

Studying the Attitude Changing Centralized Todecentralized Educational System on High School (Case Study: Bushehr's Administrators and Teachers)

Sh. Dehghan Bagh Bardani

Department of Philosophy-Science and Education, Islamic Azad University,
Bushehr Branch, Bushehr, Iran

Abstract: Ministry of education such as any other organization is a combination of set of people that are responsible for mutual functions and relationships and work to achieve an objective or a certain common objective. Most of organizations look at decentralization to achieve greater efficiency and to re-build their organizations. The purpose of this study is to examine administrators and teachers' attitude of high school in the context of changing educational system from centralized to decentralized system in Bushehr. The general purpose of study is to measure the educational administrator and teachers' attitude, namely, in general, a range of people involved in training, about management in decentralized style in education structure.

Key words: Education system, decentralized, centralized and education, common objective, Bushehr

INTRODUCTION

Office style of each country is largely a function of the political, economic, geographical, time and place, beliefs situation and opinions overcome on society and in general, a function of population or the political, social and cultural growth of that community. Focus is a function about how much decision-making power has been transferred to lower levels of organization. No organization is completely centralized or completely decentralized. Today, administrators, chose the amount of concentration or decentralization to help them to implement their decisions and achieve organizational goals.

The centralization and decentralization are the issues which has been the debate and conflict of training and education policies of scholars in education history. The last one hundred years history, namely, twentieth century, only indicates that many education systems have been grappling with the issue of centralization and decentralization. Each of the decision-making systems have their own advantages and dis-advantages and requirements. Iran's high school system has centralized features and often in response to problems look for the restoration of decentralized system. The occurrence of this phenomenon, namely, the decentralization in the education system structure happens in various components such as decision-making, administrative and financial structure and (Mehrmohammadi, 2007).

In centralized scheduling structure, scheduling usually is provided by central institution and districts and

schools are required to loyally implement it. In a decentralized curriculum system, all the authorities delegated to lower levels and each of the units have its own discretion (Goya and Iyzadi, 2003).

In recent decades, the decentralization in education in order to maximize the contribution of lower levels and enhance the legitimacy and effectiveness of educational systems and better implementation of curricula, has been developing and most countries around the world have followed it. This debate history date back to 1950 decade. At that time, curriculum was provided by experts and subject experts, that has the main task in producing curriculum and teachers, as a consumer, were just administrator of produced curriculum. Due to extensive changes in the area of science and technology as well as the inefficiency of curricula that were provided in centralized style, move towards decentralized programs and increasing participation and interest groups were begun in curriculum decisions. In fact, schools and teachers were considered as influential forces in the curricula and programs like: "decision-making on school environment" "school-based curriculum" and "school-based management" was proposed. Studies of educational decentralization experiences in different countries shows that despite the improvement of education quality has always been a concern for the educational system, the aim of decentralizing has not only been improving quality of education but also this reforms has been influenced by social, political, cultural and economic community changes (Gooya and Ghada-Kesazkhosroshahi, 2007).

Examining the attitudes of managers and teachers of high schools in conjunction with centralized and decentralized systems as people who directly deal with the educational system is very important. So this article investigates the attitude of teachers and administrators in the context of changing centralized to decentralized education system.

Centralized and decentralized systems: Centralized systems was traditional and dominant view in most countries of the world until the late twentieth century. In these systems the whole authority to decide is for the central government and usually units and lower levels have no right to decide. In fact, lower units, are operator of central government policies and strict control is applied over them. But in the decentralized system, the central government will delegate authority to lower units of the Institute. Of course, the central government to coordinate the implementation of the programs monitor them. Lack of focus include: Transferring a part or all of decisions-making and responsibilities of central power to local authorities or regions (units, municipalities, institutions or schools themselves). Local or regional powers may change curriculum priorities, teaching methods and educational management with regard to the budgets and expenses or adjust themselves with them (Shirazi, 2006).

Decentralization is a concept used versus centralization. According to experts, there is no absolute centralization and decentralization. But to better understand these two concept we can consider absolute focus and absolute lack of focus on the two ends of a spectrum by the following characteristics.

