

## Pre-service Teachers' Views on Intangible Cultural Heritage and its Protection

Elvan Yalçinkaya

*Nigde University Faculty of Education (51100) Nigde, Turkey*  
*Telephone: +90 (388) 2254384 E-mail: elvanykaya@gmail.com*

**KEYWORDS** Cultural Heritage. Education. Pre-service Teacher. Social Studies

**ABSTRACT** The Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage was accepted on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2003 at the 32<sup>nd</sup> General Conference of UNESCO. In this agreement, intangible cultural heritage is defined as the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills as well as the instruments, objects, artifacts and cultural spaces associated there with communities, groups and in some cases, individuals recognized as part of their cultural heritage. This study aims to identify the views of fourth grade students from the Nigde University Primary School Teaching and Social Studies Teaching departments on this intangible cultural heritage and its protection. The Intangible Cultural Heritage Questionnaire was used as the data collection tool. According to the findings, pre-service teachers' interest levels on intangible cultural heritage are not sufficient. Their views on culture are generally favorable.

### INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of globalization is becoming increasingly visible day by day. For this reason, people endeavor to take measures at the national and international level in order to protect the cultural heritage. Definitions of heritage tend to frame it as an inheritance, a source of identity, as an assemblage of values, discourses and materialities, or more broadly as a mediator between the past and present, human and non-human (Winter 2015). According to Akay (2006:38), efforts made for the protection of cultural heritage at the national and international levels, especially efforts by UNESCO (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) have initially focused on tangible cultural heritage yet, the efforts have also made and gradually increased for Intangible Cultural Heritage (hereafter ICH) in recent years. One of the most significant steps that have been taken for the protection of intangible cultural heritage is the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* by UNESCO dated October 17, 2003 and adopted at the 32<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly. The 2003 UNESCO Convention for the safeguard of intangible cultural heritage (ICH) is addressed to the states and assigns them

several tasks (Severo and Venturini 2015). Turkey gave its full support towards this initiative and inserted it in its national law. This convention indicates that the loss of cultural areas such as folk literature, folk music, folk theatre, folk custom and beliefs, and folk arts will be harsh for humanity, and develops countermeasures (Kurudayioğlu and Sahin 2015). According to Oğuz (2009: 8), this convention defines ways, methods and opportunities that will contribute to the protection and transference of intangible cultural heritage, which the society considers a part of its cultural identity and brings into the present day by transferring from one generation to another. Gürçayır (2011: 7) considers this convention as meaningful in that it raises awareness of information and experience transferred from generation to generation. A major starting point of this convention is the discomfort felt from the fact that societies would lose their own cultural values due to globalization and industrialization and the idea that cultural diversity would disappear across the world (Gürçayır 2011: 7).

### Intangible Cultural Heritage

In the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, it is pointed out that this convention means “practices, representations, expressions, information, abilities and also related tools and cultural places, which societies, groups and in some cases, individuals define as a part of their cultural heritage” (http 1). According to Ekici (2004: 5), the term ‘intangi-

---

*Address for correspondence:*

Elvan Yalçinkaya  
 Associate Professor  
 Nigde University Faculty of Education  
 (51100) Nigde, Turkey  
 Telephone: +90 (388) 2254384  
 E-mail: elvanykaya@gmail.com

ble' encompasses all assets of folklore. All folkloric assets including verbal, visual, application oriented and auditory (musical) assets are included into the term of 'intangible'. Oguz (2009: 6) states that the idea of safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage has emerged and developed with the term 'folklore'. Karakul (2007: 151) expresses that discussions of safeguarding of the intangible heritage have emerged in the course of defining cultural heritage and developed for resolving shortcomings of existing definitions. In this respect, these discussions have emerged not for the discrimination within the understanding of cultural heritage but emerged as a product of the effort for understanding and defining the whole once again (Karakul 2007: 151). Intangible culture encompasses religious beliefs, moral values, written and unwritten sources regulating human relations, the legal system and emotions and opinions underlying human relations. (Arikan and Dogan 2013: 31).

