers take for granted conforming to the policy of the government. They do not naturally expect an autonomy outside the control of the government. This is strengthened by the fact that teacher training mainly emphasizes the content of subject knowledge and pays little attention to the relationship between the curriculum and the teacher's role. It is unsurprising, then, that the new decentralizing reform did not arise from the demands of schools and teachers, but from a political concern to enhance democracy in the society.

In this circumstance, the intention of the new curriculum policy to promote school-based and teacher-involved curriculum development is not always welcome to the teachers. Lacking the opportunity to gain the necessary knowledge and skill to involve themselves in curriculum development, teachers mainly consider themselves either unqualified or
underresourced to develop the curriculum appropriately. If teachers are to actually become more involved, they need to be informed and trained so that they would be prepared to confront curriculum conflicts of various forms and degrees under different circumstances. The government has provided some INSET courses on curriculum development, they have not given sufficient systematic preparation and training to all teachers (KICE, 1998).

Lastly, while proclaiming some decentralization, the government still produced not only policy directives on the whole range of issues dealt with by the schools, but, crucially, official textbooks. By tradition, the meaning of curriculum in Korean has been not a syllabus, or an annual school plan, but a textbook. As most of the teachers I interviewed described it, the sixth National Curriculum, by which actually they meant ‘textbooks’, is still a ‘bible’ for teaching. This, too, is in obvious tension with the decentralizing policy.

Therefore, the influence of this curriculum reform has been minimal. It has led to teachers’ low motivation and interest, and, finally, their merely formal participation in curriculum development. The textbook-driven curriculum inhibits teachers from deciding about contents and teaching methods they want to implement in the classroom. As far as school curriculum development is concerned, the teachers generally consider it as only a formal fulfilment of the governmental requirements. It is not allowed to expand their perceptions to the notion of professionalism as autonomy.

In general, despite the ‘good intentions’ of the sixth National Curriculum, significant changes are unlikely to take place in either teachers’ perceptions, and curriculum practices and the three issues discussed are important factors conditioning this pessimistic assessment. The teachers continue predominantly to equate professionalism with professional knowledge, and to locate their main curriculum identity in teaching their own pupils. They have a new curriculum framework which necessitates increased professional skills, but the resources and training are simply not there in support. The data considered in this chapter comes close to demonstrating that they are unable or unwilling under present circumstances to participate actively in curriculum development and to strengthen their voice in moving toward ‘extended autonomy’. They mainly retain a low expectation and an indifferent attitude in the matter of their wider curriculum responsibility and do not understand how advantageous more autonomy in curriculum development could be for them as teachers and for their pupils.
Chapter 7 English Teachers' Perceptions of Themselves, Curriculum Development and the Government

The English study was of a structured sample of primary schools in London and Greater London area. These were selected on the same basis as those in Korea. However, since English schools usually were smaller and had fewer staff, more, viz. nine instead of six, were included in the sample. As detailed in Chapter 5, these were then supplemented by 18 teachers selected from an MA in Primary Education class. Altogether, there were 45 respondents to the questionnaire. In addition there was a total of 18 interviewees from across the nine schools. This study was carried out between May 1998 and May 1999.

7.1 Conceptual Understanding of Curriculum Development and Professionalism

Table 15.1 shows the English sample’s responses to questions on curriculum development and professionalism. Table 15.2 presents these results by school groups. [As before, the more significant-seeming differences are highlighted in bold type.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. As a teacher I should plan the contents, teaching, and assessment for my own class.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My role as a teacher is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The professional teacher is good at managing prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in classroom.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The professional teacher is always punctual.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘Professionalism’ is more a matter of competency than status.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers have a higher status now than they used to have.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The government gets in the way of good teaching.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The professional teacher works well in a team.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The professional teacher is a good manager of the classroom.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Subject knowledge is the most important thing for a teacher. 42 40 3.1
19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly. 22 56 2.3
20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively. 84 7 4.4
21. Teachers deserve to be paid more. 87 0 4.7
22. Society does not respect teachers enough. 89 4 4.5
23. If I were to start again, I would still be a teacher. 40 16 3.4
24. There is not enough joint planning by teachers 20 38 2.8
25. Teacher appraisal is a positive contribution to professional development. 51 16 3.4
26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers' professional pride. 51 16 3.6
27. The essential component of teacher appraisal should be self-assessment together with appraisal by senior colleagues 78 2 4.2

Table 15.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Curriculum Development and Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.1 Curriculum development

Table 15.1.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. As a teacher I should plan the contents, teaching, and assessment for my own class.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My role as a teacher is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The professional teacher is good at managing prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in classroom.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were of the general opinion that teachers should have a major role in curriculum development. Four in five believed teachers perform better when given this. Only one in eight considered that teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts, and one in four that their role was rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching (A third were ‘neutral’ on this point - it may be that the question seemed ambiguous to some respondents).

In interpreting the responses relating to the National Curriculum, we should notice that it has now been in place for over ten years in English education, and teachers have experienced many radical changes in it. When first introduced between 1988 and 1992, very many teachers criticized it because it was overloaded and too prescriptive, even if they approved of its principle. Since then, several revisions have, perhaps, created more flexibility for teachers to exercise their professional judgement and develop good practice (Dearing, 1993). Teachers might now be more inclined to acknowledge some advantages of the National Curriculum, i.e. having clearer ideas about what they should be aiming at in school, as well as some disadvantages of it, e.g. curtailing autonomy by wide-ranging central control. There were still substantial numbers of neutral responses to some of these items. Again, different degrees of control might be evaluated by the teachers according to their wishes to operate with different curriculum practices, rather than just ‘on principle’. In this sense, perhaps some were always likely to oppose government intervention in curriculum development, while others were likely to be in favour.
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Although this item will appear in Table 19.1 later, I include it here also because of its relation to curriculum development.
If the fact that 'English education was much slower in developing a national system of education and has avoided central control over the curriculum' (Lawton, 1996) is considered, I was impressed that a majority of teachers in interviews expressed positive opinions about the principle of the National Curriculum. Teachers perhaps considered that they needed some kind of basic guidelines for curriculum development to perform their role effectively. This possibility is supported by the fact that a substantial majority of the teachers did not give a negative response to the general principle of the National Curriculum (mean score = 3.7). Several interviewees commented on this point:

Curriculum should give scope to a child of any ability to reach his potential and give teachers an awareness of areas where the achievement is not satisfactory... Now, teachers have less say in curriculum planning than before. The headteacher needs to guide the planning. The major job for teachers for curriculum development is that they must be sure the children cover the work. But, in general, I feel the National Curriculum is a good idea. Now the targets are more realistic. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

The National Curriculum gives opportunity to study a range of subjects with similar content; it does not give opportunity for creative teachers to use their skills, though. The National Curriculum, especially the guidelines for assessment, are very useful for the structure and boundaries of my work. I feel that I absolutely need nation-wide guidelines to give clear overall goals and targets. It is really helpful to develop my professional skill in assessment. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

The National Curriculum requires more structured planning. Teachers could be more aware of criteria for what should be taught. Teachers are given more help in the sense of continuity and progression. Indications of goals are a really good idea. Specially, the centralized curriculum for schools enables children who move to have little disruption to their education...to standardize things at all levels. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

There is much support for the National Curriculum, then, though often expressed, as in two of the three quotations above, with some ambivalence, and with stronger support for the principle than the implementation.

As shown in Table 15.2.1, teachers in Group 1, who came from middle income area schools, seemed to be more confident and comfortable with the National Curriculum than others. Relatively, larger proportions of the teachers in Group 1 agreed with leaving it to experts in curriculum development and with unquestioning implementation. Only small minorities or, in some cases, no one at all agreed with these propositions in Groups 2 and
3. One possible interpretation of the tendency to a more favourable response in Group 1 is that the National Curriculum might work better for middle class children. My sample was too small to confirm this possibility, though. As Broadfoot et al. (1993: 118) pointed out, 'the National Curriculum as a form of centralization is likely to disadvantage less favoured socio-economic groups since teachers working to common, public goals cannot hope to achieve the same levels of "success" in such areas and yet are not allowed to adapt their goals better to meet these pupils' needs'. It is possible to suppose that a centralized curriculum is less suitable for pupils in those schools, in which teachers need much more flexibility in order to cope with a different or worse situation. This was supported by the fact that all teachers in Group 3 believed that teachers could implement the National Curriculum creatively.

In fact, a large majority of respondents as a whole believed in this creative possibility (mean score=4.4), and four in five refused support to the idea that teachers should implement the national Curriculum unquestioningly. There may well be a more consistent tendency in conceptual understanding of curriculum development among English teachers, rather than distinctive tendencies: teachers generally were much happier (71%) with a role-description that extended to planning contents and assessment as well as teaching, than with one (27%) which was restricted to teaching methods. A majority of the teachers felt that following the framework of the National Curriculum was important, but they also strongly believed that the curriculum should be implemented creatively. In this regard, one headteacher emphasized her own flexibility and creativity in implementing curriculum:

The aim of the National Curriculum is to create a format throughout the country. The curriculum should have relevance to the age of the children and should cover essential aspects of knowledge. To have such a curriculum would be beneficial for any child who has to move into another area. In the main I agree with the idea laid out in the National Curriculum. However, the National Curriculum is not everything teachers have to follow. I think it is just a framework and good guidelines. Teachers still need imagination to implement it in a classroom. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

English teachers' understanding of curriculum development seemed to have been developed through the general opportunity to participate effectively in curriculum development in school. It is likely that even though the government makes crucial decisions, teachers' own judgement and flexibility in implementing curriculum continue.
Specific opinions were held by interviewees regarding curriculum development. Unlike the majority of Korean teachers, most teachers appeared to hold a view of curriculum development which corresponded with the notion of 'extended autonomy' rather than 'restricted autonomy'.

Teachers have different perceptions of the degree of control from the National Curriculum, though. Those who considered that teachers' curriculum control co-exists with the National Curriculum argued that teachers can and should decide and implement the curriculum in the way they felt appropriate. They believed that there was a flexibility which allowed them to participate in deciding their own school curriculum. One interviewee made this kind of assertion:

Prior to 1988 any school in which I have worked had detailed schemes of work and our target and intentions were discussed...Actually, my roles and responsibilities of curriculum development have not changed before and after the 1988 Act...Of course, I try to balance all policies such as the National Curriculum, LEA and school policies. However, I have the flexibility to introduce items I feel add to the smooth running of the lesson plans. These include aspects which the children enjoy and which I have found worked well over many years. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

Other teachers, on the other hand, regarded the National Curriculum, in particular the literacy hour strategy, as prescriptive and controlling, and as restricting teachers' flexibility in classroom. For many or most of those, obviously, their conceptual understanding of curriculum development also corresponded with the sense of 'extended autonomy'. This was confirmed by an interviewee:

The National Curriculum intends consistency in all schools. The National Curriculum also introduced SATs. Ofsted prevents teachers going out of these limits. Government is trying to control the schools more with this. When we planned our school curriculum, the headteacher oversaw the process and told us

---

107 ‘Restricted autonomy’ is considered to mean the control of a teacher over his own teaching in classroom. On the other hand, ‘extended autonomy’ refers to the desire of teachers to direct their own behaviour and make their own professional decisions without pressure from outside influence (for details see Chapter 2).

108 In 1997, the government’s Literacy Task Force brought out a document introducing a National Literacy Strategy, to be implemented in schools from September 1998, in order to meet national targets by the year 2002. The strategy has a variety of aspects, including national and local management structures, additional resources, a daily timetable, professional development for teachers and the involvement of parents and others (DfEE, 1998b).
that we had to follow the National Curriculum. We have little choice. In particular, the literacy hour is much more prescriptive than the new curriculum. It gives teachers not only contents, methodology of teaching, and instruction time but also some resources. There is no room for professional judgement for teachers. Teachers should implement the curriculum in their own flexible ways. (Grp. 2. Sch. B, Tch. b2)

It is already clear, then, that a majority of the English teachers thought that the curriculum which is actually taught to children should be significantly shaped by their teachers. These ideas might be held because the long tradition of their own decision-making in curriculum development had great influence on their attitude, as some teachers expressed in their interviews. They were certain that teachers should have to make curriculum decisions which corresponded with the notion of 'extended autonomy', while disagreeing about whether the actual interventions of the government were helpful in such decisions to some extent. Even though the degree of support for the National Curriculum varied, the majority believed in teachers' ideal role as defined by 'extended autonomy'. These results suggested that through an awareness of the importance of curriculum autonomy on the part of the teachers, they have continued to keep their curriculum responsibilities. Unlike Korean teachers, who showed two distinctive tendencies to either 'restricted autonomy' or 'extended autonomy', English teachers generally showed a coherent view of their role as 'extended autonomy' in curriculum development.

7.1.2 Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. 'Professionalism' is more a matter of competence than status.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Teachers have a higher status now than they used to have.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers deserve to be paid more.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Society does not respect teachers enough.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If I were to start again, I would still be a teacher.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers should be civil servants.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this item will appear in Table 21.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers' professionalism.
English teachers appeared to have negative views about the actual status of teachers: a large majority believed that teachers deserved to be paid more and that society did not respect teachers enough. In addition, only a tiny minority believed that teachers have a higher status now than they used to have. Interestingly, the majority who disagreed with this statement had a tendency to agree that 'teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach' (r=-.208). This result indicated that teachers associated status with autonomy. In the end, however, the majority thought professionalism was more a matter of competence than status.

In addition, it was notable that two thirds of respondents did not express the positive judgement that if they were to start again, they would still be teachers. It seemed that at present they hardly enjoyed being teachers partly because of more government intervention over teachers. In this respect, no one agreed that teachers should be civil servants. Some interviewees showed their depressed feelings about being teachers:

Before I worked as a teacher, I was working in the business sector. Compared with this profession, the job of a teacher is a more demanding job. Even though I like teaching and working with children, I think that teachers do not have the honour as due to their position and role. Teachers are underpaid compared to other profession of similar age and experience. Currently, the government announced 'performance related pay' in a Green Paper. It is a bad idea, which may be offensive to other colleagues. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c2)

Especially, there have been worse changes in teachers' treatment after the National Curriculum. The teacher are very much in control, and concentrate very much on the task. I resent being dictated to...I know I am doing an important job and should take pride in the preparation of my work. But I feel there is now an unfair...lack of trust. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

The fact that teachers are supposed to be experts on everything e.g. subject knowledge, policies, parental issues, recent research etc...I have no 'non-contact' time. How can I know all these things and feel 'professional'? (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

With reference to present government policy and particularly the proposal of performance related pay, interviewees were very low in morale. Many thought their professionalism had been undermined and undervalued, with low status allocated to them by the government.
I ahle 15.1.3 Teachers’ Perceptions of Government Impact on Their Professionalism

Table 15.1.3 Teachers’ Perceptions of Government Impact on Their Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. The government gets in the way of good teaching.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher appraisal is a positive contribution to professional development.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers’ professional pride.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The essential component of teacher appraisal should be self assessment together with appraisal by senior colleagues</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.2.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Government Impact on Their Professionalism (% of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one in five agreed that the government was supportive of the professional development of teachers, while half gave definitely negative judgement about this. Consistent with what we have seen earlier, Group 1 seemed to have a more positive attitude to government intervention and its relation to their professionalism in curriculum development. In this respect, compared with other groups, a substantial majority in Groups 2 and 3 believed that the government got in the way of good teaching, while one third of Group 1 had the same response.

In England, there is a statutory obligation to carry out appraisal on a two-year rolling cycle of every teacher employed in maintained schools. The legislated purpose is to secure that appraisal assists school teachers in their professional development. An important element of the appraisal is that it is confined within the professional ambit of the school. Appraisal, other than of the headteacher, is carried out by teaching staff within each school, and individual results are not made available to the governing body (Gold and Szemerenyi, 1997). In this circumstance, it is not surprising that around half of the teachers agreed that teacher appraisal was a positive contribution to professional development; only a small minority disagreed. Consistently with this, a substantial majority believed that the essential component of teacher appraisal should be self-assessment, together with appraisal by senior colleagues.

Although this item will appear in Table 21.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers’ professionalism.
senior colleagues. For the majority of the teachers, self-appraisal was considered the ideal. This result supported the idea that English teachers valued the notion of professionalism as 'autonomy'. One interviewee amplified this view:

Appraisal is a more personal approach. In our school, we have a six-monthly self-appraisal, which is in some relation to our own needs. We have a special format for this. It is a questionnaire about our attitude to the job. For example, 'how do you see your job and career development?' Usually, it has been done by personal consultation or interviewing with colleagues and headteacher. Sometimes we do visit and observe a colleague's classroom. It is helpful for improving teaching to observe other classrooms. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

Current inspection arrangements in England are another matter, however. Half of the respondents agreed that present arrangements for school inspection were an offence to teachers' professional pride, and only 16% disagreed with this. The teachers who agreed about self-assessment for teachers' appraisal, also had a positive tendency to agree that current school inspection was an offence to teachers' professionalism (r=.511). Some interviewees commented on how the arrangements for school inspection influenced their professionalism, referring to their recent experience of school inspections:

School inspections are a necessary trauma. We were inspected on June, 1998 and warned eight months earlier. Everything was accommodated for the Ofsted inspections. I would prefer two weeks' warning. I found it very stressful. Most of all, the children suffered because teachers spent more time on the inspections than time for teaching preparation. Actually, we were not concerned about teaching, but so much time was spent on display for inspections. We should have inspections from time to time to suggest ways in which we can improve our achievement. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Four inspectors came and produced very detailed reports. They went through SATs' management, playground etc...They picked areas which had to be improved within a certain time. They also suggested ways for being more imaginative. In particular, they mainly discussed about the results of SATs, but I think they did not much give attention to our own particular circumstances. Some staff had negative attitudes and moan a lot. I am not sure about its effectiveness for my professional development. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c2)

As we might expect, far fewer in Group 1 thought present arrangements for school inspection were an offence to teachers' professional pride than the large majorities of Groups 2 and 3 who had this opinion. One headteacher in Group 1 summarised this positive view of government intervention:
Many initiatives from the government, the National Curriculum and its inspection, are important and valid for the standards to be improved. With more support and training the morale and profile of teachers as professionals would be increased. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

One teacher put forward her ideas for more effective inspection:

Inspections give the school the chance to see how it compares with other establishments, which is helpful. It helps assess if the school is achieving. It gives us more help to implement objectives. It can give approval, which is pleasing, and give pride in the job. We had inspections last year and then we do not have more inspecting for six years. Inspections were nerve-racking. But once it was under way, it was fine. I absolutely did not enjoy it, but I think it is necessary. Sometimes it gives me a sense of satisfaction. But more consistent and regular inspection would be more effective. I feel that three separate weeks would be more useful instead of tough four-day inspections. Also, school must be inspected by people who are familiar with that type of school and can identify where the excellent and poor schools are. We need more consistency amongst inspectors. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

The essential purpose of current inspection under the Ofsted is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of a school with a view to ‘improving the quality of education offered’ and ‘raising the standards achieved by its pupils’ (Gold and Szemerenyi, 1997). Therefore, inspection is given a function like that of national assessment: clear and public evaluation. Overall, the system of inspection forms part of the controls which operate on the outcomes of pupils’ and teachers’ performance.

Table 15.1.4 Teachers’ Perceptions of Professional Skills and Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The professional teacher is always punctual.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ‘Professionalism’ is more a matter of competence than status.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The professional teacher works well in a team.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The professional teacher is a good manager of the classroom.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Subject knowledge is the most important thing for a teacher.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. There is not enough joint planning by teachers.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject-specialists.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this item will appear in Table 19.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers’ professionalism.
Virtually, all agreed that the professional teacher was always punctual. Most agreed, and very few definitely disagreed, that professionalism was more a matter of competency than status. None at all disagreed that the professional teacher was a good manager of the classroom. When interviewees were questioned further about what the terms 'a professional teacher' and 'professionalism' meant to them, the majority referred to issues of competence, e.g. 'doing one's job properly' or 'doing the job to the best of one's abilities'. Interestingly, most interviewees mentioned the proper implementation of the National Curriculum as a characteristic of professional teachers:

Specify the National Curriculum and deliver it appropriately. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

Follow the National Curriculum and prepare work carefully. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

Follow all policies of the government and school. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

These comments corresponded with the changes in the standards for 'Qualified Teachers Status', which have reflected the requirements of the National Curriculum. According to the 'Standards for the Award of Qualified Teacher Status' (Teacher Training Agency, 1998), which reflects the Secretary of State's requirements for Qualified Teacher Status (DfEE Circular 10/97), the more general competences set out in DFE Circular 9/92 and 14/93 were replaced by more specific knowledge and skills, i.e. knowledge and understanding of subjects; planning, teaching and class management; monitoring, assessment, recording, reporting and accountability (see Chapter 3).

However, less than half of the respondents agreed that subject knowledge was the most important thing for a teacher, and a similar proportion definitely disagreed with this. Half agreed that primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject specialists with a quarter disagreeing with them. These results suggest that professional competence was certainly perceived generally as not only 'subject knowledge' but also as 'acting in a professional manner' and as 'commitment to their children'. Some interviewees confirmed these points:

...dress appropriately and have a professional attitude; take the job seriously, good
relations with all the people they meet, follow job description. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. bl (H))

To present oneself neatly and in a friendly manner to fellow teachers, children and parents. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Professional teachers should be objective...need to be full of passion, but do not put personal things into their work...They should not impose personal religious and political views. (Grp. 1, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

Professionalism wants 125% commitment to the job. They should arrive early in school and put in time in the holidays; they should grow and develop. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

Absolutely absorbed in the job. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Professional teachers should be role models for adults. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c2)

Professional teachers are involved with children actively, and basically respecting children. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a1)

Professionalism means to me being organized, being fair to all abilities, sexes and races, not being dogmatic, creating a pleasant environment, getting on well with colleagues. Parents regard them as a friend not an enemy. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Primary teachers’ professional attitude is different from secondary school teachers. They should be more a caring person. (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. c2)

No one disagreed that the professional teacher works well in a team, though one in five believed that there was not enough joint planning by teachers. Interviewees supported the value of interaction with other teachers, and generally agreed about sharing ideas and learning from one another. Most commented that professional teachers supported the need to work together as a team with colleagues.