Centralization and decentralization in the area of curriculum: Centralization in the curriculum system is largely rooted in the context of political, historical, social and economic system of countries education. In the centralized system the public tendency is toward centralized control at all stages of design and production of curriculum, explaining the goals of the school and from curriculum codification to curriculum implementation and evaluation of program results and students learnings (Goodarzi and Khandeghi, 2006). The message of centralized curriculum is that proving and developing curriculum is not teachers' task (Gooya and Izadi, 2006) But that's the state curriculum development centers and offices that need to have all the steps involved in designing and developing and delivering programs and teachers and instructors is only prescribed curriculum which may highly blocked the authority and influence of the teacher. Although, the centralization is necessary to

prepare the curriculum, even in concentrated systems, local employees are responsible to do tasks. In such cases, central governments usually have a desire to be involved; because of local resources without resorting to center, often meet not necessities.

Research background: Champion in a study entitled "Evaluation of centralized and decentralized systems of educational planning from the perspective of Technical Education Schools' managers" achieved the following results: Fundamental and structural planning and management of centralized educational system has more correlation and utility than decentralized system.

Focus on technical and vocational education system planning and management performance compared with a decentralized system would have more problems, focus on determination and legislation related to financial costs and attract compared with decentralized educational system which leads to drop system performance, in the decentralized educational system, there is no constructive and positive interaction between technical education system and economic and social environment, in the centralized education system, motivation, creativity and innovation of employees will decreased, in comparison with decentralized education system, in centralized one, the evaluation process is not performed completely and effectively and finally, there is positive correlation between managers education level and their tendency to establish decentralized education system.

Berman centralization and decentralization in various educational system structure such as decision-making, official and financial structure and etc., including the curriculum is done. Researcher and experts stressed that even if undertaken decentralization of the curriculum, we should determine a place for centralization until the central government ensures that children in all regions of the country have subsistence and central government to determine the subsistence, should consider educational standards and make ever body to implement them. Berman et al mention that the need for educational standards in the decentralized education system compared with centralized systems is more felt.

Yarmohammadian have conducted a research titled feasibility and solutions to make educational system decentralized in response to the question of what powers delegated to the agencies, school districts or regions and schools. The statistical society was educational sciences faculty, administrative and management sciences of Isfahan. The majority of respondents considers decisions-making about curriculum and educational issues for ministries, culture affairs for school and

educational district, school administration, district administration for ministry and the relevant issues in the field of research and planning for ministries and provincial administrations found and the Ministry of education.

Mehrmohammadi (2007) in a study by rejecting dualist thinking in the field of education and curriculum, defines this idea in the discussion of centralization and decentralization inefficient. In other words, in the proposed model, polar look is considered as the same support or total denial of traumatic local centralization and decentralization. From this perspective, with presenting the designs and decision-making releasing dimensions level about curriculum (in six formats: Zero or subtle releasing, releasing textbooks learning resources production, releasing the choice through guidelines, releasing a part of curriculum guidelines releasing the whole traditional curriculum, releasing a part of weekly school hours) there have been attempts to be traced the participation in different sectors and institutions in this area.

The proposed model by considering six basic principles such as: the need for decentralization of the curriculum, releasing levels identification, various conditions and capacities cognition in different regions of country, changing the capacities and conditions, possible to simultaneously log all releasing management levels in the curriculum project management supports a model in curriculum management that could be described as core and chaotic. It claims that in the provinces and regions of the country can experience the releasing potential in all six levels of releasing to the circumstances and characteristics. In general, there seems chaotic or core pattern (simultaneous managing and curricula) has paid less attention to facts and complexity of the existing education system. From this perspective, it can be romantic and dreamy curriculum considered among the models that have little relationship to the realities of curriculum areas (Iran's ministry of education and curriculum).

For example, assuming such conditions, can you look at all the decisions of the curriculum in all releasing provinces and territories? Is this macro-political-social permissible? And numerous questions such as these. Hence, it seems that performing such changes in curricula system according to the existing structure is very difficult.