### Protection of the ICH

This Convention aims "to safeguard the intangible cultural heritage, to ensure respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities, groups and individuals concerned, to raise awareness at the local, national and international levels of the importance of the intangible cultural heritage, and of ensuring mutual appreciation thereof and to provide for international cooperation and assistance" (http 1). Efforts and struggles of the states play a vital role in the realization of the aims stated in this Convention. Safeguarding the intangible cultural heritage and the respect for the intangible cultural heritage of the communities are important issues that must be dealt with at the national and international dimension. Accordingly, contracting countries have significant duties for the continuity of the protection of this heritage. As Ekici (2004: 10) states, safeguarding intangible cultural heritage is possible with the sustainability of this heritage. The heritage, which has been eradicated rapidly by global phenomena and has not protected by new generations would disappear by itself like old buildings (Ekici 2004: 10). This is because the problem is not cultural values, which have begun to lose its significance and have been perceived as meaningless and ordinary in the present day, but the problem is existence and continuity of the national entity (Kolaç 2009: 22).

Öcal (2008) who has pioneered in the safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and has carried out important works for the spread of this matter makes the following statements.

*"Recently, Turkey could not carry its intangible cultural heritage to the formal and non-formal education, to city life and to the media for some reasons. As a result, most sources of reference have been forgotten and replaced by examples produced by the mass culture: Nardaniye Hanim replaced by Snow White, Körođlu replaced by Robin Hood, Kerem and Asli replaced by Romeo and Juliet, and Boz Atli Hizir replaced by Santa Claus. This situation can be considered both as an annihilation of safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and also as a disappearance of cultural diversity. These examples demonstrate that the protection of cultural expression diversity depends on safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage"* (Oguz 2009: 6).

As understood, unless necessary emphasis is put on safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, the cultural heritage is under threat of disappearance. To that end, in Article 14 (education, awareness-raising and capacity-building) of the Convention for safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage it is pointed out that contracting parties should endeavor to carry out following clauses (http 1):

- a. To ensure recognition of, respect for, and enhancement of the intangible cultural heritage in society,
- i. To arrange educational, awareness-raising and information programs, aimed at the general public, in particular young people
- ii. To arrange specific educational and training programs within the communities and groups concerned
- iii. To arrange capacity-building activities for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, in particular management and scientific research
- iv. To provide non-formal means of transmitting knowledge.
- b. To keep the public informed of the dangers threatening such heritage, and of the activities carried out in pursuance of this Convention;
- c. To promote education for the protection of natural spaces and places of memory whose existence is necessary for expressing the intangible cultural heritage.

In this Convention, it is emphasized that formal and non-formal educational institutions have significant duties and students should comprehend the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage in courses and through extracurricular activities. According to Kutlu (2009: 14), this convention aims that all countries should develop their own “safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage” and should evaluate all cultural transference and processes, initially educational and communication institutions. Çulha (2009: 702) states that in basic education, the interest for cultural heritage education in the country and also across the world has increased. He expresses that cultural heritage education generally aims that children should understand basic concepts and principles of the history and culture. Cultural heritage education begins at the time when human beings interact with their surroundings, that is, it begins with questions directed to the elders within the family (Çulha 2009: 704). For this reason, cultural heritage education can be considered as a process starting in the family and continuing for the life.

### **Intangible Cultural Education in Turkey**

Within the framework of “safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage”, in order to realize the purposes in primary schools specified above, an elective course, *Folk Culture* is added to the curriculum in 6<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades (Yılmaz 2012: 122). In addition, it should also be kept in mind that there are also courses such as Turkish, Life Sciences and Social Studies, which are thought to contribute to the education of safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage at earlier ages. For instance, in social studies, cultural heritage education is given with an interdisciplinary approach. According to Çulha (2009: 707), when the curriculum of social studies at primary school is examined, it is observed that with its multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary structure, cultural heritage education is shaped within two basic learning domains in social studies courses: “Culture and Heritage” and “People, Places and Environments”.