Overall, English teachers generally believed that professionalism is more a matter of competence than status, but they also valued ‘commitment to the job’ and an ‘autonomous role’ as essential aspects of professionalism, and thus disapproved of the present inspection arrangements - and they put emphasis on ‘collaborative work with flexibility’ rather than ‘individual subject knowledge’.

Respondents were asked about their confidence in their own knowledge and skills in curriculum development, in effect, to rate their own individual competence for curriculum development.
Table 16.1 Teachers' Perceptions of Their Own Individual Competences in Curriculum Development (N=45)

["Please indicate the level of your confidence regarding each item as follows."]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83. Up-to-date subject knowledge</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Identifying conceptual structure of the subjects I teach</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Reviewing existing practice</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Implementing a programme scheme</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluating a programme scheme</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Identifying links between subjects</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Ordering, maintaining resources</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Leading workshops and discussions</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Liaising with the head and senior staff</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Advising colleagues informally</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Teaching alongside colleagues</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Visiting colleagues' class to see work in progress</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Maintaining colleagues' morale, reducing anxiety etc.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Dealing with professional disagreement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Consulting advisers, curriculum mediators etc.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Consulting teachers in other schools</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Their Own Individual Competences in Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be convenient, as for the Korean respondents, to divide those items into knowledge items and interpersonal skills.

Knowledge

Table 16.1.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Their Curriculum Knowledge: in Rank Order of Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Up-to-date subject knowledge</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Identifying conceptual structure of the subjects I teach</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Reviewing existing practice</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Identifying links between subjects</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Ordering, maintaining resources</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Implementing a programme scheme</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluating a programme scheme</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since none of these group-differences are significant, I need not refer to them below.
Clearly, the respondents had considerable confidence about their knowledge-base for curriculum development: the mean scores for all items were around 4. A few referred to problems in 'identifying the conceptual structure of the subjects' (2%) and 'relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years' (2%). Apart from that, no-one was definitely unconfident about anything. Teachers were very confident that they could devise and consolidate their own programme schemes and correct whatever inadequacies were detected.

Skills

Table 16.1.2 Teachers' Perceptions of Their Interpersonal Curriculum Skills: in Rank Order of Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97. Advising colleagues informally</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Teaching alongside colleagues</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Visiting colleagues' class to see work in progress</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Liaising with the head and senior staff</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Maintaining colleagues' morale, reducing anxiety etc.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Consulting advisers, curriculum mediators etc.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Consulting teachers in other schools</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Leading workshops and discussions</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Dealing with professional disagreement</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, their general confidence speaks for itself. On most items almost no one or only a insignificant minority responded negatively. Perhaps, this confidence was because they have always participated in the process of curriculum decision-making. However, contrasting with other items, 20% were not confident about leading workshops and discussions. One teacher suggested an explanation:

As a class teacher, I usually cooperate with my colleagues to plan curriculum. I have had no chance to lead workshop and discussions. This kind of activity was left for the headteacher as a group leader or curriculum co-ordinators. However, in that sense, the headteacher seemed to have more a pressurising role than an initiator's role to me. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

On another item, dealing with disagreement, more than half opted for the neutral
position. Perhaps they felt that they could handle disagreement well sometimes and not as well at other times.

Participants were also asked to respond to four ‘definitional-type’ description of teachers. This also reflects how they perceived the meaning of professionalism.

Table 17.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Themselves as Teachers: in Rank Order of Description (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Teachers are essentially members of the teaching and learning community</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Teachers convey specialist knowledge to pupils in an objective way.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Teachers are authoritative managers of classroom and pupils’ learning.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Teachers are craftsmen or craftswomen who draw practical knowledge from their experiences for the benefit of their pupils</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around half of the respondents agreed that teachers learnt from their experience, conveyed specialist knowledge, and were authoritative managers of classrooms and pupils’ learning. The other half could hardly have disagreed with these statement and did not disagree, but they were not enthusiastic about identifying themselves, or summing themselves up, in these ways. However, all respondents identified the description of themselves as essentially members of a teaching and learning community. This might be seen to correspond with the fact that these teachers expected to have an essential role in curriculum development as part of their professional status. We should recall, however, that 95% of Korean teachers also identified with this description.

Comparing groups of schools, the two things that stand out are, first, that Group 1 teachers are relatively enthusiastic about the three ‘yes-and-no’ description, and, second, Group 2 teachers are much the least enthusiastic about them. No easy explanation of these differences suggests itself, but perhaps the Group 1 response fits with the generally more confident responses from those teachers.
In this section, I explored how English teachers perceived curriculum development and professionalism. Since the National Curriculum, curriculum development demands more teacher involvement in implementation and delivery than in initial planning. However, the majority of teachers continued to believe that curriculum development was a responsibility for them rather than for only experts or the government. Unlike the Korean case, where teachers had two different perceptions, a strong support, as well as good correlations, were identified among items which represented the notion of 'extended autonomy': a majority of English teachers had one consistent view of curriculum development and professionalism, leading us to clarify them as Type II-e. On the other hand, English teachers varied in their perceptions of the degree of government intervention in curriculum development and of its impact on professionalism. Some thought that, up to a point, government intervention provided them with knowledge that would have a positive impact on curriculum practices and encourage professional progress. Others seemed to emphasize that government intervention deprived teachers of autonomy and professional pride. [These different perceptions of teachers will be further identified in the following sections.]

Underlying these different perceptions of the government’s curriculum interventions, English teachers seemed generally to share a notion of ‘extended autonomy’ in their conceptual understandings of curriculum development and professionalism. Some, perhaps many or most, are inclined to value intervention from the government to some extent, but, for most of these, their view should not be opposed to their claim to an autonomous role in curriculum development. Table 18.1 identifies this feature of Type II-e tendency in England by comparing some related items. Table 18.2 shows that there were strong tendencies for responses to be correlated among these items.

As we have seen in Chapter 6, I identify a similar tendency of this type among Korean teachers (Type II-k). This type of teacher in both countries supports the notion of ‘extended autonomy’, and perceives the condition of current curriculum practice as ‘restricted autonomy’ and ‘power over’ from government. However, these teachers are of course responding to different situations and contexts: the Korean teachers to a centralized tradition attempting some limited decentralization, the English teachers to a recent re-centralization of curriculum. So, I shall distinguish the Type II tendency for each country; the type of Korean teachers as ‘Type II-k’ and that of English teachers as ‘Type II-e’. The features of this type of teacher in each country will be further identified in the following sections and Chapter 8. However, as I pointed out in chapters 5 and 6, it should be remembered that these Types are conceptual models: it does not pretend that every teacher belongs to one or the other.
Table 18.1 Items and Their Results of Responses Representing Type II-e in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. The essential component of teachers appraisal should be self-assessment together with appraisal by senior-colleagues.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18.2 Correlations among Items Representing Type II-e in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2 Perceptions of Curriculum Requirements in Practice

Table 19.1 indicates the English teachers’ beliefs regarding the practice of the new curriculum in which they were involved. Table 19.2 presents these results by school groups.

Table 19.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Curriculum Practices (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. The National Curriculum has the support of teachers for its general principles.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The majority of teachers are familiar with and get to grips with the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I think the National Curriculum enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. The planned and delivered National Curriculum has greatly improved standards.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The National Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The National Curriculum is the major influence over what is taught in the classroom.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The “command-and-control” approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Assessment arrangements are the most important part of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed. 38 0 3.6
39. National assessment should rely more on teachers’ judgements. 69 2 4.0
40. Teachers have been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum. 69 7 3.9
41. The ethos of the classroom has been changed by the National Curriculum. 69 16 3.7
42. Teaching has become just a job since the National Curriculum. 13 49 2.5
43. As a result of the National Curriculum, teachers work and plan more together. 60 9 3.8
44. Assessment of standards should be done by national testing. 40 29 3.0
45. There has been inadequate resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum. 64 16 3.8
46. Mandated textbooks are a good idea. 20 51 2.5
47. Primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject-specialists. 53 22 3.3
48. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration. 22 69 2.0
49. Most teachers integrate subjects into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate. 60 22 3.7
50. The major aim of primary teachers is the promotion of basic skills. 78 9 4.0
51. The National Curriculum is appropriate to promote the basic skills of young children. 56 22 3.5

Table 19.2 Groups’ Perceptions of Curriculum Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For purpose of analysis we will consider these items - and associated interviews data - in three sub-sections: general framework and principles; contents, pedagogy and practices; and assessment.
7.2.1 General framework and principles

Table 19.1.1 Teachers' Perceptions of the Value and Worth of the National Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. I think the National Curriculum enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The National Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The planned and delivered National Curriculum has greatly improved standards.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Primary teachers should be generalists rather than subject-specialists.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The major aim of primary teachers is the promotion of basic skills.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The National Curriculum is appropriate to promote the basic skills of young children.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Standards in primary education are higher than they used to be.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19.2.1 Groups' Perceptions of the Value and Worth of the National Curriculum (% of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost exactly half believed that the National Curriculum enriched and broadened the educational experience and opportunities of young children, three out of ten disagreed with this and the remaining two out of ten would not commit themselves. Three quarters believed that teachers ‘handled it’, were familiar with it and getting to grips with it. Two

In discussing the teachers’ perceptions of the value and worth of the National Curriculum, item 31 is the key question. Other questions suggest value-judgement of the National Curriculum from this or that point of view, but ‘enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children’ must come very close, at least, to bring the ‘bottom line’ for teachers in judging it.

Although this item will appear in Table 21.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers’ practice of the National Curriculum.

---

14 In discussing the teachers’ perceptions of the value and worth of the National Curriculum, item 31 is the key question. Other questions suggest value-judgement of the National Curriculum from this or that point of view, but ‘enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children’ must come very close, at least, to bring the ‘bottom line’ for teachers in judging it.

15 Although this item will appear in Table 21.1 later, I discuss it here because of its relation to teachers’ practice of the National Curriculum.
out of three believed that its general principles had the support of teachers. Nearly three out of five believed it was a good framework and encouraged good practice. Particularly, a larger majority in Group 1 asserted this positive view of the National Curriculum. From the evidence so far, it was reasonable to infer that the National Curriculum has settled down. Furthermore, the majority of interviewees agreed that some advantages derived from the National Curriculum being imposed by the government. Most of the favourable comments referred to a good framework and clear targets for teaching:

The National Curriculum is a valuable pattern. (Grp. 1, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

The aim of the National Curriculum is, most of all, to raise standards, with the same curriculum throughout the country. I think it is a proper movement. Originally the National Curriculum was far too wide. This made its management very difficult. Now, it is much better, with several changes. I like its structure and boundaries to my work. This also has helped and encouraged me to achieve targets. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

The National Curriculum allows me to choose how and when each section is taught. In the main, I agree with the ideas laid out in the National Curriculum. I feel these would have been apparent to any school and teacher. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

In the beginning of the National Curriculum, I just followed the government plan, but, now, I am beginning to adapt it for my children’s special requirements. Especially, my professional judgement has improved because of the criteria of record keeping for assessment. I am able to give a more accurate picture and judgement of pupils. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

However, one in three (more in Groups 2 and 3) thought it had not had its intended effects, though it is possible that evaluation should be counted as an ambiguous one. Again, only one in three (fewer than the one in two who thought it was good for children) believed it had ‘greatly improved standards’. Perhaps the word ‘greatly’ influenced this result and we must note that half of the respondents remained undecided about this. Only two out of five thought standards were higher than they used to be, though a good half were agnostic about this.

As I noticed from the interviews, ‘to raise standards, with the same curriculum for all children’ was mentioned as the main aim of the National Curriculum by the majority of the teachers. However, as far as the different environments of individual schools were concerned, teachers in less advantaged schools might have experienced less benefits from
it. Only a small minority of Group 3 (13%) believed that the planned and delivered National Curriculum had greatly improved standards. As I pointed out in an earlier section, the National Curriculum may have disadvantaged this group by 'spotlighting' their relative deficiency in achievement levels. It was obvious that teachers who had been working at more achieving schools were likely to have more positive views about it.

On the other hand, as many as seven in ten thought the National Curriculum over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding (and only just over one in ten positively disagreed with this) - which must include a considerable proportion of those who basically favoured the National Curriculum. A smaller proportion of teachers in Group 1 (53%) agreed with this point, whereas all teachers in Group 2 and the majority in Group 3 believed it. Interviewees also commented on the over-prescriptive nature of the curriculum:

The National Curriculum at Key Stage 2 is very heavy. National Literacy targets are hard. Teachers' assessment has had to become more detailed. SATs have made this harder. Teachers have to record with great care. Teachers are expected to produce quality and an increased quantity of work. How can I manage it? (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. a2)

In some ways I feel after the last ten years of turmoil, everything has come full circle. If the teacher tried to achieve everything, it would have been utterly impossible. It has been a tremendous upheaval. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Teachers have managed to trim the paper work. Everything should be structured. It is a demanding job. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H))

It is still far too detailed. Aims are laudable. But there is a need to listen to the teachers. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Prior to 1988 everything was much freer, now records are much more detailed. Every new scheme produced too much extra work, far too unrealistic. There is no room for incidental learning. (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

Over half thought that the National Curriculum promoted basic skills learning, nearly a quarter thought it did not, and the final quarter stayed neutral. Perhaps surprisingly, just about eight out of ten saw the promotion of basic skills as 'the major aim of primary teachers'. This fits with over half identifying themselves as generalists rather than subject specialists and only a quarter disagreeing with this. Perhaps this points to child-centred values and it may also connect with the reservations about the National Curriculum: some teachers might be bewildered or confused in defining their role within the subject-bounded
nature of the National Curriculum. Most interviewees also regarded themselves as
generalists and child-centred. One teacher spoke for many:

Most of all, teachers should figure out what children’s needs and interests are.
They should have knowledge of the child and its relationships. Teachers should be
教学 children ways of understanding the world which they experience. (Grp.
2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

However, one headteacher in interview worried about the lack of specialists,
especially in Science and Information Technology, to run the full range of the National
Curriculum. She saw the need of specialisation because of the demands for specific subject
content. This meant that she also admitted the importance of specialist teachers in primary
schools. It should be recalled from the previous section that nearly half of the questionnaire
respondents thought subject knowledge was the most important thing for a professional
teacher.

The teachers who agreed that the major aim of primary teachers was the promotion
of basic skills, also responded positively that the National Curriculum was appropriate to
promote the basic skills of young children (r=.323). Particularly, a substantial majority in
Group 1 (87%) agreed with the latter. Some Group 1 interviewees commented on this point
and made a correlation with the newly introduced literacy hour:

When the National Curriculum was introduced, the basics were neglected because
of other subjects. I thought that the basics are the most important aim for primary
education. The National Curriculum has been modified. Now it emphasizes the
basics, in particular, through the literacy hour. It is much better. (Grp. 1, Sch. B,
Tch. b2)

Improving basic education and its standards are the reason for the National
Curriculum. I absolutely agree with this. The contents of the curriculum have
changed since 1988. This has been slimmed down. It is better now, as there is less
content, more room for movement. Teachers must see it is changed for the better.
(Grp. 1, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

It was not surprising that there were strong negative correlations between responses
which regarded the curriculum as a good framework and responses which regarded it as
too demanding (r=-.472). As I indicated earlier, there were two different evaluations of the
National Curriculum, although both proceeded from the same view of the teachers’ role
in curriculum development and professionalism, one which corresponded to the notion of 'extended autonomy' (Type II-e). This allows us, for the English case, besides Type II-e, to identify one other type of teacher, Type III.

We have seen that Type II-e English teachers were not exactly the same as the Type II-k Korean teachers but that they had a similar tendency. Though they saw their role in curriculum as 'extended autonomy', there were significant gaps between this and what they felt in practice, which was 'restricted autonomy'. In general, this type of teacher perceived the National Curriculum as over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding. By contrast, a new Type III, which did not occur in the Korean case, was identified as teachers who not only believed in extended autonomy in curriculum development but also perceived themselves as practising it: this type perceived the National Curriculum mainly as a good framework, and assumed that they had flexibility to implement it in their own ways. The characteristics of these two types of teachers in the English case will be further detailed and developed in the following discussion.

7.2.2 Content, pedagogy and practices

Table 19.1.2 Teachers' Perceptions of Level of Prescription

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The National Curriculum is the major influence over what is taught in the classroom.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The &quot;command-and-control&quot; approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19.2.2 Groups' Perceptions of Level of Prescription (% of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No-one disagreed that the National Curriculum was the major influence over what was taught in the classroom. Nearly half went further in agreeing that its 'command and control' approach left no space for professional discretion, while others were uncertain about this, and 9% disagreed. The majority in Group 2 (77%) and Group 3 (60%) agreed with it, against only some 20% in Group 1. Many interviewees agreed:

231
The National Curriculum is a legal requirement. There is more legislation which we have to be seen to be following. My school lost some of the clubs which were in place formerly. I use the scheme of work from the National Curriculum as the main plan. Some of what I once taught is literally left on the back burner, because of what I have to do based on the National Curriculum. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

We have long, middle and short term curriculum plans based on the National Curriculum. In September and February, we have a big meeting with targets and goals, in which we assess what we have achieved. The curriculum co-ordinator group makes a policy of aims, objectives for each subjects. We then follow the syllabus e.g. how it compares with attainment levels. Once the school curriculum has been decided, they meet weekly and make sure the curriculum aims are put into practice. Teachers had more autonomy formerly. Now, we must be sure children cover the work. I have not much opportunity to vary the curriculum. (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. c2)

On the other hand, we can recall that more than half the questionnaire respondents believed that the National Curriculum provided a good framework for teaching and encouraged good practice. An interviewee who perceived the National Curriculum in this way:

The National Curriculum requires more structured planning. Teachers could be more aware of criteria for what should be taught. Teachers are given more help in the sense of continuity and progression. (Grp. 1, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

So, while a large majority of teachers believed in the major influence of the National Curriculum over what was taught in the classroom, there were two different responses to this influence. As one would expect, there was an inverse relationship between items 33 and 36 (r=-.409). The teachers who perceived the National Curriculum as 'a good framework' generally disagreed that it was 'a control device' and vice versa. Type III might then be identified as those who saw themselves as autonomous practitioners within the 'good framework' of the National Curriculum, while Type II-e, as in the Korean case, felt that they performed their curriculum practice under the pressure of the National Curriculum as a control device. From now on, the Type III tendency will be identified partly by correlation with item 33 (the National Curriculum as a framework), while that of Type II-e will be partly identified by correlation with item 36 (the National Curriculum as a control device).  

Although both Type I in Korea and Type III in England regarded the National Curriculum as a good framework for teaching, their conceptual understandings of teachers' professional role in curriculum development were different: whilst Type I were satisfied with their 'restricted autonomous role' (see Chapter 6), Type III valued their 'extended autonomous role' in curriculum development.
as a command and control device).

Table 19.1.3 Teachers’ Perceptions of Changing Classroom Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Teachers have been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The ethos of the classroom has been changed by the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Teaching has become just a job since the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. As a result of the National Curriculum, teachers work and plan more together.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. There has been inadequate resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Mandated textbooks are a good idea.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Most teachers integrate subjects into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A large majority agreed that the ethos of the classroom had been changed by the National Curriculum (item 41). This had strong positive correlations with items 40 (r=.537) and 42 (r=.340): with the teachers who felt required to adopt more formal teaching methods, and with the small minority who felt teaching had become just a job. An interviewee who might be identified as typical Type II-e, commented:

I could not have this flexibility and could not add to the running of the lesson. This was a tremendous struggle when the National Curriculum was introduced. It has led to a sense of loss of ownership. This situation removes aspects which the children enjoy and which I have worked well over many years in classroom. (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. 2b)

A substantial majority may have believed that teachers had been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum, but three in five still believed that most teachers integrated subjects into project work whenever they felt it was appropriate. [Evidently, there was an inverse correlation between these two items (r=-.224).] An interviewee, who showed Type III tendency, affirmed this point:
The structure is required to provide good teaching, whether whole class teaching or group teaching. In this sense, it is possible to use the government's plan as a guide - a skeleton - to which individual teachers can add. The National Curriculum suggests a more formal and rigid approach than formerly. In fact, whole class teaching is being encouraged again. However, generally, English teachers are better at group teaching than whole class teaching. But I [as an experienced teacher] can choose and manage a proper teaching method. I follow government policy but modify it where necessary. (Grp. 1, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

The National Curriculum is seen as a subject-based curriculum, encouraging teachers to use formal whole class teaching. It was clear that most teachers were in principle aware of the newly recommended ways of teaching, but when it came to the effects of these on the classroom, they claimed to make their own judgement on whether to use, for example, some group work or whole class work. This independence in practice is one of the main characteristics of Type III.

No doubt, a majority of teachers believe in a mixture of various teaching methods, sometimes whole class teaching and sometimes teaching children in groups. However, such flexibility might seem contrary to the linear nature of the National Curriculum. This could then contribute to some teachers' sense of contradiction with the National Curriculum and might be one reason why Type II-e teachers, have experienced a frustrating gap between what they believed and what they had to do in practice.

Besides teaching methods, teachers were asked whether the provision of resources was adequate for the National Curriculum. A large majority expressed the view that there had been inadequate resourcing. Some interviewees stated that their efforts to achieve the intentions of the new curriculum were being frustrated by not having enough teaching materials. In England, there are no official textbooks provided by the government. Resources are directly chosen by schools and teachers by themselves. Thus, in the sense of choosing resources, the National Curriculum certainly gives some flexibility to teachers. In this context, half the respondents had a definitely negative view of the idea of mandated textbooks, and only one in five approved of this idea. One teacher who disapproved of mandated textbooks commented as follows:

I like the National Curriculum as a guideline. It never told us how to teach or imposed mandated resources, like official textbooks. I use textbooks in some subject areas e.g. Mathematics; these are chosen by our own school. That is enough for a teacher as a good source of instruction. If the government selected a mandated textbook and teachers had to use it, professional teachers could not exist any more. (Grp. 2, Sch. A, Tch. a2)
7.2.3 Assessment

Table 19.1.4 Teachers’ Perceptions of Assessment Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37. Assessment arrangements are the most important part of the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. National assessment should rely more on teachers’ judgements.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Assessment of standards should be done by national testing.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Present arrangement for school inspection are an offence to teachers’ professional pride.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the National Curriculum, there has been a great change in the move to SATs for the evaluation of school performance and programmes, along with teachers’ more detailed record-keeping about children’s performance in school. Despite this circumstance, only one third considered that assessment arrangements were the most important part of the National Curriculum, while half definitely disagreed with this. Interestingly, as many as two out of three teachers in Group 1 thought assessment was the central thing in the National Curriculum, while only insignificant minorities in Groups 2 and 3 agreed with this. Again, Group 1 teachers were much less likely to ask for change in national assessment. Presumably, this reflects the generally higher scores of such schools in these tests.

