Assessing the components of Structural and critical Social approaches in Iran's curriculum policies

Saber Hamzehei Javaran[1*] and Seyyed Mehdi Ahmadi Mousavi[2]

1- Field of Criminal Law and Criminology student, Islamic Azad University, kerman
2- Assistant professor, Field of Criminal Law and Criminology, Valiasr university of Rafsanjan

Corresponding author: Saber Hamzehei Javaran

ABSTRACT: the components of two theories and every six components of the educational objectives that were approved by critical theorists existed. but Functionalism components had a large more share.93 percent of data were Functionalist components and 7pecent of components were among of those that Functionalist were opposed to that. The most focus was on socialization that allocated 60 percent to himself. 65 percent of data were opposed to critical theories and 35 of data were approved.

Keywords: curriculum, Structural approach, critical approach, components.

INTRODUCTION

in conventional usage curriculum refers to a formal course of study, but many writers broaden the term to refer to the totality of experiences in an educational setting . All the learning which is planned and guided by the school, whether it is carried on in groups or individually, inside or outside the school As we can see The main emphasis is on learning thus. Course curriculum uses A variety of series Science that they check out ways of learning, its objective and Structure of Learning Institutions . One of these Sciences is Sociology of education that means the study of educational structures and practices from a sociological perspective.(Lawrence J. S.2011) therefore if we accepted Society as an organism that All his limbs has a task then Since the school is a public institution And where children are sociable (Parsons & Platt, 1973). Its function should be recognize to society and its structure in accordance with the general structure of society as Durkheim believed that education should act like other social institution for beneficial evolution of society (peel,1971) but if we consider Society as Two contrasting institutions then first question will be About The disadvantages of this institution as Althusser (1971) argued that schools in capitalist societies help preserve the position of dominant class by teaching the dominant ideology And ways to improve it or removing it. . in fact there are Two contrasting approaches that if we choose each of them, it lead to different results. Functionalist theorists Believe that education system must try to socialize Selfish and Unconscious person to social issues. in the second place Educational system should be an institution for learning life. indeed, In view of these theorists, The main goal of the educational system is an integrated Society In contrast to these, critical theorists believe the Purpose of education in first place must be Actual knowledge . curiosity in children Should be upgraded . in second place, student must have Opportunity to criticize the problems and With this way students reach freedom and Neither do oppression nor can see injustice. in a whole view the components of Functionalist include: age Classification of student, Socialization, Assignments and strict, the role of academic performance of students in their future career, monopolized Educational resources by the government, Delegating of future roles.(Durkheim.1995) the components of critical theorist include: Awareness of Real knowledge, Achieving critical view, freedom(Iliich.2010) It should be noted there are a few components that both of them agree whit those like creating of Equal opportunities and Talent development.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The aim of this study is Quantitative estimation of components of two approaches in Iran curriculum. hence total Approvals Iran's Supreme Council for Education reviewed Method of review is Content- analysis. the components of theories are Eight number Delegating of future roles and socialization have been selected as Functionalism component and Awareness of Real Awareness of Real Knowledge, Achieving critical view and Freedom have been selected as critical components. Talent development, skill development and creating of Equal opportunities are the components that both of two approaches agreed with them.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Tabel:1 The overall goals of the education system			
Data	Component	Number	Educational area
3	Talent development	1	Aims
0	creating of Equal opportunities	2	
4	Skills development	3	
1	Awareness of Real Knowledge	4	
3	Achieving critical view	5	
3	Freedom	6	
1	Delegating of future roles	7	
41	Socialization	8	
56	The sum total		

Goals of elementary school tabel:2			
Data	Component	Number	Educational area
4	Talent development	1	Aims
0	creating of Equal opportunities	2	
14	Skills development	3	
2	Awareness of Real knowledge	4	
2	Achieving critical view	5	
2	Freedom	6	
0	Delegating of future roles	7	
71	Socialization	8	
95	The sum total		

Goals of middle school tabel:3			
Data	Component	Number	Educational area
2	Talent development	1	Aims
0	creating of Equal opportunities	2	
20	Skills development	3	
3	Awareness of Real knowledge	4	
4	Achieving critical view	5	
2	Freedom	6	
1	Delegating of future roles	7	
75	Socialization	8	
107	The sum total		

Goals of height school tabel:4			
Data	Component	Number	Educational area
3	Talent development	1	Aims
0	creating of Equal opportunities	2	
26	Skills development	3	
2	Awareness of Real knowledge	4	
4	Achieving critical view	5	
1	Freedom	6	
4	Delegating of future roles	7	
62	Socialization	8	
102	the sum total		

Data	Component	Number	Educational area
	goals in other act tabel:5		
14	Talent development	1	Aims
7	creating of Equal opportunities	2	
42	Skills development	3	
2	Awareness of Real knowledge	4	
2	Achieving critical view	5	
0	Freedom	6	
17	Delegating of future roles	7	
49	Socialization	8	
133	the sum total		

Percent	Data	Component	number	Educational area
		The sum total results tabel:6		
٪5	26	Talent development	1	Aims
٪1/5	7	creating of Equal opportunities	2	
٪22	106	Skills development	3	
٪2	10	Awareness of Real knowledge	4	
٪3	15	Achieving critical view	5	
٪1/5	8	Freedom	6	
٪5	23	Delegating of future roles	7	
٪60	298	Socialization	8	
٪100	493	the sum total		

CONCLUSION

the field of curriculum, in fact included Collection of science like philology, history and Philosophy.one of the best science that help to field of curriculum was Sociology of Education. but there was no the same idea of Community , school and educational institution. therefore we showed because of this contracting views ,theories of sociology and sociology of education different in many area like aims and other. in second place we represented the basic components of two theories that Sometimes were full of conflict in that like socialization or freedom And sometimes both theories were agreed to a components like development of skill . then the study Measured The scope of these components if both theories . The results showed that the components of two theories and every six components of the educational objectives that were approved by critical theorists existed. but Functionalism components had a large more share.93 percent of data were Functionalist components and 7pecent of components were among of those that Functionalist were opposed to that. The most focus was on socialization that allocated 60 percent to himself. 65 percent of data were opposed to critical theories and 35 of data were approved.

REFERENCES

Althusser L. 1971. *Ideology and ideological state apparatuses* in L. Althusser (Ed), *lenin and philosophy and other essays.* London: new left books.
Durkheim E.1995. *education and Sociology*. translated by ali mohhamad kardan. first edition. publication of Tehran university. Tehran.
Illich I. 2010 *de-schooling society*. translated by davar Shykhavndy. first edition, publication of gisa.tehran
Lawrence J. S.2011. " sociology of Education" 21ST century EDUCATION: A Reference Handbook. 2008.SAGE publications 2011.
Parsons T and Platt G. 1973. *The American university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Peel JDY. 1971. *Herbert spencer: the evolution of* sociologist .London: Heinemann Educational.