In the domain of Culture and Heritage, students take the opportunity of examining factors belonging to the Turkish culture and their historical origins. In addition, by comprehending cultural factors, which play a vital role in the formation of national consciousness and also their

development processes, students gain sensitivity in the matter of the protection and development of cultural heritage (Tüysüz 2012). In the Culture and Heritage domain of Social Studies, by focusing upon the historical process of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, education of the continuity and the perception of change about cultural heritage are given to the students. In this way, it is aimed that students should comprehend the fact that safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is continuous from past to present and it is changing in due course.

In the domain of People, Places and Environments, students recognize the interaction of people with their environment in various dimensions. They also determine the reasons and consequences of this interaction and develop individual and social perspective (Tüysüz 2012). Accordingly, students comprehend that one of the significant dimensions of the interaction of people with their environment is the culture and heritage.

### **The Aim and Importance of this Research**

Families together with students are ones who lay the foundations of the cultural heritage education. In order to raise awareness and to enable participation in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, education should be given at earlier ages. One of the basic conditions of the effectiveness of this education is to raise well-equipped teachers in this matter. In this direction, it is deemed as important that perspectives of pre-service teachers who will raise elementary school students a few years later should be determined. In this study, opinions of pre-service teachers about safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage are presented by their analysis from various variables. Within this framework, answers of the questions below have been searched for:

1. To what degree are the pre-service teachers interested in safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage?
2. To what degree are the opinions of pre-service teachers about the inclusion of the domains belonging to safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage to the Social Studies Curriculum?
3. Is there any difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers about safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage according to their gender?
4. Is there any difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers about safe-

- guarding of intangible cultural heritage according to daytime and evening education?
5. Is there any difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers about safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage according to their settlement?

### METHODOLOGY

A descriptive research method is applied in this study. According to Kaptan (1998: 60), descriptive research endeavors to explain what events, objects, assets, institutions, groups and various domains account for.

#### Study Group

Senior students (4<sup>th</sup> grade) studying at the Department of Primary School Teaching and Social Studies Teaching, Faculty of Education, Nigde University constitute the study group. Information belonging to this study group is presented in Table 1. 167 pre-service teachers have participated in this research in total.

**Table 1: Information of study group**

Personal Information		N	%
Department	Primary school teaching	83	50.3
	Social studies teaching	84	49.7
	Total	167	100
Gender	Women	89	53.3
	Men	78	46.7
	Total	167	100
Type of Education	Daytime education	116	69.5
	Evening education	51	30.5
	Total	167	100
Type of Place	Country	17	10.2
	Town	19	11.4
	County town	58	34.7
	City center	73	43.7
	Total	167	100

#### Data Collection and Analysis

The *Intangible Cultural Heritage Questionnaire* prepared by the researcher has been used as a data collection tool. The form consists of three parts. The first part includes questions about the personal information (gender, grade, type of education, place of living) and the second part includes the questions about the inter-

est with the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage and the inclusion of it in the curriculum. As for the third part, it encompasses the questions about the ICH and its protection. The interest with the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage has been ranked as “fully”, “much”, “mediocre”, “little” and “never” and graded as 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. When it comes to items of other parts, they have been ranked as “I totally agree”, “I agree”, “I have no idea”, “I don’t agree”, and “I totally disagree” and graded as 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. By looking at the arithmetic means of participants for each item, their levels of the item acceptance have been determined and evaluated by score intervals below:

- 1.00- 1.80: I totally disagree,
- 1.81- 2.60: I disagree
- 2.61- 3.40: I have no idea
- 3.41- 4.20: I agree
- 4.21- 5.00: I totally agree

During the preparation of the questionnaire, *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* by UNESCO (The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) dated October 17, 2003 and adopted in the 32<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly has been based upon. Articles within the framework of this Convention have been converted into the survey questions. These questions enable to measure the interest to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage, the inclusion of it into the curriculum and its protection. In the questionnaire, there are 37 domains of safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. In other words, this study has been limited to the certain 37 domains. During the evaluation of these domains, five domains within the Convention have been taken into consideration. These domains have been determined in the Convention as follows:

- ♦ Language, oral traditions and narrative art acting in the transference of safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage (sagas, legends, folktales, proverbs, fairy tales, anecdotes)
- ♦ Performance arts (karagöz, public storyteller, puppet, public theater)
- ♦ Social practices, rituals and feasts (engagement, wedding, delivery and such celebrations). Practices about the nature and universe (traditional foods, folk medicine, folk calendar, folk meteorologist)
- ♦ Handicraft tradition

Some of the questions regarding the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage have been prepared as negative sentences. These questions are in the form of a five-point Likert scale. Items within the questionnaire have been submitted to the experts. In line with the suggestions of three experts, the questionnaire has taken its final shape. In the reliability analysis carried out on the acquired data, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the questionnaire has been found to be 82. Data acquired from the questionnaire has been analyzed with the SPSS (Statistical Program for Social Sciences) 15.0 package program. During the analysis of the data, the t-test, one-way analysis of variance (Anova) and descriptive statistics have been used for independent groups.

### FINDINGS

By means of this research, opinions of the pre-service teachers about their interest level in safeguarding intangible cultural heritage and to

what degree it should be included into the curriculum of Social Studies have been determined, and by dividing the questions into two categories, the questions within the scale have been presented as separate tables. While the statistical information about the pre-service teachers' interest level of the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage is in Table 2, information about the degree domains of it should be included into the curriculum of Social Studies is in Table 3.

As in Table 2, it is observed that pre-service teachers are mostly interested in the domains of bairam (4.10), proverbs (3.83), folk music (3.63), and anecdotes (3.54). The pre-service teachers are least interested in the domains of slangs (2.04), names and nicknames (2.27), myths (2.49) and folk meteorology (2.82).

As it seen at Table 3, according to pre-service teachers, the domains of folk tales (4.46), proverbs (4.44), bairam (4.32), and folk poetry (4.26) should be included in the Social Studies Teaching Program at most. The least arithmetic means belong to slangs (1.90), names and

**Table 2: The level of interest in the matter of ICH and its protection**

<i>Domains of ICH</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Domains of ICH</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Domains of ICH</i>	<i>X</i>
Sagas	3.00	Folk music	3.63	Bairam	4.10
Legends	2.98	Folk poetry	3.30	Feast	3.42
Folktales	3.45	Karagöz	3.27	Festive	3.35
Proverbs	3.83	Public storyteller	3.04	Traditional play and sport	3.54
Fairy tales	3.31	Low comedy	2.96	Religious rituals	3.49
Anecdotes	3.54	Puppet	2.87	Conventions- public legal system	3.20
Myths	2.49	Folk dance	3.30	Traditional foods	3.60
Idioms	3.53	Wedding	3.22	Folk medicine	2.78
Oral history	3.33	Engagement	3.13	Folk calendar	2.72
Riddles	3.22	Delivery	2.85	Folk meteorology	2.82
Rhymes	2.96	Funeral	3.05	Handicrafts	3.16
Slangs	2.04	Nawruz	3.01		
Name and nicknames	2.27				

**Table 3: Teachers' inclusion of ICH into the curriculum of Social Studies teaching program**

<i>Domains of ICH</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Domains of ICH</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Domains of ICH</i>	<i>X</i>
Sagas	4.35	Folk music	4.14	Bairam	4.32
Legends	4.14	Folk poetry	4.26	Feast	3.95
Folktales	4.46	Karagöz	4.23	Festive	3.92
Proverbs	4.44	Public storyteller	4.13	Traditional play and sport	4.21
Fairy tales	4.17	Low comedy	4.14	Religious rituals	3.90
Anecdotes	4.10	Puppet	3.80	Conventions- public legal system	3.73
Myths	3.77	Folk dance	4.06	Traditional foods	3.89
Idioms	4.25	Wedding	3.51	Folk medicine	3.49
Oral history	4.13	Engagement	3.43	Folk calendar	3.61
Riddles	3.88	Delivery	3.37	Folk meteorology	3.65
Rhymes	3.62	Funeral	3.46	Handicrafts	4.04
Slangs	1.90	Nawruz	3.85		
Name and nicknames	2.29				

nicknames (2.29), delivery (3.37) and engagement (3.43).