A substantial majority agreed that national assessment should rely more on teachers judgement. Under current arrangements for assessment, the teachers felt that their professional judgements might be undermined and undervalued. One teacher pointed out some difficulties of the new arrangements:

It is very difficult to achieve an assessment cycle. New resources have to be reviewed. Teachers probably work better when not under the stress of reaching too many deadlines, for record keeping. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)
These new assessment arrangements, involving the assessment of schools and national examinations, are supplemented by a powerful and independent new Inspectorate which is intended to identify how far schools meet the National Curriculum standards, through the results of nationwide Ofsted inspections. Those who agreed that the 'present arrangements for school inspection were an offence to teachers' professional pride' strongly correlated with those who believed that the assessment arrangement should be changed \( (r = .524) \) and should rely more on teachers' judgements \( (r = .338) \). Continuous assessment by teachers appeared to be considered more valid and valuable. On the issue of the principle of national testing, there was a three-way split: broadly similar proportions favoured it, opposed it, and were uncertain about it.

There were some distinctive contrasts in the perception of assessment between Types II-e and III: Type III had a negative correlation with the item that national assessment should rely more on teachers' judgements \( (r = -.389) \), while Type II-e had a positive correlation with this \( (r = .479) \). Again, Type III seemed to value the SATs, inasmuch as they tended to disagree that the present assessment arrangements should be changed \( (r = -.314) \). Several interviewees, whose views corresponded with the features of Type III, commented on this:

Current assessment is vastly different from before. Especially, SATs have given the tools to measure the achievements in a focused, sharp way. Everything is so much clearer and more pointed now. In particular, results of Key Stage 2 SATs are the most important indicator. It can be helpful as it guides the next teacher and the parents. (Grp. 1, Sch. C, Tch. e1)

I feel that record keeping is not easy with around thirty children in one classroom. But it guides us to the way forward. SATs are a good thing to know what the children have learned. It enables teachers to pick up weaknesses of the school and children. I think the more sources I have, the better to judge children. So both sources, SATs and teachers' records, are necessary and useful to assess children more objectively. (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. e2)

Compared with other groups, a very much smaller proportion of teachers in Group 3 \( (7\%) \) believed in national testing. One interviewee in Group 3, who might be identified as Type II-e, expressed this negative view of the SATs:

The government would like to produce a blue-print for assessment. The government intended to control teachers. Teachers have to carry information in their head. League tables put pressure on teachers. People regard this as results mattering more than relevance. I found it hard to let the children know they are not
achieving enough. Sometimes, it has discouraged children from achieving their best. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

We saw earlier that nearly half of the respondents believed that standards in primary education were higher than they used to be (item 56), the other half were uncertain about this. Some interviewees linked standards to the results of SATs:

The National Curriculum has ensured that teachers have clearer objectives and targets. Within this framework, my school got above average results in SATs. In a sense, I think the standards in primary education are higher than before. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

To summarise, then: in conceptual understanding of the curriculum development and professionalism, a large majority of English teachers had a coherent tendency which corresponded with the notion of ‘extended autonomy’. However, in their interpretation of the conditions of curriculum practice, two different types of teachers were identified in the English case: some identified as Type III, felt they practised their curriculum role in the sense of ‘extended autonomy’; while others identified as Type II-e, felt pressure from the discrepancy between their aspirations to ‘extended autonomy’ and their current practices of ‘restricted autonomy’ due to the government’s intervention in curriculum development.

In reference to their perceptions about the general framework, content, pedagogy, and assessment arrangements of the National Curriculum, Table 20 summarises the data on what we may call the main type-identifying items. As we pointed out above, there are strong positive correlations between items 36, 40 and 39, and again between items 33, 49 and 44, and also strong negative correlations between the lateral pairs. Also, it seems so far that almost similar proportions of English teachers could be identified as each type of teachers; Type II-e and Type III.

| Table 20 Comparison the Responses between Type II-e and Type III (% of agreement) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| **Type II-e** | **% Agree** | **Type III** | **% Agree** |
| 36. The command-and-control approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum left no space for professional discretion. | 49 | 33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice. | 58 |
| 40. Teachers have been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum. | 69 | 49. Most teachers integrate subject into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate. | 60 |
| 39. National assessment should rely on teachers’ judgement. | 69 | 44. Assessment of standards should be done by national testing. | 40 |
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7.3 Perceptions of the Relationship between Teachers and Government

Table 21.1 shows how the teachers perceived the relationship between teachers’ professionalism and government intervention. Table 21.2 presents these results by school groups.

Table 21.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of the Relationship between Teachers and Government (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since the National Curriculum</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers’ professional relationship to government has become more collaborative since the National Curriculum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers should be civil servants.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Government curriculum agencies (eg: SCAA, QCA) have been a positive influence.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Standards in primary education are higher than they used to be.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The status of primary teachers has become lower in recent years.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The quality of primary teachers has been slipping since the government took over the curriculum.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Government supports teachers well.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET).</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Recent government interventions in teacher education have been positive on the whole.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Teachers have more power than before.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21.2 Groups’ Perceptions of the Relationship between Teachers and Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Agree</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.1 Teachers’ general relation with the government

Table 21.1.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of Their General Relationship to Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. The government gets in the way of good teaching. 117</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers’ professional relationship to government has become more collaborative since the National Curriculum.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Government curriculum agencies (eg: SCAA, QCA) have been a positive influence.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Government supports teachers well.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET).</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Recent government interventions in teacher education have been positive on the whole.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been many innovations in England in the last ten years, due to the National Curriculum and its related policies such as the recent literacy hour strategy, which have led to changes in the relationship between teachers and the government. In this circumstance, it was not surprising that only an insignificant minority disagreed that the relationship of teachers to government had changed since the National Curriculum.

The government might like to think that the introduction and development of the National Curriculum meant it now had a more collaborative relationship with teachers, but very few teachers recognized it. The teachers who thought that the relationship of teachers to government had changed tended not to agree that the relationship had become more collaborative \((r=-.435)\). The majority of interviewees also saw this changing relationship as not a collaborative one. Most described it in terms of ‘more control over teachers’:

> The government has always had an input into schools. Since 1988 the control has been more significant. (Grp. 1, Sch. A, Tch. al (H))

> The government is trying to control teachers. Remarks by the government showed no regard for teachers’ commitment. Co-operative relations? (Grp. 2, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

117 Although this item appeared in Table 15.1, I present it here because of its relation to the issue of government intervention and teachers’ professionalism.
The government tried constant interference. Teachers have become nervous of constant supervision. (Grp. 2, Sch. C, Tch. c2)

...more directions and regulations from the government...Teachers are increasingly powerless and frustrated. (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. c1)

One interviewee referred on this issue to the new government proposal of ‘performance related pay’:

‘Performance related pay’ policy is absolutely government’s control over teachers. It is very hard to assess teachers formally. It may have an opposite effect. Teachers are de-motivated, discouraged and it is even offensive to other colleagues. (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b2)

Only half as many supported recent government changes in teacher education as were critical of them, though half the respondents were uncertain. Only one third agreed with the view that the government played an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET), though another third were agnostic about this. In addition, half believed that the government got in the way of good teaching and less than a quarter disagreed with this. Most striking of all, there was virtually no agreement that the government supported teachers well, and three quarters were definite that it did not. These results indicated that the teachers did not seem to regard government support as coping successfully with the demands of the new curriculum and professional development. Furthermore, a substantial majority did not feel that the government supported teachers well.

As could be expected, there were strong positive correlations among the following three items: 59 and 60 (r=.527), 60 and 61 (r=.409), 59 and 61 (r=.482). That is to say, the tiny number who felt well supported by the government tended to be among the somewhat largest minorities who approved of government interventions to teacher education and the government role in INSET. This last item turned out, also, to be another type-divider. Type II-e had a negative view of the government’s role in INSET (60: r=-.387), while Type III

Government planned to modernise the teaching profession include higher salaries. The Green Paper (DfEE, 1998c) outlined plans for 'super teachers' to get an increase of 10%, and to be selected according to the teachers' performance dependent on raising their pupils' standards.
had a positive view of this (60: r=.594).

Table 21.1.2 Teachers’ Perceptions of Their Status and Power Relation to Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers cannot be a professionals if the government tells them what to teach.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers should be civil servants.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The status of primary teachers has become lower in recent years.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The quality of primary teachers has been slipping since the government took over the curriculum</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Teachers have more power than before.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Large majorities believed that the status of primary teachers had become lower in recent years, and disagreed that teachers had more power than before. However, two thirds did not take the view that the quality of primary teachers had declined since the government took over the curriculum. The more critical judgement was highly positively linked to the belief that teachers could not be professional if the government told them what to teach (r=.414); only one third agreed with this statement, though. These results supported the earlier finding that English teachers’ perceptions of professionalism were related to their understanding of their ‘autonomous role’.

Critique of government might be reinforced by the policy of ‘performance related payment’, concerning which teachers felt more pressure from the government and that their status had been undermined and undervalued. One interviewee referred this situation to low teacher morale, especially linked to press images of teachers, Ofsted and parliamentary comments. Also, she pointed to the subsequent effect on the respect of parents for teachers, and felt that the status of teachers was too low.

In this general critical climate, it was not surprising that no one at all reacted positively to seeing teachers as civil servants. One interviewee gave his opinion:

Although this item appeared in Table 15.1, I discuss it here because of its relation to the issue of government intervention and teachers’ professionalism.

‘English teachers are technically employed by the LEA’s or schools, but the employer’s functions are almost totally delegated to the governing body of those schools with delegated budgets’ (Gold and Szemerenyi, 1997).
The government has tried to rush everything through, making each change legal without adequate preparation or consideration. The government intends to control everything that is imposed on us, teaching and payment. What else is left for us? Are we civil servants in the bad sense? (Grp. 3, Sch. C, Tch. cl)

7.3.2 Influences on teachers’ curriculum practice

Actual influences

Participants were asked how much in fact they considered each of the following when they made decisions on curriculum and pedagogy. Table 22.1 presents the items in the order from the most supported item to the least. Table 22.2 presents these results by school groups.

Table 22.1 Teachers’ Perceptions of the Actual Influences on Curriculum Development: in Rank Order of Significance (N=45)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Very important</th>
<th>% Not important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67. School policies (eg: School Development Plan)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Characteristics of pupils</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Requirement of the Inspectorate</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Your own beliefs and conception</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Previous educational experiences</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. LEA policies</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. School governors’ policies</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Views of parents</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Government policies and advice</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The interrelationship of different subject matters</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Preparation for standardized tests</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Textbooks requirements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22.2 Groups’ Perceptions of the Actual Influences on Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Very important</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Table 22.1 shows, there were few disagreements among respondents as to what affected teachers' decisions. The influence of 'textbook requirements' was felt by only one in five respondents. Obviously, this result was connected with the fact that, unlike Korea, teachers in England did not have mandated textbooks. Textbooks of some kind are quite generally used, but teachers do not feel compelled to adopt any particular textbooks. The general rule probably remains that selecting textbooks is up to each individual school within the restrictions of funds for doing so (Beauchamp and Beauchamp, 1972).

It is significant that so many thought that school policies were immediate and direct influences. Although there is no government legislation which requires schools to have a development plan, in recent years advice that all schools should have such a plan has been issued centrally. It has emerged that 98% of schools had a 'School Development Plan' in 1995 (MacGilchrist et al., 1995) and respondents would certainly have had these in mind. It was interesting to note how widely they were agreed to have a strong influence on decision-making in curriculum and pedagogy. One headteacher commented on this point:

The 1988 Education Reform Act made considerable changes to the management of school, the local management of schools (LMS). LMS has given schools all kinds of tasks. The main things are curriculum management and financial management based on the government policy. So, practically, school policies are the main sources for curriculum development. (Grp. 3, Sch. A, Tch. a1 (H))

Around half of the respondents believed that parents and school governors' policies could have an important influence on what was taught in school. However, according to the interviewees, the curriculum role of parents was not clear. Indeed, none of them mentioned an important role for parents in curriculum development; only their supporting role for their children was stressed.

About half perceived LEA policies (58%), and government policies and advice (49%) as also having serious influence, but these had less perceived influence than characteristics of pupils (64%), their own beliefs and experiences (60%) and previous educational experiences (60%). It would appear from this that teachers still had some flexibility when they developed the curriculum, and valued their own judgement.

Less than half believed that the interrelationship of different subject matters (40%) influenced teachers' decisions. According to Mortimore et al. (1998), English teachers have shown a clear tendency to favour some subject integration. Even though the
proportion supporting it was smaller than other items, this result showed some difference in teachers' attitudes toward subject areas from the National Curriculum, which has a 'traditional' structure based on subjects. It was notable that a substantial majority considered that the requirements of the Inspectorate (60%) exerted some influence. As I highlighted in an earlier section, since the National Curriculum, teachers have been obliged to conform to government regulations, and the influence of the Inspectorate had been strong. As we might have expected, Type II-e tended to respond positively on the strength of the influence of government (r=.260), but also of school policies (r=.458), Type III did not show any particular correlated items, though.

**Ideal influences**

Participants were asked how important *ideally* they considered each of the influences listed in Table 23.1 should be in determining the curriculum. Table 23.2 presents these results by school groups.

**Table 23.1 Teachers' Perceptions of the Ideal Influences on Curriculum Development:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Very important</th>
<th>% Not important</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80. The Teacher</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. The Pupils</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. The Headteacher</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. LEA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Parents</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. School Governors</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Government</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. The Inspectorates</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 23.2 Groups' Perceptions of the Ideal Influences on Curriculum Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Very important</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>% Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Teachers and pupils received the largest measures of support as ideal influences on curriculum development, with the headteacher not far before. Around half thought the LEA, and parents should be an influence, and 40% supported the influence of governors. By contrast, the claims of the government and the Inspectorates were poorly supported, though large numbers of respondents stayed neutral on both of them. There was a strong inverse tendency between those who named the teachers and the government, as ideal influences on curriculum development ($r = -.357$) and Type II-e had a strong negative correlation with the government as an ideal influence ($r = -.347$).

The large majority who saw pupils as deserving an important influence on the content of the curriculum and how it was taught might reflect the child-centred philosophy of primary education. In connection with the half of respondents who felt that parents should have an important influence on what was taught in school, since the 1986 Act the governors have had to produce an annual written report on the school’s performance, together with a summary of what the governing body had done since the last report. Compared with Group 2 (54%) and Group 3 (27%), a much larger proportion of Group 1 (80%) believed that parents should have some influence on the curriculum. Similarly, a larger proportion of teachers in Group 1 (67%) were agreed that school governors should have some influence on the curriculum. This result confirms that, as we have seen from earlier data, teachers in Group 1 were more in favour of government policy than any other group.

Two comparisons between actual and ideal influences

Table 24 Comparisons of the Teachers’ Perceptions of Actual and Ideal Influences (% selecting as very important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Actual influences</th>
<th>Ideal influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inspectorates</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teacher</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents as a whole can be said to have believed that the government and the Inspectorates had too much influences, and teachers too little influence in curriculum development. Overall, it emerged clearly that the teachers wished the government and the Inspectorates to have less influence on what was taught in schools; they felt more under
government control than they desired. The data also underscored the current influence of the Inspectorates and the teachers’ feelings about this. These results also point to the impact on their views of the history of teachers’ flexibility in curriculum development in a decentralized system. The teachers showed reluctance to let the government limit their flexibility in serious ways, and almost all respondents believed that teachers should be large influences on curriculum.

7.4 Case Study

The school was selected to provide examples of typical practice in curriculum development and professionalism. The classroom observation visits for the case study took place in the first and second half of the spring term, 1999. One each of six classrooms, from Year one to Year six, was observed during half a day. Among other things, in this case study, I shall describe further in a more specific context Types II-e and III teachers.

7.4.1 The school

This school was established in 1886. It is situated in a largely residential area, which is a mixture of owner-occupied and council maintained property. It caters for children in the four to eleven years age group. In the academic year 1998-1999, there are 398 children on the school roll with 60 in the Reception Year. A small number come from ethnic minority backgrounds. Only 14 pupils do not have English as their first language. The pupils represent a broad mix, with a significant number coming from professional and semi-professional families. About 15% of the pupils are entitled to free school lunches, which is about the national average. About 14% of the pupils are on the special educational needs register and 7 have statements of special educational need (School Prospectus: 1998/1999, 1998b).

There are six classrooms and a hall in the Infant building for the children from Reception to Year Two, and eight classrooms and a hall in the Junior building for the children from Year Three to Year Six. The class sizes are 30 or below. The school kitchen is located in the Junior building and all children eat either a cooked meal or packed lunch in the Junior hall. The school has a wide range of modern books and teaching equipment.
Computers are used throughout the school and each class has its own computer system. This is a valuable teaching and learning aid. There is a well-stocked library in the infant department. A resources area has been developed. The junior department is well resourced with library books (ibid.).

There are 20 staff members including a headteacher, a deputy headteacher, classroom teachers, an office manager, a clerical/welfare assistant, a school welfare assistant and a school keeper. There are 14 classes, 2 of each grade including reception classes. 10 out of 14 of the teaching staff are women. In addition to class teachers, the school employs a specialist teacher for pupils with special education needs. Peripatetic music teachers also visit the school on a weekly basis and pupils in Key Stage 1 benefit from tennis coaching. The main criterion for registration groups in this school is that of a homogeneous age-cohort/year-group.

7.4.2 The school-based curriculum and teachers’ responsibilities

Who has the major responsibility for school-based curriculum development?

The headteacher explained how she managed school-based curriculum development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hadteacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex/ age female/ 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching experience 35 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to 1988, we had more freedom to choose work plans. But, I think the National Curriculum, especially the literacy hour, is really good for the children. I tried to lead and follow the scheme of work in the National Curriculum. In the beginning, I chose a certain format for it, which was one of the resources recommended by LEA, since the ‘Strategy of the Literacy Hour’ distributed by the government seemed so difficult to me. Now, my staff develop our own school literacy hour format and are more confident with it. I think my staff are accustomed to managing the curriculum...I personally think that a professional teacher is a person who has an interest in individual children. Also, they should plan lessons with materials well, and be actively involved in making them...The headteacher, deputy headteacher and curriculum co-ordinators have formal role in this curriculum decision-making. All teaching staff in my school are actively involved in curriculum development, since every classroom teacher is in charge of considering at least one subject or coordinating one Year group.
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The headteacher's comments clearly indicated that the school curriculum was developed by staff within the National Curriculum, and the headteacher's role was to steer the whole curriculum plan. She thought that the literacy hour was too detailed and seemed to be obligatory for her (though it was not statutory at that time). However, she also considered it as a good framework. She encouraged the staff to involve themselves in the process of the school-based curriculum development actively. When she implemented the literacy hour plan, she developed the school's own format based on the governmental guidelines. She was a typical Type III, favouring the system of the National Curriculum and believing in teachers' autonomous role in curriculum development. She encouraged teachers to be involved in it actively. And she was well accustomed to doing curriculum development in her own way.

Although more responsible than ordinary classroom teachers for following the National Curriculum, as required by higher authorities, she as a headteacher had not on the whole defined, structured and characterised the school-based curriculum. There was probably an equal opportunity for teachers to input their opinions through the curriculum co-ordinating group. No teachers found themselves cut off from the curriculum decision-making process. It might be said that, in a very co-operative atmosphere, all staff contributed to the process of curriculum development.

What is the structure of the school-based curriculum?

The school aims to 'provide a broad, balanced curriculum providing intellectual, physical, aesthetic, spiritual and moral education for each child'. In the 'School Development Plan: 1998/1999' (1998a), the school's aim was indicated as follows:

The knowledge and skills acquired will be relevant to the children's needs and help them to develop independence. Where children require additional support this is available and the Special Educational Needs support teacher works closely with the class teachers to draw up and implement programmes of work.

The content of the curriculum in this school was made up of the foundation subjects, three core and six other foundation subjects, which were laid down by law. Besides these subjects, it also catered for other areas such as Health Education, including Sex Education, Multicultural Education and Personal and Social Education. This school had interpreted the National Curriculum as a 'subject-based curriculum with work based on themes or topics':

The National Curriculum is delivered by way of themes or topics, carefully chosen to meet the legal requirements. These topics are supported by separate subject teaching (School Development Plan: 1998/1999, 1998a).
The School Development Plan was divided into six parts: curriculum planning, government initiatives, curriculum policies, curriculum development, management and staffing, and other areas for development. In every part, leading staff were indicated and there was a strategy for review and forward planning. The 'curriculum development' section was divided according to foundation subjects, including financial allocation. Unlike Korea, there was no section about administrative duties. The 'other areas for development' section included parental involvement, accommodation and resources, staff development, and standards of achievement.

Separate 'Schemes of Work' for each foundation subject had been adopted and developed to ensure complete coverage and continuity across the key stages as well as a record of work covered. The subject-bounded characteristics of the National Curriculum were reflected in the format of the school curriculum. The Scheme of Work itself did not seem to have very detailed contents and pedagogy. It had guidelines for a set period of terms in one academic year.

Long term planning was addressed firstly in the school overview. It ensured that all aspects of the subjects were covered and related to the resources in the school. Yearly overviews gave more detail, and explained which aspects of each attainment target or area should be covered with a particular Year group. Each overview comprised a focus on aspects which were likely to be an introduction to a new idea or theme, and ongoing aspects which ensured that previously covered work was not forgotten or neglected. As the basis for medium and short term planning, each subject was provided with some detail of the work to be covered. However, only the titles of block units were indicated in the long term and medium term plans. The overview also contained a plan based on block units in which some contents were described. The block unit-based plan had four parts: learning objectives, possible assessment opportunities, contents and resources. Each plan for a block unit had one or two pages. Based on the Scheme of Work, individual teachers made weekly-based plans for their own classrooms; these have to be submitted to, and confirmed, by the headteacher.