Fathi-Vajargah and Mehrmohammadi (1999) in a study entitled Feasibility of teacher participation in curriculum development process in Iran's education system by using survey, teacher participation feasibility in Iran's curriculum and outcomes and its consequences are examined from the perspective of teachers. The overall results indicate

that teachers can be involved in different areas that their most notably is proposals for approved curriculum modification, adapting the curriculum proposed with region condition and designing appropriate educational programs. Such research findings show that providing teachers' participation contexts in school level and some neighboring schools is supported more.

Vang decentralization process in curriculum recent reform of Japan and Hong Kong suggests that there is serious political concerns to promote particular basic skills and qualities through authority submission to control curriculum from the schools. Of course, performing the taken actions and process, to change decentralization in the curriculum has been in two different countries. This research is done in Japan through a combination of direct assessment at an early stages and long-term policies with little intervention and legitimizing to the autonomy of schools in curriculum planning. While in Hong Kong which traditionally is less centralized and this approach in curriculum is less effective and more indirect strategies is used to encourage schools to establish full independence in taking their approaches and priorities to design and produce the schools' curricula.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The research methods is objectively practical and is kind of analyzing survey research in terms of data collection way which has been conducted in 86. The statically population of study consisted of two groups within the organization as follows: All managers of Bushehr's high schools which formally employed in the academic year 86-85 which according to the Education Department of Bushehr, their number in this educational year is 62 people. All Bushehr's high school teachers are formally employed in the academic year 86-85 which according to the Bushehr's education department static, their number are a total of 593 people.

In general, to obtain a sample size Cochran's formula is used. And for sampling first a list of all high schools in Bushehr was provided from the Department of Education. Girls and boys schools were selected randomly. Members of the teachers group were randomly classified kind and were selected almost equal to the number and managers because of their low number, the sample equal to society was selected. By studying the theoretical and experimental principles and in coordination with experts, according to the research objectives, a questionnaire with 44 questions was formulated that the questions is formed in packs of two parts: Underlying questions: these questions is considered for assessing educational

characteristics of respondents. Categories of behavior measurement: to measure the dependent variable, scalable questions are used which is based on total scores.

The mentioned questionnaire, first was distributed between 50 and alpha coefficient was 861/0 which was assessed at the appropriate level. Finally, by deleting inappropriate cases and modifying important questions, the main questionnaire with 31 questions was designed. Then, descriptive and statistical analysis on 250 questionnaires was evaluated.

In this study to describe the statistical methods such as: frequency distribution, percentage, mean, standard deviation as well as to determine findings significance level from inferential statistics: ANOVA, t-test (t) of independent groups is used. It is noteworthy that data analysis using SPSS and Excel Software is done in windows environment.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

First hypothesis: There is a significant difference between high school teachers and administrators’ attitude in tend to centralized, decentralized educational system. In Table 1 shows the t-test the first hypothesis, based on the above table the mean attitude of teachers and administrators in tend to centralized, decentralized education system is equal to 89/5053 and 95/2581, respectively which indicates that there isa difference in the attitude amount of the two groups and this difference and t-value is equal to 2/905 and degrees of freedom 248 is significant at a confidence level up to 95%. And the so-called hypothesis is confirmed. Therefore, there isa significant difference in the attitudes of teachers and administrators.

The second hypothesis: there is a significant difference between high school male and female teachers and administrators’ attitude in tend to centralized, decentralized educational system. As seen in Table 2, the mean attitude of male and female respondents in tend to centralized, decentralized education system is equal to 92/7040 and 89/1600, respectively which indicates that there is a difference in the attitude amount of the two groups and this difference and t-value is equal to 2/055 and degrees of freedom 248 is significant at a confidence level up to 95%. And the so-called hypothesis is confirmed. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the attitudes of males and females about the decentralized education system.