Table 4 includes information about the opinions of pre-service teachers in relation to the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage. The table below involves the arithmetic mean of each item.

As it seen in the statistical information in Table 5, it is observed that there is no significant difference among the opinions of pre-service teachers about the safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage ( $t_{(165)}=1.27$   $p>0.05$ ) according to their gender. According to acquired findings,

**Table 5: Independent samples t-test results about the gender-based difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers in matter of ICH and its protection**

Gender	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Woman	89	3.80	.37	1.27	165	.222
Man	78	3.73	.41			

it can be stated that gender does not have a determining role in the opinions of pre-service teachers about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage.

As it seen in the statistical information in Table 6, it is observed that there is no significant difference among the opinions of pre-service teachers ( $t_{(165)}=1.82$   $p>0.05$ ) about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage according to their education type. According to acquired findings, it can be stated that the type

**Table 6: Independent samples t-test results about the difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers in the matter of ICH and its protection according to their education type**

Education type	N	Mean	S	t	sd	p
Daytime education	116	3.73	.37	1.82	165	.070
Evening education	51	3.85	.42			

**Table 4: Opinions of pre-service teachers about the ICH and its protection**

Items in relation to the ICH and its protection	$\bar{X}$
ICH, which is transferred from one culture to another is continuously recreated depending upon the interaction of societies and groups with their environment, nature and history, and this gives them a feeling of the identity and continuity.	4.46
ICH contributes to the cultural diversity.	4.38
ICH cannot contribute to the respect for creativity of people.	2.31
It is necessary to research, compile and constitute the archive and documentation centers of heritage within the scope of ICH.	4.09
It is necessary to establish museums in relation to ICH.	4.13
It is not necessary to teach "ICH" as a course in educational institutions.	2.35
It is necessary to give place to ICH as positive cultural values in mass media.	4.10
For the protection of ICH at national level, states should take necessary measures within their borders.	4.37
Each country should adopt an overall policy in order to add value to the functioning of the ICH and countries should also include the protection of heritage into their planning programs.	4.31
Each country should determine or establish one or more authorized institution for the ICH within their border.	4.23
Each country should encourage the scientific, technical and art examinations and research-related methodology especially for the protection of the ICH.	4.37
The establishment of the institutions about the education and administration of the ICH should be encouraged and it is also essential to teach this heritage to the next generations in places in the way of presentation or else.	4.37
Countries should guarantee the ICH by showing respect to traditional practices of the heritage.	4.24
It is not essential to organize an educator, consciousness-raising and informative programs which aim at the society and especially the youth.	2.31
It is essential to organize particular training and education programs among related communities and groups.	4.27
It is essential to organize capacity building activities especially in management and scientific research for the protection of ICH.	4.09
It is not possible to transfer information about the ICH from one generation to another with out-of-school activities.	2.31
Public opinion should be informed about the threats against this heritage.	4.36
It is essential to encourage education in order to protect natural areas and places related to the memory, which are necessary for the representation of the ICH.	4.22
There is no need for the international cooperation for the protection of the ICH.	2.21

of education does not play a determining role in the opinions of pre-service teachers about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage.

As a result of the F test, it is observed that there is no significant difference among the opinions of pre-service teachers ( $t_{(165)} = 1.82$   $p > 0.05$ ) about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage according to their living place ( $F_{(3-163)} = .21$   $p > .05$ ) (Table 7). As understood from the arithmetic mean of the pre-service teachers' opinions, arithmetic mean of pre-service teachers living in country is 3.79. This arithmetic mean is 3.84 for pre-service teachers living in a town, 3.74 for teachers in country towns and 3.77 for teachers living in city centers. It is also observed that the means are close to each other. Thus, it can be stated that living areas do not have an effect on the opinions of pre-service teachers about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage.