Compared with school-based curriculum documents in Korea, the English documentation is simple and less detailed. In Korea it was not only more detailed in contents and pedagogy, but also had more sections, such as a summary of the headteacher's
educational philosophy, and the organizational principles of the school curriculum. In addition, 'the curriculum' section contained the time allotment, the yearly timetable, a monthly educational plan for each grade and subject, and a school discretionary time plan. This section included very specific curriculum implementation and organization plans. In fact, the school-based curriculum plan in Korea specified in detail instructional plans for the subject matter, although there were official textbooks which contained very detailed single-subject contents.

What is the process for developing the school-wide curriculum?

The headteacher and deputy defined areas and agenda items in the School Development Plan, a plan which provided clear direction for school-based curriculum development. For curriculum development, the headteacher, deputy headteacher and subject co-ordinators who were the leading staff, as a first step for developing the school-based curriculum, reviewed the plan from the previous academic year under the following categories:

a) the schemes of work which are established and successful;
b) standard of teaching improved;
c) coverage of programmes of study in the National Curriculum achieved;
d) time allocations for all subjects in line with national expectation.

The main issue for this academic year was the literacy hour and the expected numeracy hour. The School Development Plan for 1998-1999 indicated that the introduction of the literacy hour in autumn 1998 and the numeracy hour in autumn 1999 would necessitate a curriculum review. This school planned to carry this out in the summer term 1999. One staff member took the lead, sometimes with an assistant, as a curriculum co-ordinator for every foundation subject. The main tasks of the curriculum co-ordinator were to review previous plans, work out success criteria, set targets and define resource requirements.

Two class teachers, who perhaps represent the views of our two types of teachers, commented on how they perceived this process of curriculum development. Although their
perceptions of their own roles were slightly different from each other, they did not show any particular significant difference in their practice of curriculum development, unlike in Korea where some teachers were involved in the process actively, while others were indifferent to the process of curriculum development.

**Teacher A**

sex/ age female/ 41  
teaching experience 18 years  
position Year Two class teacher

For this year, it was a lot easier than before. When we had to set out every single detail of the school-based curriculum in the beginning year of the National Curriculum, it took much energy and time. Now, all we have to do is reviewing and amending. For the literacy hour as a new policy, I think, we followed the same tracks which we did before to implement the National Curriculum. Although we are very much accustomed with the situation with the national guidelines through ten years, teachers’ professionalism is getting worse. In particular, at present, we are faced with even more demanding work, with more detailed contents and methodology. It demands really a lot of work from teachers, but reduces autonomy from teachers.

She seemed to be unhappy following the process of planning based on the National Curriculum. Though valued as a major decision-maker and contributor to the whole process, she seemed to have a sceptical attitude about dealing with the new situation. She might be identified as similar to teachers in Type II-e.

**Teacher B**

sex/ age male/ 39  
teaching experience 14 years  
position Year Six class teacher

In my school, all teachers have some responsibilities in curriculum development. Sometimes, I feel, I do not have enough time to manage my role as a curriculum co-ordinator for English and History. But I believe that teachers must know what is going on the National Curriculum and we should be involved in it as main contributors. I am an important decision-maker, in my subjects, although I have to be confirmed by the headteacher. Discussion and debate offer the opportunity to develop and consider how English or History may be represented and interpreted.
When he commented on his significant role in curriculum development, he seemed to believe in teachers' autonomous role in curriculum development, and that he practised it. He might be an example of Type III. There was no stated gap between his perception and practice in terms of his role in curriculum development, which he saw as having extended autonomy.

*What are the roles and responsibilities of teachers?*

Every teacher in this school identified an aspect of curriculum co-ordination for which they had a particular responsibility. The school had assigned named curriculum responsibility to all individual teachers. Compared with Korean schools, usually, the size of schools in England was smaller, with fewer children and staff. In this circumstance, the English teachers could hardly avoid having some responsibilities as, at least, co-ordinators for one subject. By contrast, in the Korean primary school, only selected staff, usually senior staff, could be actively involved in school-based curriculum development. On the other hand, all Korean teachers were assigned some administrative duties, which was not the case in the English counterpart.

The *School Development Plan: 1998/1999* (1998a) described the job of curriculum co-ordinators as follows:

> The job's purpose is to lead school improvement by monitoring, developing, co-ordinating and evaluating the subject or aspect for which the post holder has responsibility.

In particular, it emphasized that the curriculum co-ordinator should support colleagues in planning and implementing work in that area within the school. In other words, they were supposed to work closely with colleagues and to offer 'co-ordinator' support to ensure that the teaching of agreed policies in the subject or aspects was implemented and improved.

The school’s last Inspection Report (1997a) had commented on the situation of curriculum development and remarked that there was not sufficient non-contact time to deal with this work effectively:

> The school is aware of the need to improve this aspect of its work at all levels.
Curriculum co-ordinators do not have sufficient non-contact time to work alongside their colleagues. In some subjects, co-ordinators are not aware of work related to their subject in other areas of the school. The headteacher monitors teachers’ planning, but should spend more time in classroom to effectively monitor teaching and attainment.

Since then, the school has tried to allow more time to monitor, evaluate, and support curriculum development.

7.4.3 Teacher’s curriculum practice and professionalism in the classroom

**What do teachers do in school?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The overall routine in this school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sex/ age</strong> female/ 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>teaching experience</strong> 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>position</strong> Year Two class teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am a class teacher in a primary school in the London area. I’ve been teaching for over 18 years. I am in charge of Year Two, 28 children aged seven years. In my school, the staff meetings are weekly and most of the issues are related to curriculum development. The agenda timetable of staff meetings for the spring term in 1999 is as follows:

- **11.1.99 Singing**
- **18.1.99 Writing across the curriculum**
- **25.1.99 Literacy-word level**
- **1.2.99 Target setting - how to achieve the target set for the Year group**
- **8.2.99 No formal meeting - parents’ meeting**
- **22.2.99 INSET Closure: guiding reading - guest speaker**
  - Review morning and relate to school practice
  - Review literacy hour to date
- **1.3.99 Target setting - Year group**
- **8.3.99 Curriculum working group - Art and Geography**
- **15.3.99 Curriculum working group - P.E. and Music**
- **22.3.99 No formal meeting**
One day's life

Wednesday, 12th February, 1999

08:00 Arrive at school
08:30 Coffee at the staff room
08:40 Supervising children at playground
   The children line up ready for me to collect them
08:55 Meet children off playground/ Registration
   Children start work
   Review and full test for Maths
10:10 Assembly
10:35 Morning break: children set their chairs and go out
   Wait till all children are out before leaving classroom
   Coffee is available at the staff room
10:50 Collect children from playground
   Literacy hour
12:00 Supervise children for school dinner
   Have a lunch at the staff room
13:00 Children are sent in from playground
   Call register
   Children start work
   Science
14:15 Afternoon break
14:30 Collect children from playground
   Children change shoes and go to playground for outdoor games
15:30 Return to class
   Tidy class, stack chairs or put them on table
   Children go home
15:30 Prepare tomorrow's lessons
16:00 Leave work and drive home
   Sometimes, stay at school to prepare tomorrow's work

This teacher dedicated the majority of her time to teaching in the classroom. She had weekly curriculum-related meetings, as well as non-pupil days for INSET. The time for the meetings which relate to the curriculum was about one hour per week. After the end of the afternoon session, she did not have any obligation to stay in school. However, sometimes, she prepared some material for teaching after school, but she did not have any school welfare or administrative work as Korean teachers did. In other words, besides teaching and some curriculum-related responsibilities such as being curriculum co-ordinator, she did not have any activity directly relating to duties and administration. The weekly curriculum-related meeting might reflect an important feature of teachers' curriculum practice in classrooms. She prepared formally written weekly lesson plans which she was obliged to submit to the headteacher. She said that this routine seemed to leave her without enough time to prepare lessons properly.
How do teachers practise the National Curriculum in the classroom?

Planning in the classroom

From the autumn term of 1998, the school has had a literacy hour and a Maths lesson in the morning session for all Year groups. Since this school expected that there would be prescriptions about how the daily Maths lesson should be taught, as in the case of the literacy hour, the teachers prepared and started to practise for the numeracy hour in the current term. Usually teachers decided their own class timetable for the afternoon according to the time requirements which were recommended by the National Curriculum. In this respect, compared with Korean teachers, English teachers were given more flexibility to control their own working time during the day.

Teachers did not usually have daily-based plans for individual lessons, whereas officially they had long term, medium term and weekly-based plans. When I asked one teacher to show me her day’s plan for an individual lesson, she said that “it is in my head”. As she indicated, most teachers did not have a specific daily plan, except some notes and the resources they had prepared. In this respect, I noticed no sharp division between teachers. English teachers seemed to have less paperwork than their Korean counterparts, who must submit daily plans to the headteacher.

Despite the implication of a centralized approach in the National Curriculum, this school-based curriculum was developed by teachers in their own ways; in most teacher planning, the coverage of National Curriculum subjects predominated, though. The comments of the Inspection Report (1997) about the curriculum in this school reflected this situation:

The curriculum is broad and balanced. There is a successful blend of areas of learning for children under five with level 1 of the National Curriculum in the Reception classes. In Key Stages 1 and 2, the work planned meets the requirements of the National Curriculum in all subjects, except information technology. A recent revision of schemes of work in most subjects is effectively underpinning learning. There is a range of extra-curricular activities, which enhance learning opportunities for the pupils.

The school’s curriculum documentation prioritised a broad and balanced curriculum, and in practice this limited the space into which class teachers could fit their own
classroom activities. The teachers prioritised factual subject knowledge in the literacy hour. Interestingly, morning lessons appeared to be very similar from class to class, which no one could imagine before the National Curriculum. The literacy hour and Maths in the policy of this school required the same contents and teaching methodology for each class in the same Year group.

- Implementing contents and pedagogy in the classroom

Observation 1

Teacher A (Type II-e?)

*subject* Literacy hour
*pupil's* Year Year Two
*class size* 27 pupils
*observation time One whole session (70 minutes)*

In the literacy hour, fifteen minutes of whole-class reading and writing is followed by fifteen-minutes of work on words or sentences, followed by twenty-minutes when the class was split into groups for independent activities, followed by ten-minutes of whole-class review of the work covered in the lesson.

The class was then divided into five groups which consisted of two more able groups, two average group and one less able group. Definitely, for literacy hour she did not permit the children total freedom of choice. She determined where the children sat according to their reading ability. This group setting based on the children’s ability was one of the teaching methods for effective learning which were suggested in the literacy hour strategy.

During the first fifteen-minutes, children were sitting together in front of the teacher on a carpet area and listening to what the teacher said. Although she generally encouraged children to react and respond, she mostly used formal methods and whole-class teaching at this time. For the twenty-minute group session, she mainly concentrated on a particular group and spent more time with them (later, she explained that she devoted herself to one group for effective learning in one day, in turn). Although she considered the issue of equal opportunity for each group, she could not have enough time to respond to each ability group on the same day. Generally, the lesson was targeted to the average ability groups.

She had a firm grasp of the National Curriculum 'Programmes of Study' for the literacy hour. The literacy hour, which required subject-based contents and structured teaching methodology, seemed to leave her with no alternatives. In this respect, she complained about her practice in restricted autonomy (Type II-e).

This classroom observation clearly demonstrated how the classroom situation has been changed dramatically. In particular, the literacy hour has had a great impact on the teachers’ curriculum practice and classroom orientation, promoting a subject-based approach. It was predominantly delivered by her using formal and direct authoritarian methods.
Observation 2

Teacher B (Type III?)

*subject* Geography
*pupil's Year* Year Six
*class size* 29 pupils
*observation time* One whole session (70 minutes)

The teacher encouraged children to present their own project-based work, on 'rivers in the world', which was prepared at home. After several children's presentations, he started the lesson with whole-class directed teaching, and then ordered the children to do some work sheets. Sometimes, he was working with one particular group in turn, while the other groups were working by themselves. Finally, he finished the lesson with whole-class teaching.

Although he was required to keep to the subject contents and time allocations of the National Curriculum, he had some flexibility concerning contents and ways of teaching in the classroom. He also stated that he always considered integration, and tried to integrate some subject contents. He could manage the National Curriculum in his own way, as he felt that this was necessary. In this regard, he commented about his lesson:

"It is necessary for me to convey some facts, offer children's views and show possible ways of performing some aspects of Geography. This not only develops their understanding of Geography but also allows them to create their own concepts, explanations and methods. As a teacher, I need to convey facts, sharing knowledge, and discuss with children. Furthermore, their own project work which was done at home offers children the opportunity to consider and develop an image of the rivers in the world. In this circumstance, some guidelines in the National Curriculum give me a clear sense. Besides, what I do is the same as what I did before."

He clearly understood the intentions of the National Curriculum as providing some kind of guidelines to enhance his professionalism and implemented it in his own autonomous way. He might be identified as Type III.

- Implementing assessment in the classroom

I was unable to observe any assessment-related activities directly, apart from teachers' concerns with assessment in the literacy hour and Maths lessons which were closely linked to the SATs. However, it was possible to figure out broadly the changing pattern of practice that seemed to characterise the National Curriculum as 'assessment driven'. This clearly appeared when the headteacher mentioned her strategies to prepare for SATs in May, 1999:
Headteacher

For this time, I plan to employ an assistant teacher who can help pupils to achieve good results in the SATs.

On the same issue, teacher A (Type II-e?) and teacher B (Type III?) explained how they considered and prepared for the SATs:

Teacher A

In the past, over a period of time, I observed children as they were engaged in a variety of activities in the classroom. The children were divided into groups based on their interests or their friendships and involved in different activities which focused on their own needs. I talked to the children about their work and noted how well they could use a range of skills. For example, having learnt how to use a context page as part an English activity. I noted if the children were able to do so again as part of a Science lesson. However, now, the situation is completely different. In my class, I set the children into five ability groups for English and Maths. I think this approach leads to focused directed teaching and accelerates the pace of learning. I feel that the teaching changed in response to assessment requirements. Observation of ability groups in classrooms stood out as the major area of changing practice in assessment. This situation makes assessment practice more formalised than before.

Teacher B

In the beginning of a new term, I usually overview 'the attainment target' in the National Curriculum which was also redefined in our school-based curriculum. I set several targets according to the ability of children in my class. I use these targets not only to teach children but also to assess them. The children are assessed termly on their understanding of the current theme or topic and examples of their written work. Differentiation should ensure appropriate learning experiences for all children. This may be achieved through differentiated provision of outcomes. I allow each child the chance to reach their full potential... You see, this is the last year's sheets of SATs. I let pupils practise these sheets and another working paper to prepare for the test. Besides that, I look for evidence of specific skills and knowledge in each child. I am able to give levels which indicate each child’s attainment in speaking and listening, reading, writing, Maths and Science.

This school published a clear summary of its results in the SATs in the School Prospectus: 1998/1999 (1998b). Moreover, the following extracts from the Inspection Report (1997a) and a letter to parents refer to the SATs results and show how the school...
was concerned about assessment:

The statutory assessment showed that the levels of attainment were broadly average at the end of both key stages. However, the number of pupils attaining higher levels was below the national average at seven and eleven. A similar pattern was found this year. However, there was clear evidence of sound progress throughout the key stages and skills and knowledge were systematically developed (Inspection Report, 1997a).

we take pride in our achievement. The Ofsted report has also acknowledged our good attainment...High standards can only be achieved when parents work in true partnership with the school and support their children's class teacher in achieving the target set out. I would like to take this opportunity of thanking you for your continuous support (School Letter, 1997b).

7.5 Summary and Conclusion

7.5.1 Summary

English teachers mainly understood and supported the idea of a fundamental professional role for teachers in designing and developing the curriculum as taught to children. The majority believed that teachers themselves should have immediate and direct influence on what is taught. In that sense, they supported the notion of professionalism as requiring 'extended autonomy'. They understood professionalism as something shown in their own competence and in an attitude of strong commitment to their role - so, responsibility as well as autonomy - yet most teachers felt more professional when they could decide and manage what should be taught and how in classrooms. Of course, this did not stop them from agreeing that the professional teacher would be an effective implementer of the National Curriculum.

In practice, although the teachers were wary of the National Curriculum as reducing a sense of professionalism, they implemented the curriculum in their own ways with some flexibility. They thought the National Curriculum had the support of teachers in its general principles. But they also appeared to continue to keep their role as authorities over the curriculum. Half of them thought that their relationship with the government was less collaborative since the new curriculum. They generally felt that influences from school policies affected the teachers' decisions strongly. Generally, they had considerable confidence about their knowledge and skills in curriculum development. Evidently, they
believed that teachers should be essentially members of a learning society.

This study had exposed that the introduction of the National Curriculum influenced the whole style of curriculum development and had a significant impact on English teachers' perceptions of their professional responsibilities in curriculum practice. One of the attempts of the government to control the curriculum was concerned with the assessment of children on the basis of skills. Most of all, teachers were under pressure to adopt more detailed predetermined curriculum practices and to be monitored by the results of the SATs. Some believed that this governmental intervention to some extent had correlated positively with teachers' professionalism. They perceived that, in particular, as far as the different environments of every individual school were concerned. Teachers who had been working at more middle-class schools were especially likely to have more positive views about governmental intervention.

Some inconsistency between the ideal of school-based curriculum and what happened in practice was noted around the issues of curriculum contents and teaching methods in the new literacy hour, whilst there was notable flexibility in teachers' practices in other subject areas. Of course, teachers predominantly prepared their curriculum documentation according to the National Curriculum, but there were two different patterns of this in actual practice. These corresponded to different tendencies of control as perceived by teachers according to their attempts to operate with different pedagogic practices. The first pattern seemed to be the strong governmental intervention provided by the new literacy hour strategy. The teachers' curriculum practice for this, which had more detailed contents and pedagogy, was predominantly more formal and organized. In the case study, teachers' classroom practice had been changed significantly since the literacy hour had been introduced. The actual content of the curriculum planned and delivered by teachers remained constant across all classrooms in the same Year group. The teachers in the study resented this. Indeed, most stated that the literacy hour left teachers with little or no sense of professionalism, since it imposed not only a sequence of content but also classroom activities, as in the Korean curriculum. They believed that more formal teaching styles were being enforced.

The second pattern was the lesser degree of governmental intervention with reference to teaching methods of other subjects, in which practice was more flexible and according
to the teachers' own judgement. In this respect, the National Curriculum could be interpreted as a set of national criteria regulated by the government, which teachers must use to guide their practice but which leave them with considerable flexibility and autonomy. Teachers generally 'look for' this interpretation because it left them free to develop materials, methods and approaches that suit their children.

Two types of teachers were identified: Types II-e and III. Unlike the Korean case, teachers were generally consistent in their conceptual understanding of teachers professionalism in curriculum development: that it corresponds with the notion of 'extended autonomy'. However, there was disagreement and two distinctive tendencies in perceptions of their current conditions of practice. With English teachers, therefore, the significant differences were ones of interpretation and 'reading' of an ambiguous situation, rather than of conception of curriculum development and professionalism. But this perception of two different degrees of curriculum control appeared to influence their practice in classrooms.

The first group of teachers, Type II-e, perceived the National Curriculum as a kind of control device to diminish teachers' autonomy and professionalism (item 36). They felt some significant degree of discrepancy between their understanding of their professional role and their practices; that is 'extended autonomy' versus 'restricted autonomy'. In any case, for Type II-e, the government's relation with teachers in the National Curriculum more generally was seen as 'power over' (item 52).

Type III teachers' conceptions of their professional role in curriculum development also corresponded with the notion of 'extended autonomy'. But, they regarded the National Curriculum (possibly excepting the new literacy hour) as on the whole a good framework for teachers, which they felt free and able to implement in their own ways and creatively (items 33, 49). They may have been generally more positive about government interventions, more inclined to see them as supporting and collaborative (items 53, 60, 61).

Roughly, similar proportions of teachers were identified as Types II-e and III in the English case. Table 25 shows a summary of English teachers' perceptions of the issues about curriculum development and professionalism (in somewhat oversimplified terms):
7.5.2 Conclusion

The data from questionnaires, interviews and the case study showed clear evidence that some English teachers were in a very creative phase of development in the implementation of the National Curriculum, as teachers' growing confidence and knowledge allowed them to mediate external requirements to more professionally acceptable practice. Based on this finding, I will discuss the following issues which appeared to influence English teachers' perceptions of their curriculum practice in relation to government intervention: a) the tradition of teachers' curriculum ownership and b) the assessment-driven curriculum.
Firstly, the dominant description of the system of curriculum control in England has been that the curriculum is the concern of teachers. This tradition is likely to be responsible for teachers' flexibility in implementing the National Curriculum. In the English school system, the system had been decentralized, and there were very little government intervention in the curriculum in the period before the 1988 Education Act. In this circumstance, the English primary teachers' understanding of the curriculum has been of an annual school plan or a personalized scheme of work for their own classroom. A decisive break with this idea of minimal external control had been made with the introduction of the National Curriculum, but my research subjects still predominantly understood the curriculum as requiring that teachers should plan for teaching in their own ways dependent on the classroom situation. This tradition ensures that teachers are still aware of the importance of curriculum autonomy on the part of the teachers.

In itself, this tradition had the capacity to expand to include some central direction and some form of National Curriculum. Pollard et al. (1994: 20) summarized these perceptions of English teachers as follows:

Teachers have by no means been opposed to the introduction of the National Curriculum. They supported it in principle and they supported forms of assessment that directly contributed towards pupil learning. Indeed, in some respects curricular and assessment innovations enhanced teacher professionalism by focusing, structuring and developing expertise and by developing teacher collaboration. Some important forms of teacher judgement, the quintessential characteristic of professional practice, may well have been enhanced. On the other hand, the gradually tightening specification of teacher roles and systems of accountability, many of which were deemed by teachers to be inappropriate and counterproductive, were a constant and undermining source of frustration, insult and, potentially, deskilling.