The third hypothesis: There is a difference between respondents’ attitude with regard to education level in tend to centralized, decentralized. The t-test of third hypothesis is determined in Table 3. According to

Table 1: The t-testof first hypothesis

Groups	Number	Attitude mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
Teacher	188	89/5053	12/70921	2/905	248	0/004
Administrator	62	95/2581	15/74795			

Table 2: The t-test of second hypothesis

Groups	Number	Attitude mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
Female	125	89/1600	15/38506	2/055	248	0/031
Male	125	92/7040	11/61897			

Table 3: The t-test of third hypothesis

Groups	Number	Attitude mean	SD	t-value	df	Sig.
B.A	205	90/0098	13/32364	2/288	248	0/023
M.A and more	45	95/1333	14/84251			

Table 4: ANOVA of fourth hypothesis

Groups (years)	Number	Attitude mean	SD
Experience			
1-10	65	91/8615	11/96463
11-20	90	89/9111	13/67738
21-30	95	91/2632	
Total	250	90/9320	

Table 5: Significant value of ANOVA hypothesis

Groups	Sum of squares	df	Mean	F-value	Sig.
Intra	16/380	2	80/190	0/424	0/655
Inter	466/46715	247	189/131		
Total	46875/864	249			

Table 3 the mean attitude of respondents with BA and more about decentralized education system is equal to 90/0098 and 95/1333, respectively which indicates that there is a difference in the attitude amount of the two groups and this difference and t-value is equal to 2/288 and degrees of freedom 248 is significant at a confidence level up to 95%. And the so-called hypothesis is confirmed. Therefore, there is a significant difference in the attitudes of respondents with regard to the education level.

The forth hypothesis: there is a significant level in respondents’ attitude in compared with decentralized system with regard to the service history. Table 4 of forth hypothesis ANOVA shows that according to above table there is no significant difference in respondent attitude with regard to their service history compared with decentralized system and F-value obtained is not significant at a confidence level up to 95% And the so-called hypothesis is not confirmed (Table 5).

CONCLUSION

According to the results obtained for each of hypothesis, the following interpretations are as follows: There is a significant differences in the attitudes of teachers and administrators in tend to decentralized system. According to the average of the two groups, administrators than teachers are more intended to decentralized system. There is a significant difference in

the attitudes of male and female teachers and administrators about the decentralized educational system. Due to the attitude of teachers and administrators, it seems that attitude of male teachers and administrators is more positive to the decentralized system.

According to the education level of teachers and administrators, we can still see that the education degree can be associated with decentralization and centralization attitude. And with regard to the comparison between groups with education degree B.A and more, they were more intended to decentralization system.

Finally, we can say that there is no significant difference between the service history level of people in attitudes towards decentralized system. Investigation of whether middle and lower-level managers in any organization, in practice, are able to manage their collections?

Investigating the attitudes of parents, students, students of Training and Educational Management about management with decentralized or centralized manner. Comparative study of education systems in countries with institutions and organizations which have more mandate and can identify their weaknesses, strengths, failures and success. Like this studies be done in other cities and provinces.

REFERENCES

- Fathi-Vajargah, K. and M. Mehrmohammadi, 1999. Dynamic and comprehensive pattern for need-assessment of curriculum. *Edu. Q.*, 1: 11-156.
- Goodarzi, M.A. and M. Khandeghi, 2006. Studying and designing the regional curriculum system. Ministry of Education, Research and Curriculum Organization, Tehran.
- Gooya, Z. and L. Ghadaksaz-Khosrowshahi, 2007. New explanation for centralization and decentralization in Iran. *Quarterly of Curriculum Studies in Iran*, pp: 17-28.
- Gooya, Z. and S. Izadi, 2003. National curriculum, centralization and decentralization on curriculum, in search of proper pattern: A report from studies in basic issues and discussions of curriculum and teaching methods. Education Research Institute, Tehran.
- Mehrmohammadi, M., 2007. Concurrent management of decentralization in curriculum system. *Q. Curriculum Stud.*, 4: 10-16.
- Shirazi, A., 2006. Preliminaries of Training Management. Aeein Trabyat Publications, Tehran.