**Table 7: One-Way Anova results about the difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers in the matter of ICH and its protection according to their living place**

	<i>Sum of squares</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>Mean of squares</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Inter Group	.15	3	.50	.21	.810
Intra Group	25.29	163	.15		
Total	25.44	166			

As it seen in the statistical information in Table 8, it is observed that there is no significant difference among the opinions of pre-service teachers ( $t_{(165)} = .61$   $p > 0.05$ ) about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage according to the department of their education. According to acquired findings, it can be stated that the department does not play a determining role in the opinions of pre-service teachers about the safeguarding of intangible of cultural heritage (Table 8).

**Table 8: Independent samples t-test results about the difference between the opinions of pre-service teachers in the matter of ICH and its protection according to their department**

<i>Education</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Primary school teaching	84	3.79	.43	.61	165	.538
Social studies teaching	83	3.75	.33			

## DISCUSSION

Since the end of the twentieth century the increasing importance of cultural heritage has been complemented with the recognition and protection of intangible heritage (Suárez et al. 2015). Education plays a vital role in handing the cultural heritage down from generation to generation. When it comes to education institutions, they're the protectors and carriers of the cultural heritage from one generation to another (Tezcan 1999: 58).

According to Kolaç (2009: 22), in recent days when the destructing effect of the globalization on cultures is felt intensely, it is of capital importance to protect the cultural values, to hold them and to raise consciousness for the national identity. The fact that the education of cultural heritage plays a vital role in Social Studies course has been highlighted in a wide range of studies (Chapin and Messick 1996; Hunter 1988; Çengelci 2012; Arikan and Dogan 2013; Dönmez and Yesilbursa 2014). Opinions of the pre-service teachers in this study coincide with the literature. Furthermore, pre-service teachers indicate that ICH domains should be included into the Social Studies Teaching program. In the study by Sidekli and Karaca (2013) the opinions of pre-service teachers about the inclusion of local cultural heritage elements to the Social Studies Teaching have been determined, and it is observed that pre-service teachers look positively towards the inclusion of local cultural heritage elements in the social studies teaching. In addition, the study conducted by Selanik and Kurtdede (2013) so as to determine metaphors of pre-service teachers as regards to cultural heritage has also drawn similar results. In the study by Kurudayiglu and Sahin (2015), it is revealed that students of Turkish Education Department choose this folk culture subject, which is obligatory and given by academicians who are experts in this field, and contains the elements of this culture (clothes, games, traditions, foods), as they want to learn about the culture in which they live and also do not want to be alienated from it. Accordingly, domains of ICH should be associated with the courses both, in basic education and also in teacher education.

## CONCLUSION

Within the scope of findings obtained from this research wherein opinions of the pre-service

teachers about the intangible cultural heritage and its protection have been analyzed, it is possible to draw the following conclusions.

- The level of interest of pre-service teachers about the ICH is insufficient. The domains that they are most interested in are bairam, proverbs, folk music and anecdote. Domains that they are least interested in are slangs, name and nicknames, myth and folk meteorology.
- According to pre-service teachers, domains that should be included in Social Studies Curriculum are folktales, proverbs, bairam and folk poetry. The least arithmetic means belong to slangs, name and nicknames, delivery and engagement. Pre-teacher candidates think that the domains they consider relevant to the Social Studies course should be included into the courses. In addition, they think that domains such as slangs and name and nicknames that they consider not so relevant to the course should not be included in the curriculum.
- Pre-service teachers often are favorable to the intangible cultural heritage and its protection.
- It is observed that opinions of pre-service teachers about the intangible cultural heritage and its protection do not differ according to gender, education type, living place and department. Accordingly, it can be stated that gender, education type, living place and department do not play a determining role in the opinions about intangible cultural heritage and its protection.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Various suggestions can be made regarding the findings and discussion of the research. Conducting the ICH education at education institutions in a planned, programmed and systematic way will enable the protection of this field and also the transference of it to next generation. One of the courses directly related to ICH is social studies. The interest level of social studies and primary school teachers who give this course as a primary education and their opinions about the protection of ICH has a direct influence on ICH education. It is observed that the interest level of the pre-service teachers who will, in the near future, perform a duty in the basic

education in which the foundations of ICH education will be laid varies according to domains. It is essential to endeavor for raising consciousness about the ICH and its education in Education Faculties in order to increase the interest level of pre-service teachers about the ICH. It is essential to enable pre-service teachers to be interested in ICH domains.