We have seen, however, significantly different readings of this in practice among teachers in my study.

Secondly, the main purpose of the National Curriculum was to raise standards through regular assessment of children's knowledge and skills. This pattern controls teachers directly with reference to the results of SATs rather than the organization of content and pedagogy, though the introduction of the literacy hour complicates the picture. In this circumstance, there is a large amount of discretion for teachers in deciding when and how to follow the curriculum. On the other hand, since the national assessment is
compulsory, allowing for nation-wide comparisons in the form of league tables available to the public, individual teachers experience much pressure in their implementation of the new curriculum from their concerns about assessment. Assessment-driven curriculum not only influences teachers' flexibility in curriculum practice but also puts more pressure on them to be accountable: it allows teachers to use their alternative practices in classroom, but in order to fulfill assessment requirements. The teachers, who used to have a very high degree of autonomy from outside influences, are under pressure now that they are monitored by the results of the SATs.

Flexibility is reinforced by the fact that, traditionally, English teachers have not been obliged to work with prescribed textbooks and curriculum resources. Even under the current National Curriculum, the specification of the content and process of teaching is weak, 122 in contrast to the strong emphasis on assessment. In this respect, the National Curriculum leaves teachers with considerable flexibility. Overall, under the National Curriculum, English teachers have continued to feel free to develop materials, methods and approaches that support their children's achievement.

Accountability pressure is reinforced by the inspection system. The old English Inspectorate, i.e. HMI, operated compatibly with the traditional decentralized structure of the English system. Unlike Korea, it was not incorporated into the government, but collected facts and information about the overall performance of the school system and reported on them to the government (Brighouse and Moon eds., 1995). However, since the National Curriculum, the issue for the new Inspectorate, i.e. Ofsted, has been less 'what was actually happening' in schools, and more to inform the public about the schools' achievement, 'the educational standards achieved', 'the financial resources availability', and 'the quality of the education provided' (DFE, 1992b). Its main function is now to evaluate the overall performance of the whole school and make the outcome available for public judgement and choice (see Chapter 4). This new system is mainly identified by the use of national assessment results as indicators of teachers' performance. Again, therefore, although the assessment-driven curriculum leaves space for teachers to utilise curriculum resources at their discretion, it also puts much more pressure on them to raise their

122 However, as I pointed earlier, the 'Literacy Hour' prescribes contents and pedagogy.
The introduction of the National Curriculum has certainly influenced the whole style of curriculum development and had a significant impact on teachers' perceptions of their professional responsibilities in curriculum practice. This study has exposed that the majority understanding of their role and responsibility in curriculum development corresponds with the notion of 'extended autonomy', although the teachers perceived their conditions of practice in different ways. The majority of them supported government intervention in curriculum development to some extent, but the degree of support varied.

The two traditions of teachers' curriculum ownership and of assessment-driven curriculum are the main influences on these perceptions about curriculum role and conditions of practice. English teachers have a view of their curriculum authority which springs from both their curriculum tradition and the nature of the National Curriculum, and which leads them to value the relatively high degree of teachers' control over the curriculum. It should be noticed that most teachers felt more professional when they could decide and manage what should be taught, and how it should be taught in classroom. If curriculum control policies shift to more powerful strategies aimed more directly at changing content and method than indirectly at raising the standards achieved by their pupils, more teachers will feel compelled to teach in a way which goes against their sense of professionalism.
In Chapters 6 and 7, I identified four types of teachers in the two countries: Types I and II-k in Korea, and Types II-e and III in England. In terms of conceptual understanding of curriculum development and professionalism, Type I stood out. They understood their role in curriculum development as 'restricted autonomy', and professionalism as a matter of 'knowledge and commitment', while the other types saw their role in curriculum development as 'extended autonomy' and professionalism as a matter of 'autonomy'. On the other hand, in practice, whilst Types I, II-k and II-e believed that they implemented their National Curriculum with very limited flexibility, Type III perceived that they implemented the curriculum in their own autonomous way.

Despite the considerably different reactions of teachers to the mode of government intervention in the two countries, there might still be some similarities in their perceptions of the changes in curriculum development and professionalism, now taking place. As pointed out earlier, regardless of general differences between the two countries' teachers, Types II-k and II-e teachers in both countries felt a striking and uncomfortable contrast between their curriculum practice and their own beliefs. The general tendency of Types II-k and II-e was to support the notion of professionalism in curriculum development in the form of extended teacher autonomy, while experiencing a lack of flexibility and autonomy in curriculum practice, though Types II-k and II-e teachers were not completely identical.

On the whole, English teachers seemed to have a conceptual understanding of curriculum development and professionalism as involving 'extended autonomy', whereas there were two distinctive viewpoints among Korean teachers, who saw the meaning as either 'restricted autonomy' or 'extended autonomy'. In curriculum practice, Korean teachers agreed that they implemented the curriculum with 'restricted autonomy'; by contrast, two opposite views existed among English teachers: practice with 'restricted autonomy' and practice with 'extended autonomy'.

However, comparison of these four types of teachers is not the main focus in this chapter. For one thing, they are abstractions, not a certain number of real teachers in the
two countries. Nor shall we be concerned to compare the ‘average’ Korean and English teachers - such averages would be abstractions to a still greater degree. Rather my main concern will be simply to compare and contrast the response patterns of the two sets of teachers. I will discuss in some detail, first, the general differences of tendency in the perceptions of the Korean and the English teachers and then, second, the general similarities of tendency between them. Throughout, I will refer to the two cultural contexts: how do teachers’ perceptions function in the two very different, yet in some ways similar, cultural contexts? The reader will notice a paradox as this structure unfolds, however. Ultimately, the similarities between the two systems cannot be fully isolated from the differences. More often than not, then, we shall have to follow an identification of a similarity with a warning that it may well be camouflaging an important difference.

8.1 The Differences in Teachers’ Perceptions

8.1.1 Understanding and practice of curriculum development and professionalism

Table 26.1 Differences in Perceptions of Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The professional teacher is good at managing the prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in the classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26.2 Comparison by School Groups 1,2,3 of Perceptions of Curriculum Development (% of agreement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G1</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers can implement the National Curriculum creatively</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26.1 indicates the different perceptions of curriculum development between teachers in Korea and England. As we can see, more Korean than English teachers regarded curriculum development as the responsibility of educational experts. A large majority of them interpreted their role in curriculum development in a limited sense, such as ‘managing the prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in the classroom’. Furthermore, only a small minority of Korean teachers agreed on ‘implementing the curriculum creatively’, whereas a substantial majority of English teachers had this view.

In other words, the teachers in the two countries showed generally contrasting views of considered definitions of teachers’ professional role in curriculum development: ‘restricted autonomy’ versus ‘extended autonomy’. Most Korean interviewees perceived the introduction of the sixth National Curriculum as imposing another obligation to the government rather than as a matter of gradual diffusion of control by the government through less detailed prescription. On the other hand, English teachers seemed to divide in perceiving their National Curriculum as using two different degrees of curriculum control, weak or strong: some teachers regarded it as a framework for reinterpretation, others perceived it as government directives and loss of autonomy. However, more English teachers regarded the ‘literacy hour’, which indicates not only content but also pedagogy, as depriving teachers of autonomy, since they strongly believed that teachers should have an essential role in curriculum development.

Different traditions of curriculum control have affected the teachers’ different understanding of curriculum development. The English tradition, as we saw in Chapter 3, in which school autonomy and the absence of detailed prescription were prevalent, allowed teachers to continue to keep their personal authority in their role of curriculum development. Although English teachers were required to adopt the National Curriculum, they seemed generally to implement it in their own ways. They were significantly aware of their essential and professional role in curriculum development. Many even perceived the National Curriculum not as something which they were simply obliged to follow, but as something they could implement in whichever way they felt appropriate in classroom practice. In this context, Maw (1985: 95) pointed out how this notion of teachers’ autonomy in England has affected their curriculum practice:
It (autonomy) influenced the whole style of the curriculum development movement in this country, and it had a powerful (though haphazard) impact on teachers’ conception of their professional responsibilities and their willingness to engage in the realities of curriculum change. In other words, the belief in the teachers’ autonomy had an impact on practice at all levels.

By contrast, Korean teachers generally understood their role in curriculum development rather as managing or implementing. Traditionally, they had the habit of a minimal role in curriculum development under highly centralized control. In the early stage of the sixth National Curriculum, in particular, traditional expectations were shown in the teachers’ reaction to the new curriculum; they had some difficulties in grasping their new role in school-based curriculum development. This might be reinforced by their sense of their position as civil servants. Loyalty to the service has made teachers’ professionalism more vulnerable to exploitation. This bureaucratic nature of the teaching force in Korea can be related to Sockett’s (1990: 108) notion of the ‘moral obligation on teachers for accountability’: in particular, ‘they are under a moral obligation to provide to their employer an account of their conformity to the governmental policy’. Johnson (1993: 411-2), too, explained this kind of attitude in terms of his ‘administrative model’ as follows:

[The administrative model] is understood and faithfully implemented by all classroom teachers; this calls for teachers who are both able to interpret curriculum documents accurately and willing to adhere to their direction...centrally imposed curricula act as security for teachers,\(^1\) protecting them from political interference by other stakeholders such as politicians, parents, administrators, universities and trade and commercial interests.

Korean teachers would be more likely to be aware of working in the civil service sector and offering a service to the public. In addition they might be satisfied with enjoying a significant degree of freedom and control over what took place within the limits of their own classroom. In the classroom, their relative freedom of action is their distinguishing trait.

It is interesting to extend this comparison to include the different tendencies among

\(^1\) On the other hand, as I have pointed out in Chapter 2, there are other point of views to this. According to Ginsburg (1997: 7), ‘George Bernard Shaw’s description of professions being a “conspiracy against the laity” seems accurate, at least for some professions’.
the particular school groups in each case (Table 16.2). The teachers in middle class (Group 1) and low income (Group 3) areas in England had different points of view on their role in curriculum development. About half of Group 1 were content to say that teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly, but no-one in Group 3 agreed with this. A larger minority of Group 1 teachers than others thought teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts. In this regard, a greater number of Group 3 (actually 100%) than of other groups believed that the National Curriculum should be implemented creatively. On the whole, the teachers in affluent areas were more satisfied and confident with the National Curriculum than the teachers in less advantaged areas. Teachers in low income areas were less supportive of government interference in curriculum development because they needed much more flexibility to cope with a different or worse situation.

In Korea, by contrast, there were fewer overall differences among groups than in England, and more teachers in mixed income areas were in favour of the National Curriculum and its implementation either unquestioningly or creatively. The reason for this may be the four-year transferring system aiming at providing equal opportunity. It was interesting that no teachers in Group 1 agreed with the creative implementation of the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. The professional teacher is always punctual.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers have a higher status now than they used to have.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The professional teacher works well in a team.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Subject knowledge is the most important thing for a teacher.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If I were to start again, I would still be a teacher.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher appraisal is a positive contribution to professional development.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I already quoted in Chapter 7, ‘the National Curriculum as a form of centralization is likely to disadvantage less favoured socio-economic groups since teachers working to common, public goals cannot hope to achieve the same levels of “success” in such areas and yet are not allowed to adapt their goals better to meet these pupils’ needs’ (Broadfoot, et al., 1993: 118).
More English than Korean teachers valued punctuality and teamwork with colleagues as important factors in professionalism, and had experienced as valuable appraisal systems for professional development. Substantially, more Korean than English teachers believed that subject knowledge was the most important prerequisite for a professional teacher.

There are two lines of explanation for these differences. The first refers to the characteristics of the curriculum. Under the control of detailed curriculum contents and methodology imposed by the government, Korean teachers took punctuality for granted as already assumed in the time allocations of the National Curriculum. Again, within the centralized curriculum, fewer Korean than English teachers valued either working with colleagues or appraisal for professional development. Since they were supposed to follow the same curriculum, working alone by themselves without cooperating with colleagues in curriculum practice was the way in which teachers had proceeded with their curriculum work for a long time. Since they already conformed sincerely to every single requirement of the National Curriculum, they regarded their practice in the classroom as a matter of their own privacy. In this closed and individualistic culture, they saw little need for interference or advice from colleagues, and accordingly, they were reluctant to expose their experience, whether it was of failure or not. This occupational tradition of Korean teachers favoured independence rather than interdependence, although recent training has probably made them more aware of teamwork than before.

In England, too, 'teachers in primary schools are socialized into a tradition of isolation, individualism, self-reliance, and autonomy' (Nias, 1989: 202). However, in recent decades, curriculum development usually arose out of colleague or school-based consensual decision-making (Nias et al., 1992). Collaborative work with colleagues and consensus from those teachers engaged in participatory curriculum development become common experiences. Even under the National Curriculum, 'they generally accepted that it was necessary to be constantly seeking to improve, recognized good practice in the work of their colleagues and appraised their own work' (op. cit.: 234). These activities were requirements of working efficiently within the decentralized or less centralized curriculum tradition.

A second persuasive line of explanation for these results is difference of emphasis in pre-service education in the two countries. Pre-service courses in England have
emphasized offering sufficient opportunity for the teachers to relate their courses to classroom practice (General Teaching Council, 1993), while, as I commented in Chapter 4, pre-service education in Korea has been mainly focused on subject or theoretical knowledge, and less on site-based learning. I anticipated that the high focus on subject knowledge and low level of curriculum development related work in pre-service education in Korea would give teachers the perception of the significance of subject knowledge. Thus, different educational backgrounds are a probable reason why teachers have different perceptions of professional requirements. It is consistent with this that younger English teachers in interviews, who started their teaching profession with the National Curriculum and had been trained within the frame of this curriculum, generally had a tendency to value subject knowledge (see Chapter 7).

The majority in both countries did not consider that teachers had a higher status now than they used to have. However, the difference between the two countries was striking, as twice as many English as Korean teachers rejected this view. When interviewees mentioned change in status, English teachers particularly referred it to the intervention of the government in curriculum development in the form of the National Curriculum. Korean teachers rarely related status to their curriculum authority, most referring instead to the public’s expectations and respect for their dignity being lower than they used to be. The important point to notice here was that Korean teachers did not perceive that teachers had achieved a higher status through their autonomous role in curriculum development. If we relate professionalism to the extent of teachers’ role in curriculum development, the Korean teachers have accepted a more restricted meaning of professionalism than the English teachers. Two very different conceptions of professionalism, in particular in the process of curriculum development, were reflected in these perceptions of teachers.

Otherwise, both Korean and English interviewees related their status mostly to salary levels as showing the way that the government and public estimated their value. Even though the simple comparison of salaries is sometimes meaningless, salary levels as quantitative indicators influence the individual teacher’s sense of the value of a teaching profession.

The salary levels of primary teachers as a proportion of GNP per head from the 1980s to 1990s are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>87 (1989)</td>
<td>(1978= 100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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career, and at the same time they may affect the public's ideas about teaching. At any rate, a common feature of the financial attitudes of teachers in both countries has been the fact that, as we have seen in the previous chapters, they considered themselves underpaid for the nature and range of tasks they perform.

Current central government's policies such as the introduction of the National Curriculum and the recent proposal for teachers' performance related payment, could be the main reasons for this perception in England. On the other hand, the economic crisis in Korea in the late 1990s may explain Korean teachers' attitude to their status being less negative than that of the English teachers. The security of a civil service job has been a major attraction in Korea at all times. The emerging problem of unemployment in Korean society probably makes teachers value this security more than their autonomy from the government and increasing salary level. This is consistent with the teachers' negative reaction to the government's acceptance of the establishment of teachers' unions in 1999 (see Chapter 4). Korean teachers have believed that unionism might erode the job security and the dignity given to teachers. A majority seemed to consider the status of teachers, not as depending on having the right to influence the government in a professional way, but as reflecting their job security as civil servants.

These two circumstances of traditional respect for teachers and the recent economic crisis in Korea were also reflected in teachers' positive view that if they were to start again, they would still be teachers. Fewer than half as many English teachers agreed with this. There is no wonder that these different perceptions are related to their understanding of professionalism. Under the highly centralized and hierarchical Korean education system, Korean teachers, even though critical of government in many ways, seemed to take security from the involvement of government, which was reinforced by their status as civil servants. Accepting their restricted role in curriculum development goes with this. Teachers valued their privileged position in terms of the security of a civil service post and its high reputation more than their autonomy.

Conversely, the decentralized English tradition, in which teachers value their degree of freedom, led to a negative attitude about their current status as teachers whose autonomy was reduced since the National Curriculum. In that situation, around half of the English teachers were uncertain that if they were to start again they would still be teachers. In
addition to the English tradition, which is widely different from Korea, of 'the dislike of a uniform national solution' (Lawton, 1999), the recent public recognition and criticism of teachers' professional quality through the media contributed to their unfavourable attitudes to their profession.

On the whole, English teachers appeared to have more concrete and precise ideas about the nature of professionalism, and what professional teachers should do. Both sets of teachers saw payment as an important indicator of professionalism, but more English than Korean teachers had a perception of professionalism at the advanced stage of autonomy. As Broadfoot et al. (1993: 78) pointed out in her comparative study of teachers in England and France, 'the English teachers tended to see professional responsibility as an involvement of the whole person, a commitment of self'. By contrast, Korean teachers were more likely to see professionalism as corresponding to the ideal image of teachers who were respected by the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 28 Differences in Perceptions of Their National Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The majority of teachers are familiar with and get to grips with the National Curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Teachers have been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subjects with no project work and no attempt at integration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the new curriculum reforms in the two countries has demonstrated moves in opposite directions in terms not only of administrative but also of academic features of the curriculum (see Chapter 3). The Korean government officially attempted to promote more progressive or process-oriented approaches, whereas the English

126 For Korean teachers, this question was modified as follows: 'teachers have continued to use more formal teaching methods because of the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum'.
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government attempted to promote more objective or outcome-oriented approaches. In Korea, the sixth National Curriculum signified integrated theme approaches, the introduction of child-centred teaching methods and formative assessment based on pupils' performance which encouraged teachers' own judgements. By contrast, the English curriculum emphasized a subject-based approach, more structured formal teaching methods and summative assessment based on national testing such as the SATs, together with detailed record-keeping.

As we see in Table 28, Korean teachers were less confident about understanding the overall intentions of the new curriculum than English teachers. 'Level of professional confidence may be associated with teachers' ability to maintain a proactive role in terms of managing the changing demands made upon them' (Helsby, 1995: 325). As I pointed out earlier, being in the tradition of teachers' curriculum authority, many English teachers were more confident about imposing their own professional interpretation of the National Curriculum and balancing its demands in their own ways. By contrast, most Korean teachers were likely to take a more passive role in implementing the curriculum, through lack of confidence and will. Thus, more Korean teachers doubted the achievement of the intended effects of the curriculum than their English counterparts. Although only a small minority among Korean teachers thought that the formal teaching methods had increased in use because of the subject-based nature of the curriculum, many interviewees remarked that in practice they have had a difficult time attempting to integrate subjects in a way which they were not used to, instead of formal teaching. Furthermore, they were suffering from performance-based formative assessment without adequate changes at the practical level, such as smaller class sizes and sufficient in-service training for that method. This may explain why twice as many Korean teachers as English ones believed that the assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.

On the other hand, although English teachers understood that the National Curriculum had sometimes forced them to adopt more formal teaching methods because of its subject-based approach, a substantial majority believed that they used various kinds of integrated approaches whenever they were needed. Also, only 38% of English teachers showed a definitely negative attitude to the new assessment arrangements in the National
Curriculum, although all the others neither agreed nor disagreed with it. Overall, English teachers were more confident in dealing flexibly with the National Curriculum than Korean teachers, because they were already more accustomed to flexibility, which involved being in control and planning curriculum, than simply following instructions.

One of the reasons for these differences is that the curriculum in Korea has been defined by subject contents and pedagogy, whilst the English curriculum has emphasized more detailed assessment and its description rather than subject content and pedagogy. In particular, the Korean curriculum has been strongly connected to official textbooks, while the English curriculum has not defined the teaching materials and methods. In Korea, the National Curriculum is textbook-driven and the textbook is the main carrier of governmental requirements to teachers. In this circumstance, although the sixth National Curriculum has encouraged the integrated theme-based approach and various teaching methods, in practice, the teachers were still dominated by the selected contents of the textbooks when they approached curriculum planning.

Compared with the Korean curriculum, the English curriculum is assessment-driven, and the SATs are the main means to ensure that curriculum requirements are met. A set of national criteria for standards is constructed by the government, but teachers are allowed to have some flexibility in working towards these, in order to optimise their results. Progression is more criterion than content defined: the focus is on defining a sequence of expected performances by levels of description, not on a sequence of content or classroom activities, as in the Korean setting. In this respect, English teachers are allowed more managerial autonomy for the organization of content and pedagogy in classrooms than Korean teachers.

However, it should be noticed that English teachers are now supposed to adopt more definite contents and teaching method in the literacy hour strategies. They perceived strong governmental intervention in the literacy hour, although this was not formally an obligation but a recommendation. Its character is a sequence of content and classroom activities,

127 However, in 1993 teachers' professional associations boycotted the new assessment procedures.

128 In 1999, the government proposes to give statutory force to the literacy and numeracy strategies, which currently are not compulsory (QCA, 1999).
as in the Korean curriculum. Most of the teachers I interviewed and observed stated that it left teachers with a lower sense of professionalism. Teachers are thus under some pressure to adopt more detailed predetermined curriculum practices and to be monitored by the results of the SATs, regardless of the context of their particular school and personal choices. This pattern reduces professional autonomy in the organization of content and pedagogy, and controls teachers directly with reference to the results of the SATs. This kind of direct control would inhibit the use by teachers of alternative practices in order to fulfil the requirements.

Korean teachers have less experience of using methods other than formal ones than the English teachers. Traditionally, textbooks have not only directed content but regulated teaching methods, in which teachers have had little flexibility. Not having been encouraged to attempt various kinds of teaching methods, their experiences were limited. Furthermore, they seemed to believe that whole-class or formal teaching would be the most appropriate for the crowded classrooms in Korean schools. Accordingly, Korean teachers continued to adopt and practise a limited range of teaching methods. Textbook-driven curriculum planning, lack of teachers’ experience of various teaching approaches and the present situation of crowded classrooms in Korea have largely invalidated the intended weakening of subject boundaries, since the correspondence of each textbook to each subject renders communication amongst subjects largely ineffective. This situation was reinforced by the centrally prescribed subject-based time allotments, which schools were not allowed to alter. In the end, detailed contents and pedagogy based on textbooks imposed strict control over what teachers were doing in classroom.  

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that more Korean than English teachers believed their National Curriculum had not had the intended effects. The sixth National Curriculum had attempted to provide greater space for teachers’ flexibility and their own judgement in curriculum development, including selecting some contents, teaching

---

However, the study of Reynolds and Farrell (1996: 54), which reviewed the internationally comparative studies of educational achievement, regarded this ‘textbook-driven’ curriculum as one of the factors for the high achievement scores of Pacific Rim societies, with Korea: ‘the use of the same textbooks by all children, which permits teachers to channel their energy into classroom instruction and the marking of homework, rather than into the production of worksheets that is so much a feature of English teaching’.
methods and formative assessment at classroom level. As Table 28 has shown, only a small minority of Korean teachers considered that these intentions of the sixth National Curriculum had been achieved.

On the other hand, the main purpose of the National Curriculum in England has been to raise educational standards and the quality of teaching through an assessment-driven curriculum. Only one third of English teachers believed that it had failed to have its intended effects. English teachers mainly related their negative judgements to their reduced autonomous status or level of professionalism, but they had quite positive views of the overall intentions of the National Curriculum. More Korean than English teachers called in question the general intentions or framework of their National Curriculum, but of course the two national curricula have different starting points: decentralizing curriculum control versus improving academic standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Leading workshops and discussions</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Liaising with the head and senior staff</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Advising colleagues informally</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Dealing with professional disagreement</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have seen in Chapters 6 and 7, overall, the teachers in both countries were more confident about their knowledge than their skills in the process of curriculum development. Table 29 is restricted to skills. More English than Korean teachers were confident about curriculum discussion with colleagues, senior staff and the headteacher. However, for one variable, ‘dealing with professional disagreement’, more Korean teachers than English teachers felt confidence, although no English teachers responded negatively to this. That English teachers were relatively unconfident about professional disagreement may be because they were more active and individually assertive in curriculum matters and

Based on Campbell (1984), I divided curriculum competence into two aspects; knowledge and skills. This study found some differences in curriculum skills (Table 29) and some similarities in curriculum knowledge (Table 38) between teachers’ perceptions in Korea and England.
The Korean teachers are likely to solve disagreements merely by obedience to senior staff, especially the headteacher, because of the hierarchical subordinative subculture of Korean school teachers.

It was striking that as many as one third of the Korean teachers produced no responses to these items, which rarely occurred for other items in the questionnaire. It might be surmised that they had little or no chance to take on these roles and responsibilities under the centralized curriculum control system, and thus had no ideas or lacked confidence about them. Conversely, the traditional educational setting in England, where management had been a school affair, and the autonomous position of the teachers, gave more opportunities to participate in curriculum decision-making processes and more space for teachers to deal with real situations in effective ways.

In addition, it was likely that the difference of emphasis in the training received by teachers in the two countries would also produce different kinds of competencies in curriculum development. In England the value of school-based experience has been emphasized by transferring much of the focus of teacher training from universities to schools, in order to make teachers more effective in relation to what schools and children need. In contrast, in Korea both pre- and in-service teacher education courses have been largely focused on traditional academic knowledge rather than on curriculum development and related school experiences (KICE, 1998; Kim, 1991).

8.1.2 Perceptions of the relationship between teachers’ professionalism and government intervention

Table 30 Differences in Perceptions of the Relationship between Teachers’ Professionalism and Government Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since the National Curriculum</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Teachers should be civil servants.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. The status of primary teachers has become lower in recent years.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Recent government interventions in teacher education have been positive on the whole.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Considerably fewer Korean than English teachers felt that the relationship of teachers to government had changed since the new curriculum. This item also produced a high non-response rate (31% for the Korean cohort, and 33% for the English cohort). It might be that teachers in both countries found it difficult to define their changing relationship to government at the practical level. However, at a general level the perceptions can be characterized as continuing centralization in Korea and changing to centralization in England. Although the sixth National Curriculum attempted to give some power to Korean teachers and intended a co-operative relationship with teachers through some decentralization, central control was seen to remain dominant. On the other hand, English teachers experienced stronger intervention by the government since the introduction of the National Curriculum. In both cases, we can say that teachers perceived more government intervention in curriculum development than they had expected to have.

Relatively more English than Korean teachers believed that the status of primary teachers had become lower in recent years. In addition, no English teachers wanted to be civil servants, whereas nearly half of the Korean cohort were content with this. This significant difference perhaps related to traditional attitudes to the national education system. The English adopted a national system later than many other European countries, and continue to suspect it of being a constraint on flexibility (Lawton, 1996; 1999). This aspect of the English tradition valued the freedom of the teaching profession from government influence, and almost saw teachers' status as negatively related to the intervention of the government. So, our respondents interpreted civil servants' status for teachers as a subordinate relationship to the government, rather than as a privileged position.

Conversely, teachers in Korea have felt that as civil servants they had a high status with the public, despite their low salary and less flexibility. Centralized educational policy, including the National Curriculum, could be read as showing the government's goodwill in helping them to be professionals. So administrative duties, mainly related to official documentation for the government, were accepted unconditionally as suiting the role of their profession. At any rate, Korean teachers believed that the government provided conditions where teachers felt secure about their status and job. Accordingly, they felt some responsibilities to obey the government's instructions.
By contrast, English teachers had enjoyed a long tradition of an autonomous position independent of government control, but since 1988 the central government has come to see itself as the guardian of educational services, and parents as consumers. It sought to guarantee satisfaction of consumers’ demands through its control over teachers from which teachers might feel diminished and patronized. These policies help to explain why the majority were sure that their status had become lower in recent years. Many worried that they were becoming simple implementers of predetermined educational outcomes. In addition, the recent governmental proposal of performance related payment did not seem likely to offer any satisfactory solution to teachers’ desire for professionalism, but seemed to give lower self-esteem with less flexibility and autonomy for teachers themselves.

In this situation, Korean teachers might enjoy their civil servants’ status as a benevolent influence, while English teachers might regard the prospect of it as deprivation of their professionalism and autonomy.

Table 31 Differences in Perceptions of the Actual Influences on Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important (%)</td>
<td>Not Important (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Government policies and advice</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. LEA policies</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Textbook requirement</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Your own beliefs and conception</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Previous educational experience</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Characteristics of pupils</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. The relationship of different subject matters</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 Differences in Perceptions of the Ideal Influences on Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important (%)</td>
<td>Not Important (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Government</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Local Authority</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English teachers were more likely to respond neutrally, or not at all, to these items especially to some of them. This is quite difficult to explain, though it might be that English teachers found it confusing to explain the actual or appropriate levels of government and LEA influence in the present changing situation in England. Nonetheless it is clear that English teachers perceived the actual and the ideal influences of government policies and advice as less than how they were perceived by Korean teachers. And, of course, Korean teachers regarded textbook requirements as larger influences on curriculum development than did English teachers, reflecting the nature of the textbook-driven curriculum in which teachers regard textbooks rather than the National Curriculum as what directly impacts on them.

In other respects, the general perceptions of influences on curriculum development might seem very similar. However, their responses should be understood in terms of how they considered or applied these variables. Teachers in Korea and England understood the meaning of influences on curriculum development in their different contexts and within different conceptions of appropriate autonomy. For example, although even more Korean than English teachers indicated that they relied on their own beliefs and experiences, they might implement their own judgement, beliefs and experience only in the sense of restricted autonomy and within the prescriptive contents of their National Curriculum.

Besides the different degrees of significance between teachers in Korea and England, different tendencies were found between the 'actual' and 'ideal' perceptions of influences of government and local authorities: the government and local authorities were very close to each other in Korea, and also close to each other for LEAs in England, while there was a big gap for government in England. English teachers seem really quite unhappy with the government's present degree and kind of influence as they perceive it. In the strict bureaucratic educational system in Korea, the local authorities have had little or no power except to deliver and confirm the orders of the central government rather than their own. Within this centralized tradition, the influence of the government and of local authorities seemed to be the same to Korean teachers. English teachers, however, perceived that the intervention of the government was quite different from that of LEAs. They tend to assume, no doubt, that they would have more flexibility in responding to their individual local situation under the influence of LEAs rather than that of the government.
8.2 The Similarities in Teachers’ Perceptions

8.2.1 Centralization or decentralization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. As a teacher I should plan the contents, teaching and assessment for my own class</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34 Similarities in Perceptions of the Ideal Influences on Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80. The teacher</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quite clearly, the vast majority of teachers in both countries believed that teachers should be given an essential role in curriculum development. However, the Korean teachers might not perceive the meaning of this role quite in the same way as English teachers. Teachers’ understanding of their role in each country must be supposed to be very different because of the contrasting traditions in both countries, in which different conceptions have been developed.

Centralized curriculum control in Korea has developed a tradition of conformity to authorities, and rigidity and uniformity in schools. Korean teachers have been deprived of opportunities to make their own decisions in curriculum development at national level as well as school level. The decentralizing attempt of the sixth National Curriculum has had a limited effect on this situation. A main reason for this is that teachers have low expectations and desires to make their own curriculum decisions because of the dominance of textbooks. Teaching is still being directed by textbooks which define detailed contents and teaching methods. Teachers took for granted the national descriptions of curriculum contents, and never raised questions about these. In these circumstances, Korean teachers will have a limited sense of their role in curriculum. The above results are compatible with the essentially classroom-based role of Korean teachers within the centralized curriculum.
On the other hand, English teachers have developed their understanding of teachers’ curriculum role in the tradition of decentralized curriculum control, with more control over what should be taught, and how, in school than the teachers in other countries. In particular, from the 1940s to the 1970s, the school curriculum had been largely free from external influences, and teachers had much greater flexibility and extended autonomy than before or after. Since 1988, the situation of teachers has dramatically changed. Teachers must now follow the framework of the National Curriculum. In addition, the literacy hour policy, introduced in 1998, suggested not only the contents of teaching but also the methods and time allotment. However, this present situation seem not to have changed teachers’ beliefs, which were founded in the long tradition of teachers’ essential role in curriculum development, although some teachers felt the impact of recent legislation upon their curriculum practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. The National Curriculum has the support of teachers for its general principles</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The National Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The National Curriculum is the major influence over what is taught in the classroom.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the teachers in both countries supported the general principles of the new curriculum and regarded it as a good framework for practice, despite the different curriculum control directions in the two countries. However, the teachers in the two countries seemed to perceive the meaning of a ‘framework’ as providing different degrees of detail. The comments of one former Korean primary teacher who now lives in England showed how Korean teachers might expect the curriculum and textbooks to impose rigid contents for their teaching:
I always ask and check what my daughter is doing in school [English school]. I myself was a primary teacher in Korea. I want to teach my daughter some contents which should be taught in school in advance and go over it with her after she has learned it in school. But I cannot figure out what my daughter is exactly learning in school... When I met the teacher in parents’ evening, I asked her for some detailed contents which my daughter should have learnt in school. She said that “I already sent a letter about the theme of the week. If you lost it, I will give it to you again.”... Actually, I read the letter before. But it seemed to me less organized and systematic. For example, there are no textbooks, which cover the whole year, except some story books for English as a subject. It is amazing to me what English teachers do without textbooks in school.

On the whole, English teachers expected to interpret and contextualize the National Curriculum, while Korean teachers would interpret it by adhering to its directions and details: ‘guidelines’ versus ‘prescribed texts’. As Johnson (1993) pointed out, generally teachers in a centralized curriculum development system, like the Korean teachers, enjoyed little or no involvement in curriculum development, and lacked the understandings and skills necessary to take part in curriculum development. On the other hand, English teachers identified the curriculum as a framework, giving broad guidelines which should not impose very detailed contents or methods. In the several revisions of the National Curriculum since 1988, one of the issues always raised by teachers has been curtailing the detail of the contents. When the literacy hour policy was introduced in 1998, again many teachers had a negative reaction to it because of its more detailed content and pedagogy. The most recent proposals for the National Curriculum 2000 in England (QCA, 1999) claim to be a basic framework within which schools can develop their own approaches. However, although there were simplifications in most areas, and prescription has been replaced by ‘flexibility’ to ‘enable teachers to use their professional judgement’, there were still criticisms by teachers about ‘too much to be taught’, and ‘some remained concerned at the amount of study’ (Daily Telegraph, 14/5/1999). It is clear that English teachers expect a framework of the National Curriculum to be not detailed contents and methods but a set of national guidelines or national standards.

It is interesting, however, that both groups see their National Curriculum as over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding. When the two National Curricula are compared with each other, the Korean curriculum has the much more detailed contents and methods, as well as textbooks. It imposes heavily on teachers in respect of contents and methods, while the English curriculum is oriented by assessment, which allows
teachers more flexibility in dealing with contents and method in the classroom (See Chapter 3). However, more English than Korean teachers still believed that their curriculum was over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding. It remained that the majority of Korean teachers also felt their curriculum was more demanding than they expected.

With the introduction of the new curriculum, Korean teachers’ role has become more diversified in terms of techniques of teaching and formative assessment. Teachers felt handicapped in this by an increasing workload without any appropriate support such as reduced class sizes and providing new kinds of materials. Also, the government required more documentation of the teachers’ actions because they were anxious to know what was happened in schools which had such flexibility. In this circumstance, increased participation in curriculum decision-making held little or no attraction for Korean teachers. This means that they are still failing to gain understanding of, and commitment to, their essential role in curriculum development and their critical thinking about alternative teaching methods and contents has not flourished. Conversely, the long tradition of having the curriculum produced by teachers’ own judgement in England has enabled them to implement the curriculum faithfully, but according to its appropriateness for particular situations, and thus to enhance its relevance.

Table 36 Similarities in Perceptions of the Actual Influences on Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important (%)</td>
<td>Not Important (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. School policies (eg: School Development Plan)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Preparation for standardized tests</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant majorities of teachers in both countries perceived school policies as actual influences on curriculum development. With the introduction of the sixth National Curriculum, Korean teachers have had an opportunity to participate in school-based curriculum development for the first time in Korean curriculum history. This new form of curriculum development made teachers more aware of the concept and possibilities of a school policy in which they had some participatory role and which would influence their
practice significantly. As for the English teachers, there was also an emphasis on a school-based curriculum approach in the 'school development plans' (SDPs), which enabled teachers to accommodate and respond to the National Curriculum in a coherent way.

School-based curriculum or management refers to a philosophy adopted by schools to improve education by increasing the autonomy of teachers when they make school-based decisions (Gomez, 1989). As the vast majority of teachers in both countries recognized school policies as actual influences on curriculum development, school-based curriculum development and its management became a common issue in both countries.

However, the purpose of this approach is to make changes in the traditional structure of authority, with the establishment of new relationship among teachers, administrators and pupils (Purkey and White, 1988). Thus, it is not simply a decentralization effort in respect of curriculum development in both countries. In Korea, it focused on teachers' participation in curriculum decision-making. On the other hand, in England, it emphasized the government’s curriculum demands and requirements that teachers accepted, decentralized school financial management and teachers’ in-service education, although more English teachers still had more flexibility in the school-based curriculum than Korean teachers.

Considering the nature of the assessment-driven curriculum in England, it is a little surprising that a relatively small proportion of the English teachers saw the SATs as important influences on curriculum development. Somewhat more Korean than English teachers acknowledged this influence. This was also despite the fact that many of my respondents were teachers of Year Two and Year Six in England, which were the target years for the national tests, and they would be seriously concerned about them. One English headteacher's remarks showed the school's ambivalence about the SATs:

I think the factual information of league tables, which shows the rank of my school at national level, is meaningless since they do not consider any specific circumstances each school faces. However, I could not disregard it. For this year, I receive some money from the authority for better results of the SATs. I plan to employ a special strategy to help Year Six children who have potential to achieve the highest level (Grp. 3, Sch. B, Tch. b1 (H)).

In my English sample, there were fifteen teachers of Year Two and Year Six (33%) out of forty-five teachers.
Overall, although at present the teachers in each country face different directions of change in curriculum control, a significant degree of similarity was noticed in their perceptions of their curriculum roles and responsibilities in relation with governments. Teachers in both countries agreed about teachers' essential role in school-based curriculum development under the National Curriculum as a framework. In addition, teachers in both countries saw their classroom as their own territory, and their responsibilities in relation to that were understood as defining their main tasks.

However, the perceptions and expectations of teachers about the appropriate extent and manner of their involvement differed from each other. Different traditions of curriculum control have led to different perceptions of the curriculum role of classroom teachers. Generally, centralization focuses upon the initiation of development by central authorities, and rests upon a relatively restricted view of teachers' role in curriculum development. Teachers are expected to implement the curriculum as intended and directed. On the other hand, decentralization provides teachers with a meaningful role in developing a situationally relevant curriculum. My main suggestion, however, is that the changing relationship of government intervention and teachers' flexibility should be interpreted not simply in terms of the direction of the policy, whether centralization or decentralization, but by teachers' own traditions which shape their attitudes and practices. Korean teachers wished to remain in control of a much more restricted field than English teachers. They were more comfortable with government assuming a 'power over' relationship with them, although, at least officially, the sixth National Curriculum aspired to a 'power with' relationship between government and teachers. On the other hand, English teachers felt more imposed upon than their Korean counterparts although they had to teach a less detailed curriculum and implemented it with more flexibility than the Korean cohort. English teachers expected a 'power with' relationship with the government, where they had a choice about how to implement the requirements laid on them.
8.2.2 Professionalization or deprofessionalization

Table 37 Similarities in Perceptions of Government and Teachers' Professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The government gets in the way of good teaching.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers' professional pride.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. The quality of primary teachers has been slipping since the government took over the curriculum.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Government supports teachers well.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 Similarities in Perceptions of Their Knowledge in Curriculum Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Korea</th>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Up-to-date subject knowledge</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Constructing a programme scheme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluating a programme scheme</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Choosing between available resources</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Deciding about methods</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Korean and English teachers tended to believe that teachers could be, and no doubt are, professional 'even' with government telling them what to teach, and they quite firmly believed that the quality of primary teaching had not been slipping despite the worst or the best that government could do to the curriculum. However, this does not mean that teachers are reasonably happy with government. To the contrary, in both countries they were strongly critical. In both countries, about twice as many teachers agreed with the proposition that government 'got in the way' of teaching as disagreed with it - government is here being perceived as a nuisance. More strikingly still, two out of every three Korean teachers and three out of every four English teachers definitely did not feel well supported
government (In England, indeed, only one in twenty-five teachers did positively feel well-supported - probably this exceptionally low figure in affected by the current dispute with government).

A particular discontent with government in both countries - not necessarily the greatest but one which they were asked about - related to inspection. More than half of the respondents in each country thought that present arrangements for school inspection were an offence to teachers' professional pride. School inspection in Korea has been mostly concerned with the hierarchical imposition of the central curriculum, through surveillance of what, how and when to teach. The compulsory textbooks and timetables provide detailed pre-defined tasks, and thus the inspectors check that these requirements are met rather than evaluating teaching and learning. Korean teachers cannot introduce alternative practices in their classrooms, but merely deliver what the textbooks indicate. In this circumstance, many Korean teachers expected inspection to show them as simple implementers of predefined contents without any professional flexibility. No headteachers in Korea in my samples allowed me to see the inspectors' report about their own school. This situation suggested how sensitive they were about the inspection from the authorities, and this secretiveness was unlikely to enhance teachers' professionalism.

In contrast, the inspection mechanism in England is more concerned with evaluating the school's practice, making it visible in its particularity to the public and classifying it rather than checking the requirements of subject contents and time allotment. In this situation, the English interviewees in my study complained that they were evaluated in a very short period and mainly by the results shown in the pupils' performance, without contextual understanding of the particular school environment. As a result of the assessment-driven curriculum, teachers acted more than before as managers to achieve predefined educational outcomes. In this regard, the government's new proposals for 'performance related payment', which would determine the payment by the extent of pupils' achievement in school, were also condemned by teachers (Journal of NUT, 1999). Some English teachers pointed to this as something which would damage teachers' professionalism.

It was very evident that, with the tradition of the participatory role of teachers in curriculum development in England, the teachers were aware and capable of designing
curriculum units, and of evaluating their success using criteria they formulated themselves. Generally, these advantages of a decentralized approach might be recognized as implying the deficiencies of a centralized curriculum approach as in Korea. Greater government control implies less capacity of teachers to control their conditions of work. More government intervention obstructs the ability of professionals to exercise their own discretion and makes them just part of the machinery of production. The political rationale underlying government educational policy has a decisive effect upon the degree of teachers' control over the development of their profession. The waiting upon government to take the fundamental decisions becomes a reasonably comfortable habit for teachers. So, it was interesting that the majority of Korean teachers, who had been dominated by a highly centralized government policy, saw themselves as operating without undue pressure from government control, felt a sufficient flexibility within their own classroom, were satisfied to play their individual role within the classroom, and were as confident as English teachers about their knowledge in curriculum development (Table 38). All this, even though they had been under the influence of a highly prescriptive and centralized curriculum! Conversely, the English government's increasing centralization - which was not simply intended to diminish teachers' professional role since it offered and assumed teacher involvement and participation in implementing the new curriculum - left many teachers feeling professionally threatened.

8.3 Conclusion

The government's effort towards decentralization in Korea was a response to a social demand for 'democratization' which had not found politically stable ground in the past. On the other hand, in England, more centralization in curriculum reform was part of the agenda to strengthen the economic structure through raising educational standards. Different social and political priorities led to different curriculum reforms from different curriculum starting-points, and subsequently those changes gave rise to movements in opposite directions in curriculum control. But teachers in both countries believed they should have a major influence on curriculum development, while being at the same time likely to support the general principles of the National Curriculum and its implementation.
as a framework. Both sets of teachers had some positive perceptions of the role of the government in curriculum development, while also agreeing on a lack of appropriate support from government.