### REFERENCES

- Akay AS 2006. Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın tarih araştırmalarında kaynak olma özelliği. *Milli Folklor*, 70: 38-58.
- Arikan I, Dogan Y 2013. İlköğretim 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin kültürel mirasla ilgili başarı düzeyleri ve tutumlarının bazı değişkenlerce incelenmesi (Adıyaman örneği). *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15: 29-68.
- Chapin JR, Messick RG 1996. *Elementary Social Studies: A Practical Guide*. New York/USA: Longman Publishers.
- Çengelci T 2012. Sosyal bilgiler öğretim programında somut olmayan kültürel mirasın yeri. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25(1): 185-203.
- Çulha ÖB 2009. İlköğretim sosyal bilgiler derslerinde kültürel miras eğitimi. In: Mustafa Safran (Ed.): *Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık, pp. 701-720.
- Dönmez C, Yesilbursa CC 2014. Kültürel miras eğitiminin öğrencilerin somut kültürel mirasa yönelik tutumlarına etkisi. *İlköğretim Online*, 13(2): 425-442.
- Ekici M 2004. Bir sempozyumun ardından: Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın düzenlenmesi. *Milli Folklor*, 61: 5-13.
- Gürçayır S 2011. Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın korunması sözleşmesi üzerine eleştirel bir okuma. *Milli Folklor*, 92: 5-12.
- Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage 2003. From <<http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention/>> (Retrieved on 10 October 2014).
- Hunter K 1988. Heritage Education in the Social Studies. ERIC ED 300306. From <[www.eric.ed.gov](http://www.eric.ed.gov)> (Retrieved on 10 October 2014).
- Kaptan S 1998. *Bilimsel Arastırma ve İstatistik Teknikleri*. Ankara: Tekisik Web Ofset Tesisleri.
- Karakul Ö 2007. Tarihi çevrelerde halk mimarisi: Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın yasama mekanları. *Milli Folklor*, 75: 151-163.
- Kolaç E 2009. Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın koruma, bilinç ve duyarlılık oluşturmada Türkçe eğitiminin önemi. *Milli Folklor*, 82: 19-31.
- Kurudayıoğlu M, Sahin C 2015. Perceptions of students in Turkish education department about folk culture course. *Anthropologist*, 19(3): 603-612.
- Kutlu MM. 2009. Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın korunmasında eğitime yönelik ilk adım: Halk kültürü dersi. *Milli Folklor*, 82: 13-18.
- Öcal O 2008. UNESCO ve insanlığın sözlü ve somut olmayan mirası banyapıtları. *Milli Folklor*, 78: 5-11.
- Öcal O 2009. Somut olmayan kültürel miras ve kültürel ifade çeşitliliği. *Milli Folklor*, 82: 6-12.

- Selanik AT, Kurtdede NF 2013. Öğretmen adaylarının kültürel miras kavramına ilişkin metaforları. *Turkish Studies*, 8(12): 1135-1152.
- Severo M, Venturini T 2015. Intangible cultural heritage webs: Comparing national networks with digital methods. *New Media and Society*, 1-20.
- Sidekli S, Karaca L 2013. Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde yerel kültürel miras öğelerinin kullanımına ilişkin öğretmen adayı görüşleri. *Gaziosmanpaşa Bilimsel Araştırma Dergisi*, 5: 20-38.
- Suárez R, Alonso A, Sendra JJ 2015. Intangible cultural heritage: The sound of the Romanesque cathedral of Santiago de Compostela. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 16(2): 239-243.
- Tezcan M 1999. *Eğitim Sosyolojisi*. Ankara: Safak Matbaacılık.
- Tüysüz S 2012. *İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler 4 Öğretmen Kılavuz Kitabı*. Ankara: Tuna Matbaacılık.
- Winter T 2015. Heritage diplomacy. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 1-18.
- Yılmaz A 2012. İlköğretim okulları seçmeli halk kültürü dersi öğretim programlarının sınıflar düzeyinde karşılaştırılması. *Milli Folklor*, 93: 112-124.