Interacting with these commonalities were significant differences. Most, but not all, Korean teachers regarded designing the curriculum as the job of educational experts, leaving teachers to show their professionalism by good management of the prescribed curriculum. They appeared to lean back towards the traditional education hierarchy and to consider themselves as implementers rather than developers or planners. They still geared their curriculum practice to the letter of the National Curriculum rather than to their own judgement on the curriculum, partly because textbook-driven teaching was undermining the official drive towards a school-based curriculum. Despite all this, it was interesting to notice that Korean teachers perceived their own beliefs and conceptions rather than the government as actual influences on curriculum development.

Conversely, English teachers, as might be expected, appeared to value greatly the autonomy of their role in curriculum development, though they put more emphasis on teamwork with colleagues than on individual teachers’ subject knowledge in curriculum development, even in the central matter of curriculum contents. Since they typically supported the notion of professionalism as ‘extended autonomy’, they felt much more pressure from government intervention in the form of the command-control curriculum than the Korean teachers, who actually had to work with a more detailed curriculum and less flexibility. English teachers were not much in favour of the literacy hour, the most recent government intervention in the curriculum, although they recognized its necessary role to some extent. Some differences were noted across the different socio-economic areas, - English teachers in disadvantaged areas being more critical of the curriculum than those in affluent areas - whereas there were less significant differences among these groups in Korea.

Although in Korea, according to the well-known idea of the sixth National Curriculum, the weakening of subject boundaries, the selection of optional courses and teachers’ decisions over teaching methods would be emphasized as areas for the professional judgement of teachers, the degree of decentralization was not enough to influence the teachers’ perceptions and practices. On the other hand, the trend towards
centralization in England was apparent where the government had moved towards imposing detailed contents, and even teaching methods in the literacy and numeracy hours. Although this trend profoundly affected their curriculum practice in school, English teachers still practised their curriculum role in their own flexible ways.

The curriculum systems in both countries are likely to continue to function with much continuity. There is little willingness among Korean teachers to see the government’s espousal of teacher participation as a fundamental change. Besides, the majority of teachers are likely to be more comfortable with their restricted autonomous role than with a much more extended autonomy. They are also fairly satisfied with their posts as civil servants who are fundamentally stable in terms of both title and salary. So a more fundamental kind of curriculum decision-making might hold little or no attraction for Korean teachers. By contrast, English teachers are employed by LEAs, or their requirements and posts are varied depending on the needs of individual schools. Due to the decentralized structure of the educational system in England, which has had a tradition of pluralistic and divergent educational provision, the teachers are more resistant to governmental intervention in curriculum development than Korean teachers. In the light of the English education tradition, a centralized system and its effects are likely to be different from and less effective than in Korea (Ahn, 1999a).

Teachers’ professionalism and government intervention have different meanings for the teachers in the two countries, depending on the tradition and nature of their relationship with the central government. What has emerged clearly is that teachers’ perceptions in both countries have not fundamentally changed over the short period of time of the 1990s.

It might not be appropriate to assume that a centralization approach always leads to teachers accepting the government as being in ‘power over’ them, and a decentralization approach always leads to ‘power with’ reinterpretations of these relations. In this study, the features of professionalization and deprofessionalization were not being determined simply by the mode of control of curriculum development. Total autonomy might lead to a sense of not only professionalization but also deprofessionalization, depending on teachers’ views of their professionalism in relation with government intervention, as shaped by their own cultural contexts. Decentralization in Korea did not guarantee the participation of teachers in curriculum decision-making, and despite centralization in England, English
teachers in varying degrees still practised their curriculum role as if they 'owned' the curriculum. In both cases practice should also be interpreted in the context of the teachers' own perceptions and practices of their role in curriculum development arising from their own cultural tradition. The comparative analysis in this chapter strengthens the view that 'what the teachers do is affected by what they think' (Clark and Yinger, 1977) which arises from the nature of their own cultural contexts.

At present, teachers in both countries are faced with the task of dealing with the curriculum in ways which require a wide variety of strategies. The most important point to notice is how in both countries teachers have kept their balance in the changing situations and compromised with it. The underlying questions are 'How far should the curriculum be under lay control?' and 'What degree of flexibility should be allowed to teachers?' This might have implications for enhancing teachers' professionalism in relation to the government. Carrying out these tasks of coping with the new curricula could be a vital factor to enhance professionalism. These issues will be discussed in Chapter 9.
Part III Conclusion

In this thesis I have considered how changing patterns of governmental control of curriculum development have affected teachers' professionalism in Korea and England. In Part I, I provided background analyses of curriculum development and professionalism in both countries, and traced the main lines of traditional and cultural influence. In Part II, I explored the three themes which partly structured and partly emerged from my empirical data. The first was the teachers' understanding of the terms 'curriculum development' and 'professionalism'. The second was the variety of ways in which teachers implemented the curriculum and 'read' the conditions of their practice. The third was how the teachers viewed their professionalism in relation to the role of government. In this final Part I will offer some final reflections, including some broad and tentative recommendations, on the main concern of this study, the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention, and the implications of this relationship for teachers' professionalism in different cultural contexts.
Chapter 9 Conclusion

9.1 Summary Reflections on the Findings

Recently, the mode of government curriculum control has changed in both Korea and England, moving in opposite directions along the centralization-decentralization continuum. Focusing on the changes in the curriculum control system in the two countries, the thesis has found that teachers' professionalism vis-a-vis government intervention is affected much more by what teachers think, which is shaped by their own traditions and cultural contexts, than by the nature of the change itself as defined by the legislation.

The shift from teachers' to government control in England may be viewed as resulting from the judgement that teachers had failed in some way in their task of devising a satisfactory curriculum. Broadfoot (1996: 224) has emphasized that as a result, 'the imposition of a National Curriculum and assessment framework since the 1988 Education Reform Act that is subject to the direct authority of the Secretary of State for Education, represents a fundamental change by substantially increasing the formal power of central government.'

However, since this power is exercised as much, or more, through assessment as through prescribing subject content and pedagogy, the wide range of subject contents in the National Curriculum allows teachers to have some flexibility in curriculum practice. Furthermore, the half century tradition of decentralized curriculum control which emphasized teachers' autonomy in curriculum decision-making, supported the teachers' continuing use of alternative practices to implement the new curriculum, as we have seen in Chapter 7. Despite recent governmental intervention in curriculum development, the majority of English teachers can be characterized as still having a good deal of autonomy in implementing the curriculum.

Compared with this situation in England, Korean teachers had been traditionally excluded from curriculum development under the tightly centralized curriculum control exercised by the Ministry of Education. Due to the democratic movement in recent decades, the government attempted some decentralization of curriculum control, by
requiring teachers to participate in curriculum development, in particular, at school level. With the introduction of the sixth National Curriculum in 1992, teachers were encouraged to decide on optional courses and various teaching methods, and attempt formative assessment based on their own judgement.

However, the traditional bureaucratic mode of control had been the norm for Korean teachers, so that they generally felt uneasy about this ‘freedom’. In addition, the textbook-driven curriculum largely invalidated the proposed weakening of subject boundaries, the selection of optional courses and teachers’ decisions over teaching methods. Therefore, although this new mode of control attempted to loosen up the prescribed curriculum, the majority of teachers were not able to perceive any profound changes in their role and responsibility. The sixth National Curriculum was still subject to relatively strong central control, and the professionalism of Korean teachers was still generally limited to the level of restricted autonomy.

Traditions and cultures in both countries were very difficult to change, and changed slowly, because they were shaped by ‘values that were communally agreed, deeply embedded and taken-for-granted’ (Prosser ed., 1999). As Fullan and Pomfret (1977) pointed out, the actual use of a curriculum is different from its intended use, and as I argued in Chapter 8, getting teachers to implement these changes was never likely to be as simple as introducing the relevant legislation. Teachers possess the capacity to accept, subvert or modify such imposed changes.

Beyond confirming this general point, I identified in Chapters 6 and 7 four types of teachers who perceived their professional role in curriculum practice differently: Types I, II-k, II-e and III. The majority of Korean teachers, Type I, preferred government control, in which they had the role of ‘restricted autonomy’ in implementing the curriculum. For them, teachers’ increased participation in curriculum decision-making was hardly or not at all welcome. They believed that it complicated their essential role of implementing the curriculum in their particular classroom. Given their culture, it was not surprising that the move to give Korean teachers some flexibility to develop their own curriculum had not been initiated by teachers themselves. Indeed teachers felt it amounted rather to another case of subservience to the government than to autonomy for teachers. They did not relate participation in school-based curriculum to their professional pride. Thus, while
reaffirming the important role of teachers in curriculum work, it was clear that they were satisfied and confident with their traditionally restricted interpretation of the role.

Much research has shown that as long as a centralized bureaucracy makes crucial decisions that affect the lives of teachers, many teachers will be discouraged in their efforts to influence curriculum change and feel thwarted by a policy which leaves insufficient authority in their hands (Johnson, 1993; Apple and Tatelbaum, 1986; Carson, 1984; Ozga and Lawn, 1981; Jennings-Way, 1980; Young, 1979). In this context, however, it might be assumed that a majority of Korean teachers were clinging to a limited role because they had been socialised into it. Teachers’ views and practices concerning professionalism should be interpreted in the light of their professional responsibility as shaped by the culture to which they belong. The Korean teachers’ professional role should be judged in terms of the long tradition of highly centralized curriculum control. In contrast with their English counterparts, who have the knowledge and skills that they have developed through control over their own curriculum development over many years, Korean teachers have not had sight of the whole process of curriculum development. They generally believe that teachers’ territory is the classroom, within which they can exercise their own flexible decision-making: this limited version of curriculum control is indeed essential for professional teachers, who will not simply adopt official guidelines without consideration of their teaching situation. For this type of teacher, the majority in Korea, that amounts to a significantly important curriculum role within classrooms.

Furthermore, their limited interpretation of their curriculum role did not necessarily mean that they had less competency in this role. As Broadfoot et al. (1993: 121) argued, ‘the continuing commitment of the teachers, who are under centralized curriculum control, to the desirability of central control of curriculum and pedagogy, evaluation and employment does not make them less professional than their more decentralist colleagues.’ Although they were disinclined to apply critical views in order to create alternatives in teaching, their practice of the prescribed curriculum might well be powerful in shaping classroom activities. Tamir (1986: 86), comparing the curriculum control system in Israel and America, underlined how teachers might benefit under a centrally controlled curriculum:
There is no doubt that teachers' participation in curriculum development can be a fruitful and desirable experience which may contribute significantly to the professional development of teachers...An interesting question may be raised regarding the power in terms of learning effectiveness that teachers actually exert under the different modes. However, it is conceivable that teachers who have the benefit of centrally developed materials, and perhaps centrally offered support, as well as the freedom to choose from available options, may be more powerful and more effective than teachers who are left alone to exercise responsibility and complete extended autonomy.

Teachers' exercise of 'restricted autonomy' of itself was not necessarily related to 'deprofessionalization', or that of 'extended autonomy' to 'professionalization'. Generally, under a centralized bureaucracy, teachers will be discouraged in their efforts to influence curriculum change and therefore feel deprofessionalization. But teachers' professionalism should be judged in different ways according to their expected professional responsibility which is shaped by their own curriculum tradition. In addition, it is evident that most teachers have neither the time nor the expertise to take over many of the major tasks in curriculum development. Thus, in many cases, teacher-developed curricula have been judged to be of rather low quality (Eden et al., 1985) - like many centralized curricula. In this sense, as we have seen in Chapter 6, half of Korean teachers believed that their curriculum role was separated from that of experts, so that they were content to implement the curriculum in their own professional way.

By contrast, roughly a half of the sample of English teachers [Type III] valued a much more extended version of teachers' autonomy and, despite the more centralized National Curriculum, still saw themselves as enjoying flexibility and as free to implement the curriculum in their own autonomous ways. This type of teacher perceived themselves to have the capacity of remaining open to a range of outside influences and directions without losing their important role as 'curriculum authorities'.

Generally, within the decentralized system, English teachers had traditionally been free to determine their own curriculum and pedagogy within broad guidelines. They believed a deeper commitment to this process would develop greater self-confidence, a sense of accomplishment, and an understanding of the curriculum. Type III teachers understood the National Curriculum as providing a framework or broad guidelines for teachers, but allowing them flexibility in curriculum choices. For this type of teacher, the major difference from before the National Curriculum was that though they were
encouraged to develop their own curriculum according to the needs of their own pupils, they should ensure that they operated within the guidelines provided by the National Curriculum. They ‘freely’ translated the ‘guidelines’ into specific programmes in their classroom, whereas a majority of Korean teachers gave priority to interpreting curriculum documents ‘accurately’ and were willing to adhere to their directions and implement them ‘faithfully’. As we saw from their negative reactions to the new ‘literacy hour’ which indicated not only specific contents but also teaching methods, these English teachers were not likely to welcome a more dictated curriculum and even greater governmental intervention in curriculum development. Overall, this type of teacher was strongly aware of ‘a sense of ownership’ in curriculum development.

What I have called ‘Type II’ teachers, a very broad category, were found as a significant minority [II-k] in Korea and a half [II-e] of the sample in England. Like Type III, these teachers regarded their curriculum authority as a major characteristic of professional teachers. However, unlike Type III, they experienced ‘decision deprivation’; that is, ‘their desired participation in school system decision-making was greater than their actual participation’ (Alutto and Belasco, 1972: 27-8). While identifying with the role of extended autonomy in curriculum development, they felt ‘acted upon’ rather than ‘acting’ in current curriculum practice.

Thus my empirical data showed that a few Korean teachers [Type II-k] were not impressed by the efforts of the sixth National Curriculum towards decentralization. They perceived this new curriculum as still ‘power over’ and bureaucratic, despite its intention to encourage teachers’ own judgement. They would have preferred an active involvement in curriculum development, and were not satisfied with implementing what they saw as an over-prescriptive and still highly centralized curriculum.

For the Type II-e English teachers, the re-centralization of curriculum control appeared to them under the aspects of pressure and control from the government. They felt that their professionalism was changed, and significantly different from before. Because they believed themselves to be already knowledgeable enough for curriculum decision-making, they felt a corresponding ‘deprivation of autonomy’. From this perspective, the term ‘deskilling’, which indicates that ‘in one’s labour, lack of use leads to loss’, truly describes what these teachers perceived about their professionalism in practice:
When individuals cease to plan and control a large portion of their own work, the skills essential to doing these tasks self-reflectively and well atrophy and are forgotten. The skills that teachers have built up over decades of hard work - setting relevant curricular goals, establishing content, designing lessons and instructional strategies, individualizing instruction based on intimate knowledge of students’ desires and needs, and so on - are lost (Apple and Tatelbaum, 1986: 180).

As we could recognize from identifying and studying these different types of teachers, no absolute judgements could be made about the conditions which promote ‘professionalization’ or ‘deprofessionalization’. Since teachers’ understandings of these concepts were related to the differences in how they identified their role in a particular cultural context, the changing mode of the government’s curriculum control, whether it involved decentralization in Korea or centralization in England, might be seen by teachers to lead either way, towards ‘professionalization’ or ‘deprofessionalization’ in their curriculum practice.

Although Korean teachers were forced by the government to work under conditions which continued to impose constraints on their teaching, they were given a great deal of flexibility in their classrooms. In this respect, the majority of the Korean teachers [Type I] in my study did not regard participation in curriculum decision-making beyond their classrooms as an integral part of their professionalism and might well feel fully in command of their curriculum practice. They believed in developing their professionalism by following detailed curriculum guidelines which shaped teachers’ choices and their curriculum practices in the actual achieving of teaching. While the teachers had little flexibility in the circumstances of a centralized curriculum system, they felt that their power and potential effectiveness in the classroom might be increased relatively in charge of classroom teaching.

As we saw when reviewing the history of education in England, schemes of external evaluation, such as payment by results and the 11+ examination, had traditionally been the main apparatus to control the primary school curriculum and teachers, with or without direct control over curriculum and pedagogy. The National Curriculum was more concerned with criteria for the attainment of targets and evaluation requirements than with detailed subject contents and pedagogy. It centred on what should be achieved and attained in the end, and therefore the role of assessment became crucial in controlling schooling and teachers.
From this perspective, the National Curriculum and its assessment system imposed centralized control on teachers by emphasizing cognitive learning which could be measured through tests. Although this kind of control limited 'the space available for pedagogic appropriations' (Bernstein, 1996b), it did not inhibit teachers' access to alternative practices in classroom. The implementation of these changes by those English teachers who in my study were identified as Type III showed that although these teachers perceived strong governmental intervention which caused some changes in their classroom practice, their professionalism was still in the state of 'extended autonomy'.

Although Types I and III had opposing understandings of their professional role in curriculum development, both types of teachers were involved in their own ways of professionalization; while Type I teachers, in Korea, developed their professionalism in the restricted sense of concern with their core responsibilities for classroom interaction, Type III teachers, in England, practised their professionalism through maintaining their autonomy concerning the curriculum and teaching methods.

By contrast, Types II-k and II-e teachers in both countries were experiencing 'deprofessionalization' in their curriculum practice. Although these types of teachers recognized current changes in the same way as Type I, as experiencing 'power over' control from the government which limited their role in implementing the curriculum, they regarded these situations as seriously reducing their autonomous role, and saw teachers' professionalism as at stake. This is because the professionalism cherished by Types II-k and II-e teachers, like Type III, is associated with an acceptance of the 'extended autonomy' notion of curriculum development. Although these types of teachers in both countries were predominantly critical of the impact of the curriculum on their professionalism, we have seen the important differences between the two groups arising from the difference in curriculum context in the two countries.

My interviews and observations suggest that the braver and progressive teachers in Korea [Type II-k] were more likely than the others to be critical of 'the centralized traditions' of the National Curriculum. The sixth National Curriculum may have attempted to loosen the previous strict guidance and control, but no major structural alteration was intended. The changes proposed were not sufficient to promote alternative approaches for these teachers, in particular, because teachers' curriculum practice was still regulated
through issuing the textbooks, which combined prescriptive guidelines for both subject content and pedagogy. Thus, although a basically negative stance towards the National Curriculum may not be the most practical one to adopt in England, it may be the only reasonable one in Korea for those who value 'extended autonomy'.

Type III teachers in England were more likely than others to be 'comfortable' with recent changes and the National Curriculum. Possibly, some of this type should be regarded as unrealistic, adopting the new curriculum authority in theory, but underestimating its demands in practice. Probably, however, they were the more confident and experienced ones, who could work towards the imposed targets by devising their own curriculum. Therefore, we need to ask whether Type II-k in Korea and Type III in England were actually those who should be most highly valued.

9.2 The Possibilities and Limitations of Teachers' Professionalism in Different Cultural Contexts: Some Broad and Tentative Recommendations

As for understanding teachers' professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum development, it should be noted that the designation of the conceptions of curriculum control patterns and professionalism in the literature, deriving mainly from several typologies referring to ideal types, is constructed from the general and traditionally held views of characteristics of curriculum development and professionalism (see Chapter 2). As I emphasized with reference to the findings of my empirical study, the characteristics of teachers' professionalism have been shaped by social, political, educational and institutional cultures in very complicated ways. Professional differences exist among teachers in any case, and not all teachers are likely to be willing to alter their professional values whatever they might be (Nias, 1992).

In comparing the relationships between teachers' professionalism and government policy and action in the two countries, emphasis has been put on the extent to which in each case intervention has contributed, or not, to teachers' professionalism, and in which ways. An implication of the discussion is that one way to improve the situation in either country is to start from a careful consideration of the nature of teachers' relations to others in that country's own cultural setting. Teachers' perceptions of professionalism in relation
to curriculum practice have essentially reflected the power structure within which they operate. Viewed in this light, the relationship between teachers' professionalism and government intervention can be clarified. Understanding the differences between the two countries may make its own contribution to this process of classification leading to enhancement of professionalism.

In Korea, since the central government is the major employer of teachers, they are influenced by certain tensions engendered in the employer-employee relationship (see Chapter 4). Consequently, continuities in the conditions that provide the background of government policy affect the changing forms of this relationship, and the pattern of control over teaching accordingly. As I analysed in Chapter 6, teachers have accepted not only the legal and social prestige of the civil servant, but also the requirement it lays upon them. In addition, hierarchical patterns based on dominance and dependence or superiority and subordination are continued in school. The headteachers' authoritarian assignment of school-based curriculum development to specific master teachers hindered other teachers' active participation in curriculum development. Teachers adapted to this school culture, which was very bureaucratic and hierarchical, in the process of their professional development. In this situation, they were likely to avoid or minimize risks and problems. Teachers' acceptance of this role is made evident by analysing the empirical data which have shown that most Korean teachers were reluctant to manage all aspects of curriculum by themselves, without the usual specificity of guideline from the government.

In England, the National Curriculum has strengthened the central government's position, while it has weakened the teachers' power over curriculum decisions in their classroom. English teachers have long had an ideology of professional control of the curriculum, so that teaching could legitimately claim, or at least aspire, to be a self-governing occupation and a profession. Broadfoot et al. (1993: 119-20) made a similar contrast by making a comparison between teachers' perceptions of their own professionalism in England and in France which had a highly centralized educational policy like Korea: 'where English educational tradition emphasizes the sanctity of the individual and his rights, French educational tradition emphasizes the contrasting value of central control as the guarantee of equality and national unity'. Moreover, in English primary schools before the National Curriculum, teachers' control of the curriculum often
meant the headteacher's control within each school. Under the National Curriculum, headteachers are supposed to exercise control to the extent that they have the power to decide whether or not to set limits on teachers' control of the curriculum. However, the majority of headteachers in my study did not lay down the actual content of the curriculum in their schools, but only set general guidelines.

The recent changes in direction of the central government's control in both countries is making it clear to teachers that they need to be aware of their own role and responsibility as teachers, and to judge the situation in which they find themselves. Increasing governmental control, and consequent reduced professional control, or vice-versa, may not imply that professionalism can simply be pushed out or pumped in. The nature of teachers' traditions and 'self-imposed' professional responsibility continue to shape the characteristics of professionalism in each country: Korean teachers generally feel obliged to fulfill government or public expectations in order to meet their duty as civil servants; English teachers generally feel obliged to protect a large degree of extended autonomy as integral to their professionalism (see Chapter 8).

A question which has been raised in the current situations in both countries is how will current changes impact on teachers' professionalism in the coming decades. How can their own traditions and concepts of professionalism survive or develop within new contexts in both countries? As we have seen from the results of my enquiries, simple compliance is certainly undesirable, since it would mean teachers' loss of resistance to external control and their lack of awareness of alternatives.

The changes themselves have not been simple in either country. In Korea, some decentralization through options on course content and on various teaching methods, and a new emphasis on formative assessment, were accompanied by the preservation of textbooks of the same style as before and traditional bureaucratic regulation, while in England, the move to more centralization through the National Curriculum, stressing assessment, was combined with a decentralized system for managing schooling.

In Korea, the development of a more effective decentralization requires not merely further governmental amendment but, most importantly, teachers' attitudinal change. In traditional hierarchical subordination to the government, teachers have been instilled with passivity, and this has generated indifference to curriculum development. The teachers still
depended much more on the National Curriculum and on the traditional hierarchy in school rather than their own judgements and collaborative work with colleagues. They were not convinced that they really had the power of decision-making, despite the intentions of the sixth National Curriculum.

To overcome current problems, the government would most of all need to demonstrate its keenness for active participation by teachers, and teachers would need to see teachers' curriculum authority as a matter of professionalism. As I pointed out in Chapter 6, only a minority of Korean teachers had a more than 'adaptive' sense of curriculum ownership. Perhaps the most significant block on the development of a professionalism that reaches towards a more extended autonomy is the belief that it already exists.

The sixth National Curriculum's attempts to offer teachers a chance to use their expertise in moving towards extended autonomy was at a 'surface' not a 'deep' level. Yet through the experience of the sixth National Curriculum, teachers have become aware of possibilities in their role and responsibilities. The discussions of the seventh National Curriculum for the twenty-first century seem to suggest further steps towards a more decentralized system and more opportunities for teachers to become actively engaged in curriculum development (KICE, 1998). In my view, the future development of professionalism in Korea should eventually include 'extended autonomy'.

One of the problems which is commonly indicated in discussion of recent educational reform in Korea is its half-hearted and partial nature (Ahn, 1997). Reforms should focus on the practical issues, so as to address the realities of the profession, and identify the choices that the teachers must make to meet the challenge of a new curriculum role. The recommendations of OECD for the teaching profession in Korea made this point:

That very close attention be given in the reform process to the policy issues, variously taken up in the Education Reform proposals, that have as their central objective the development of a Korean teaching profession that is broadly conceived, has enough members to meet the increasing demand for teachers and for new categories of education and training professionals, and is managed and organised at provincial/municipal and local levels so that all educational professionals can become actively involved in educational development in their professional area (OECD, 1998: 199).

As my empirical data and much other research (Taylor et al., 1996; 1994; 1991;
1990; Broadfoot, 1996; Broadfoot et al., 1993; Nias et al., 1992; 1989; Nias, 1989) has shown, English teachers, accustomed to decentralized curriculum control, were likely to resist governmental attempts to enforce changes in the measure that they read them as diminishing their professional autonomy. Type II-e teachers who were unconvinced of some merits of centralized curriculum control, would, in particular, have to be persuaded to relinquish some of their previous discretion in curriculum decision-making (Johnson, 1993). The search for an appropriate professionalism that could reconcile the interests of teachers and the central government must continue. On this point, Lawton (1984: 15) commented on the relation between national guidelines and professional autonomy: 132

The existence of national guidelines on the school curriculum is not necessarily in conflict with the idea of professional autonomy: an individual teacher can still exercise professional judgement about exactly what to teach (and when) provided that the national (or regional) prescriptions are not set out in the form of detailed syllabuses or lesson plans. If the national framework consisted of no more than a list of areas (or even subjects) then that would leave the school and individual teacher with plenty of professional room to move in.

In introducing the latest government proposals for the revision of the National Curriculum 2000, which were described as ‘minimal and low-key’, David Blunkett, the Education Secretary, seemed to emphasize that teachers should have flexibility to use their professional judgement (although he had introduced the much more prescriptive literacy and numeracy hours in primary schools): ‘the National Curriculum introduced by the Tories between 1988 and 1992 was overloaded and too prescriptive...Instead of a national curriculum, there will be a basic framework within which schools can develop their own approaches’ (QCA, 1999: iii). 133

132 Before 1988 Act, Lawton was arguing for a National Curriculum, but not the one which the English have now. I refer to his proposal here to emphasize an appropriate balance and relationship between national guidelines and professionalism. In this respect, Lawton (1996: 13) took the critical view that ‘the [1988] National Curriculum was a top-down, political-bureaucratic programme imposed on teachers who were marginalised by the whole 1988 Act, which was deliberately anti-professional in several ways. It appealed to market force rather than planning and to parental choice rather than professionalism of teachers whose status was reduced to that of employees required to carry out orders’.

133 In November 1999, the government published the revised blueprint for what every child between the age five and sixteen will be required to learn in school from September 2000. Nick Tate, chief
On the whole, the traditional socialization of teachers shapes beliefs and attitudes about teaching, which cannot be changed quickly. Teachers should be prompted to clarify their own beliefs about teaching and encouraged to consider the appropriateness of alternatives for their own classroom settings. Teachers are able to offer alternatives and make adjustments, and professionalism means that teachers should not be obstructed from adopting a broad view of the context in which they perform their services. The responsibility for the curriculum is a professional matter, and those without teaching experience and knowledge of individual children are not competent to make curricular decisions.

One of the central pillars of this study is concern with teachers' professionalism, and how it has been determined and enhanced. The reality is that teacher control has operated within a very different cultural context in each country, although, at present, there are certain significant constraints, such as accountability and bureaucracy, in both countries. In general the expansion of government control has limited teachers' options for advancing important aspects of their professionalism. However, teachers' control of the curriculum has been limited not only by the intervention of the government, but also by their own narrow interpretation of curricular prescriptions, and narrow decisions on how to implement these in practice. As Lawton (1984: 20) emphasized, 'the new centralism or decentralism will only be acceptable if it is based on sound educational principles; bureaucratic or political dogma will not do'. Most of all, the application of such principles can be achieved by the contribution of teachers, although it is not easy to elaborate upon the extent to which teachers should develop the curriculum to suit their specific circumstances: 'the ways of changing how teachers think will in turn impact upon what they do' (Broadfoot et al., 1993: 127).

Despite significant differences in their different cultural contexts, what is needed for executive of the QCA, emphasized that: 'the curriculum is much clearer and much less prescriptive than what we had before. What we tried to do this time was to give schools greater freedom in most subjects. Many aspects have been clarified and slimmed down' (Guardian Education, 16/11, 1999: 3).

Broadfoot (1996: 223) referred to these terms as 'moral' accountability, the responsiveness of the system to clients, and 'bureaucratic' accountability, the responsiveness of the system to the formal bureaucratic hierarchy.
teachers in both countries to enhance their professionalism in curriculum development, as a common core of professionalism in Korea and England, is for them to become more capable as teachers; teachers' professionalism has not developed according to the extent of teachers' autonomy but rather through making use of professional expertise. The teachers would need to use or implement existing or changed structures in appropriate ways. Any attempt to change the balance of curriculum control between teachers and government has to be initiated with the assent of teachers. The practice of the classroom should be generated by teachers' sense of ownership and the confidence that they can play a vital role in shaping the curriculum. Teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards any change of curriculum control, rather than the nature of the change itself, are in both countries the most important factors in its implementation.
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Appendix 1 The Letter to School

Dear Headteacher

I have a great favour to ask of you and your school. But, first, let me introduce myself. I am a Korean educationist, until recently employed at the Korean Educational Development Institute. Currently I am a researcher at the University of London Institute of Education, working with Professor Denis Lawton and Dr. Patrick Walsh, studying primary teachers’ perceptions of professionalism in relation to government interventions in curriculum. The study is a comparative one, six primary schools in Seoul and nine in London. In both England and Korea there have been important changes in the role of government in curriculum: in England more centralization, in Korea some decentralization. My research examines the perceptions that teachers in the two countries have of these changes.

Of course I know the schools in Seoul better than schools in London. But I am gaining some appreciation of one English primary school as a mother to my 7 year old son.

Your school was suggested by my supervisors as ideal for my purposes. Would you permit it to be included among my nine London schools? I am planning to conduct my field study between October, 1998 and January, 1999. I fully understand that it is a very delicate time to request teachers to take on extra paperwork. Furthermore I am aware how little spare time teachers have. I think that my questionnaire and interview with your teachers could be a good opportunity to express opinions about the situation of teachers. I shall be very grateful if you allow me to do this research in your school.

What you would be consenting to is ONE VISIT from me. The visit would last approximately half a day. During that time I would wish to interview you the Headteacher and one other teacher, preferably either a Year Two teacher or a Year Six teacher if available. These interviews are designed to last 45 minutes, but because my English is a bit slow it would be safer to say 60 minutes each. I would also leave questionnaires for two teachers, preferably of grades between Year One and Year Six, to complete and return to me. If there is some time left over I would greatly appreciate a chance to observe a class in action and thus to catch some of the spirit of the school.

I shall be very grateful if you agree. Professionalism is an important topic, and I would take good care of the data and protect the anonymity and confidentiality of the school and the teachers. I should be most grateful if you could suggest a time which would be suitable for me to visit you.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Meesuk Ahn
Curriculum Studies Academic Group
Institute of Education, University of London
Fax 0171-612-6330
E-mail ammpcup@ioe.ac.uk

For Korean study, the date was “December 1997.”

For Korean study, I modified this part as following: “Would you permit it to be included among my six Korean schools? What you would be consenting to is TWO VISITS from me. The first would be a brief one: I would call, perhaps around coffee or lunch-time, to give questionnaires to around twelve teachers, preferably two teachers for each grade between Year One and Year Six, and to you the Headteacher. The second visit would be about a week later and would last approximately half a day. During that time I would wish to interview you and two other teachers, one Year One and one Year Five teachers.
Appendix 2 The Questionnaire

Curriculum Studies Academic Group
Institute of Education, University of London
20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL

Dear Teacher:

I am doing some research at the Institute of Education, University of London, working with Professor Denis Lawton and Dr. Patrick Walsh, on curriculum development in England and Korea.

Your expertise is requested regarding a very timely and important educational matter - the role of teachers in curriculum development. Your experience will aid my efforts to provide valuable insights to analyse the relationship between teachers and government in curriculum development.

The instrument requests information about you and your perception concerning curriculum development and professionalism. It is hoped that the data may contribute to the development of teachers' professionalism in both countries.

The replies which you make will be treated as strictly confidential. No attempt will be made at any stage to identify individual teachers. So please do not sign your name anywhere. At no time will you be referred to by name nor will your school. The questionnaires should take no more than 45 minutes to complete.

There are five parts to the questionnaires:
   Personal information
   Curriculum development and professionalism
   National curriculum
   Government’s and Teachers’ roles and responsibilities
   General opinion of curriculum development and professionalism

I should be most grateful if you could fill in these questionnaires as soon as possible. I very much hope you will be able to spare the time to complete the entire form as the information will be of such value in my research work.

Could I, as a special favour, ask you to complete the questionnaires over the next few days and return it in the reply-paid envelope provided.

Thank you for your assistance with my research. Your participation in this study is deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Meesuk Ahn
Please share your experience and background by providing the information which is requested on this questionnaire. Complete all questions. Your participation and assistance are greatly appreciated.

Part One - Personal Information

The questions will ask you to respond by means of a tick(✔) for the answer.

1. Please indicate whether you are:
   ___ A. Male
   ___ B. Female

2. What is your position in school?
   ___ A. Headteacher
   ___ B. Classroom teacher

3. How long have you been a teacher?
   ___ A. 1-4 years
   ___ B. 5-10 years
   ___ C. 11-20 years
   ___ D. Over 20 years

4. What year of children are you teaching?
   ___ A. Year One
   ___ B. Year Two
   ___ C. Year Three
   ___ D. Year Four
   ___ E. Year Five
   ___ F. Year Six

5. What is your training and qualifications?
   ___ A. CertED
   ___ B. Bed
   ___ C. Degree & PGCE
Part Two - Curriculum Development and Professionalism

Teachers' view of curriculum development and professionalism

Please indicate the extent to which you agree, or disagree, with each statement below:

A. Certainly false
B. Probably false
C. Uncertain
D. Probably true
E. Certainly true

6. As a teacher I should plan the contents, teaching, and assessment for my own class.
7. My role as a teacher is rightly restricted to choosing methods of teaching.
8. Teachers should leave curriculum development to educational experts.
9. The professional teacher is good at managing a governmental prescribed curriculum and pedagogy in classroom.
10. The professional teacher is always punctual.
11. ‘Professionalism’ is more a matter of competency than status.
12. Teachers will perform better if they are given a role in curriculum development.
13. Teachers cannot be professionals if the government tells them what to teach.
14. Teachers have a higher status now than they used to have.
15. The government gets in the way of good teaching.
16. The professional teacher works well in a team.
17. The professional teacher is a good manager of the classroom.
18. Subject knowledge is the most important thing for a teacher.
19. Teachers should implement the National Curriculum unquestioningly.
20. Teacher can implement the National Curriculum creatively.
21. Teachers deserve to be paid more.
22. Society does not respect teachers enough.
23. If I were to start again, I would still be a teacher.
24. There is not enough joint planning by teachers.
25. Teacher appraisal is a positive contribution to professional development.
26. Present arrangements for school inspection are an offence to teachers’ professional pride.
27. The essential component of teacher appraisal should be self-assessment together with appraisal by senior-colleagues.
Part Three - National Curriculum

Views of the National Curriculum in primary level

*Please indicate the extent to which you agree, or disagree, with each statement as follows:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Certainly false</th>
<th>B. Probably false</th>
<th>C. Uncertain</th>
<th>D. Probably true</th>
<th>E. Certainly true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

28. The National Curriculum has the support of teachers for its general principles.
29. The majority of teachers are familiar with and get to grips with the National Curriculum.
30. The National Curriculum has not had the intended effects.
31. I think the National Curriculum enriches and broadens the educational experience and opportunities of young children.
32. The planned and delivered National Curriculum has greatly improved standards.
33. The National Curriculum provides a good framework for teaching and encourages good practice.
34. The National Curriculum is over-prescriptive, overloaded and over-demanding.
35. The National Curriculum is the major influence over what is taught in the classroom.
36. The "command-and-control" approach to the introduction of the National Curriculum leaves no space for professional discretion.
37. Assessment arrangements are the most important part of the National Curriculum.
38. The assessment arrangements in the National Curriculum should be changed.
39. National assessment should rely more on teachers' judgements.
40. Teachers have been forced to adopt more formal teaching methods by the subject-based nature of the National Curriculum.
41. The ethos of the classroom has been changed by the National Curriculum.
42. Teaching has become just a job since the National Curriculum.
43. As a result of the National Curriculum, teachers work and plan more together.
44. Assessment of standards should be done by national testing.
45. There has been inadequate resourcing for the new curriculum areas in the National Curriculum.
46. Mandated textbooks are a good idea.
47. Primary teachers should be generalists rather than subjects-specialists.
48. My school divides the curriculum into distinct subject with no project work and no attempt at integration.
49. Most teachers integrate subjects into project work whenever they feel it is appropriate.
50. The major task of primary teachers is the promotion of basic skills.
51. The National Curriculum is appropriate to promote the basic skills of young children.

Part Four - Government's and Teachers' Roles and Responsibilities

Your opinion about the relative roles and responsibilities of government and teachers over curriculum

Please indicate the extent to which you agree, or disagree, with each statement as follows:

A. Certainly false
B. Probably false
C. Uncertain
D. Probably true
E. Certainly true

52. The relationship of teachers to government has changed since 1988 (since the sixth National Curriculum in Korea).
53. Teachers' professional relationship to government has become more collaborative since 1988 (since the sixth National Curriculum in Korea).
54. Teachers should be civil servants.
55. Government curriculum agencies (eg: SCAA, QCA in England; KEDI in Korea) have been a positive influence.
56. Standards in primary education are higher than they used to be.
57. The status of primary teachers has become lower in recent years.
58. The quality of primary teachers has been slipping since the government took over the curriculum.
59. Government supports teachers well.
60. Government plays an important role in supporting the continued professional development of teachers (INSET).
61. Recent government interventions in teacher education have been positive on the whole.
62. Teachers have more power than before

How much in fact do you consider each of the following when you make decisions on curriculum and pedagogy (63-74)? How much should influence should they have ideally (75-82)?

Please indicate the degree of importance with each statement as follows:

A. No importance
B. Little importance
C. Some importance
D. Very important
E. Most important

* IN FACT
63. Government policies and advice
64. LEA policies
65. Requirement of the Inspectorates
66. School governors' policies
67. School policies (eg: School Development Plan)
68. Textbooks requirements
69. Your own beliefs and conceptions
70. Previous educational experiences
71. Characteristics of pupils
72. The interrelationship of different subject matters
73. Preparation for standardized tests
74. Views of parents
How important IDEALLY, in your opinion, is each of the following in determining the curriculum?

* IDEALLY

75. Government
76. LEA
77. The Inspectorates
78. School Governors
79. The Headteacher
80. The Teacher
81. The Pupils
82. Parents

MY OWN SKILL: As a teacher, I am confident that I have the following competencies in curriculum development.

Please indicate the extent of your confidence regarding each item as follows:

A. Very unconfident
B. Quite unconfident
C. Uncertain
D. Quite confident
E. Very confident

83. Up-to-date subject knowledge
84. Identifying conceptual structure of the subjects I teach
85. Identifying skills in the subjects I teach
86. Reviewing existing practice
87. Constructing a programme scheme
88. Implementing a programme scheme
89. Evaluating a programme scheme
90. Choosing between available resources
91. Deciding about methods
92. Identifying links between subjects
A. Very unconfident
B. Quite unconfident
C. Uncertain
D. Quite confident
E. Very confident

93. Ordering, maintaining resources
94. Relating what I teach to what my pupils will be taught in later years
95. Leading workshops and discussions
96. Liaising with the head and senior staff
97. Advising colleagues informally
98. Teaching alongside colleagues
99. Visiting colleagues’ class to see work in progress
100. Maintaining colleagues’ morale, reducing anxiety etc.
101. Dealing with professional disagreement
102. Consulting advisers, curriculum mediators etc.
103. Consulting teachers in other schools

How could you describe yourself as a teacher?

104. A craftsman or craftswoman who draws practical knowledge from my experiences for the benefit of my pupils.
105. One who conveys specialist knowledge to pupils in an objective way.
106. An authoritative manager of classroom and pupils’ learning.
107. Essentially a member of the teaching and learning community.

108. What are your present roles and responsibilities in curriculum development? Please make a list.

A. __________________________________________

B. __________________________________________

C. __________________________________________

D. __________________________________________
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109. What should be the teacher's roles and responsibilities in curriculum development? Please make a list.

A. 
B. 
C. 
D. 

Part Five - General Opinion of Curriculum Development and Professionalism

110. What is your final goal in your career? And what is needed for it?

A. Goal 
B. Needs 

111. Is there anything I haven't asked about curriculum development and professionalism that you think is important/should have been asked? Please make any comments you wish on issues raised in this questionnaire.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
Appendix 3 The Interview

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this interview. Until recently I employed Korean governmental research institute. Since last year I am doing some research at Institute of Education, University of London. I am conducting research on the topic of curriculum development and professionalism. Specifically, I am interested in comparing Korean and English teachers’ perceptions of professionalism in relation to government intervention in curriculum. In both England and Korea there have been important changes in the role of government in curriculum; in England more centralization, in Korea some decentralization. My research examines the perceptions that teachers in two countries have of these changes.

The interview is about your professional opinion and experience of curriculum and professionalism. The interview will take 45 minutes to an hour to complete and will make a valuable contribution to enhance teachers’ professionalism. Some interview questions will ask you to describe the current situation and others will ask you to give your opinion as an individual teacher and a member of school staff as well.

I want to assure you that you will remain completely anonymous and no records of this interview will be kept with your name on it. I would like to request your permission to tape-record the interview to help me in the analysis of the data collected. No other individuals will have access to the recording. May I tape-record the interview?

Please do not mind if I suddenly cut you short on some of the questions. Because other questions I really would like longer answers on. Please do not be defended if I do that.

Personal Profile

Could I just fill a few background details?

1. ________ School
2. Sex
3. How long have you been a headteacher or primary teacher?
4. What year of children are you teaching?
Teacher, National Curriculum and Government

1. In your opinion, what is the aim of the National Curriculum? Does that match your own aims? Is it the same as yours?

2. How do you plan your teaching under the National Curriculum? Has this changed since 1988 in England (1992 in Korea)?

3. To what extent do you consider the following when you are deciding on subject contents and teaching strategies?
   First of all government policies?
   How important are LEA polices in your planning, the way you work?
   How important are the SATs at the end of key stages?
   To what extent do you stick (stay with) your own beliefs?

   How have any of these changed since 1988 in England (1992 in Korea)?

4. Of the following who has the major role in deciding how the National Curriculum will be implemented in your school?
   School governors/ Headteacher/ Teacher/ Parents/ Pupils

5. What would you say are your responsibilities regarding the curriculum?

   Are you simply following the government’s plan?

   What is your role in enhancing curriculum in your school?

   Do you feel that you have the power to make decisions over the curriculum?

6. How do you feel about the National Curriculum?
   Do you feel it’s appropriate?

   Do you feel that the contents of the curriculum are suitable for the children that you teach?

   Does it really demand a lot of you as a teacher? Can you manage to cover the National Curriculum?

7. How has the National Curriculum affect your way of assessing children?

   Has it increased your professional skill in assessment?

   Are you able to assess everything that you are meant to assess?
Professionalism

8. What does being professional mean to you? Could you describe a professional teacher?

9. Do you think there have been changes in teacher’s attitudes to professionalism since 1988 in England (1992 in Korea)?

10. Do you have teacher appraisal in your school?

   What do you feel about that as far as professional development is concerned?

   Do you believe that it’s good idea that school should be inspected?

   Does it help the teacher’s professionalism?

11. Do you think that there is more and more control coming from central government?

   How does that make you feel?

Is there anything else you want to tell me about working with curriculum and your own professionalism?

Your participation and assistance is greatly appreciated.
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