A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MIDDLE SCHOOL FOLK CULTURE CURRICULUMS DEVELOPED IN TURKEY

TÜRKİYE'DE GELİŞTİRİLEN ORTAOKUL HALK KÜLTÜRÜ ÖĞRETİM PROGRAMLARININ KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR ANALİZİ

Sezgin ELBAY[1]

Abstract

This research aimed to make a comparative analysis of 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2018 Middle School Elective Folk Culture Course Curriculum. For this, descriptive model was adopted in the research and document analysis technique was used. The data source of the study was the Middle School Elective Folk Culture Course Curriculums published by the Ministry of National Education Board of Education in 2006-2007-2008 and 2018. In the data collection process two forms were used; Comparative Document, and Curriculum Analysis Forms. The data were analyzed descriptively. According to the analysis results, it was determined that the sections such as the commission list, activity examples, the definition and purpose of folklore and the description of the Folk Culture course in the 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula were not included in the 2018 curriculum. When the structural features of the curriculum were examined, it was determined that the 2018 curriculum did not include skills, but instead included competencies as core skills. In addition, different values are included in the curriculum; it has been concluded that there are substantial similarities in learning areas and acquisitions. When examining the dimension of teaching-learning process, although the 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula include detailed examples of activities and daily lesson plans related to each acquisition it was determined that there was no sample activity in the 2018 curriculum. In the evaluation dimension, while the measurement tools are explained in detail in 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula and examples related to their outcomes are included, it has been determined that measurement-evaluation methods and tools are not included in the 2018 curriculum.

Keywords: Turkey, Folk culture course curriculum, Document analysis, Curriculum evaluation.

Öz

Araştırmada 2006, 2007, 2008 ve 2018 Ortaokul Seçmeli Halk Kültürü Dersi Öğretim Programlarının karşılaştırmalı olarak analizinin yapılması amaçlanmıştır. Bunun için araştırmada betimsel model benimsenmiş ve doküman inceleme tekniği kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın veri kaynaklarını, 2006-2007-2008 ve 2018 yıllarında MEB TTK tarafından yayımlanan Ortaokul Seçmeli Halk Kültürü Dersi Öğretim Programları oluşturmuştur. Veri toplama araçları olarak, Karşılaştırmalı Doküman ve Öğretim Programları Analiz Formları kullanılmıştır. Veriler betimsel yoldan analiz edilmiştir. Analiz sonuçlarına göre, 2006-2007 ve 2008 öğretim programlarında yer alan komisyon listesi, etkinlik örnekleri, halk biliminin tanımı, amacı ve Halk Kültürü dersinin açıklaması gibi bölümlerin, 2018 öğretim programında yer almadığı belirlenmiştir. Ayrıca 2018 öğretim programında becerilere yer verilmediği, bunun yerine yetkinliklerin çekirdek beceriler olarak yer aldığı saptanmıştır. Bunlara ek olarak öğretim programlarında birbirinden farklı değerlere yer verildiği; öğrenme alanları ve kazanımlarda ise büyük ölçüde benzerlikler olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Eğitim durumları boyutu incelendiğinde, 2006-2007 ve 2008 öğretim programlarında her bir kazanım ile ilgili etkinlik ve günlük ders planı örneklerine ayrıntılı bir şekilde yer verilmesine rağmen; 2018 öğretim programında herhangi bir etkinlik örneğine yer verilmediği belirlenmiştir. Değerlendirme boyutunda ise 2006-2007 ve 2008 öğretim programlarında ölçme araçları ayrıntılı bir şekilde açıklanıp, bunlarla ilgili kazanım bağlantılı örneklere yer verilirken, 2018 öğretim programında ölçme-değerlendirme yöntem ve araçlarına yer verilmediği saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Türkiye, Halk kültürü öğretim programı, Doküman analizi, Program değerlendirme.

[1] Dr., T.C. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB), sezgin_elbay@hotmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-0601-806

1. INTRODUCTION

Folklore is a course that scientifically compiles, classifies, evaluates and systematically explains all the material and spiritual cultural elements in human life from birth to death, examining the general development and change rules of folk culture, and revealing the similarities and differences among cultures (Çobanoğlu, 2020). In this framework, the folk culture is tried to be transferred to the younger generations through the Folklore course.

Folk culture is traditionally defined as the attitude and behavior set of a group that has homogeneous values, beliefs, norms and ideologies that live in relative isolation from other groups. This cultural fabric historically, when transmitted through oral tradition, shows "old ways" versus innovation, and folk culture is associated with a sense of community in this sense. On the other hand, folk culture is often linked to a sense of place. As a result, if the basic elements of folk culture are copied or transported by foreign settlements, they still symbolically carry the powerful connotations of the original places of creation. In this respect, it has taken its place in a special course curriculum on folk culture in the Turkish education system. In the Turkish education system, the "Folk Culture" course has been put into practice gradually in the 6th, 7th and 8th grades of middle schools since the 2006-2007 academic year. Therefore, before 2006, there was no separate course called Folk Culture. Nowadays (in 2021) in middle schools in Turkey, the teaching of Folk Culture (5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades) is carried out by social studies teachers for 2 lesson hours (40 minutes) per week. For this, "Middle School Elective Folk Culture Lesson Curriculum" has been developed. However, it was determined that these curriculums were not analyzed comparatively.

The issue of the place of folk culture in education remains up-to-date for several reasons. Today, it is witnessed that two paradigms are in conflict with each other in the global ideological context. These are the globalist paradigm and national component that neutralizes national differences not only to protect the nation itself; it is also a traditionalist paradigm that considers it vital to create a new modern layer (Medkova, 2017). It has been observed in Turkish society that since the 2000s, it has been observed that traditional values and global values have been kept alive together at both the state level and almost every level of national formations. However, in recent studies, it has been determined that cultural colonialism has begun to erode traditional values (Akkoç, 2019; Çavdarcı, 2002). In this sense, through the Folk Culture course, which is taught as an elective course in Turkish middle schools, strategic goals such as preserving traditional cultural values, transferring these values to young generations, and creating a Turkish identity in order to root patriotic beliefs are tried to be achieved.

Folk Culture Course

The United Nations, which has taken important steps in the protection and preservation of Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage in many platforms, put forward a contract in 2003 on the protection, survival and transfer of intangible cultural products to new generations (UNESCO, 2003). In Turkey, one of the most serious steps towards the protection of intangible cultural products was taken with the approval of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey in 2006. In line with this contract, it has been decided by the Board of Education affiliated to the MoNE to introduce an elective Folk Culture course for 6th, 7th and 8th grades in primary education (Kutlu, 2009). In this framework, in the 21st century, when strong cultures try to destroy weak cultures, it is thought that the Folk Culture course will fill an important gap in students' getting to know their own culture, protecting it and transferring it to future generations (Çetin & Gürgil, 2013).

The Folk Culture course, which is a part of cultural education, is a "culture" course that reflects nurtures and is a resource that reflects the thoughts, tendencies, attitudes and behaviors of Turkish people in different areas of social and cultural life (Kutlu, 2009). In this context, it is aimed to protect cultural heritage and to transfer this heritage to future generations. In fact, what is meant by the concepts of "heritage" and "protection" is the protection of "common memory" areas (Oğuz, 2007: 5-8). Common memory is based on the objectives, content and learning areas of the Folk Culture course; in short, it has been tried to be reflected in the curriculums.

Curriculum Development and Evaluation

The curriculum is defined as all the studies carried out for the purpose, content, learning-teaching process and evaluation dimensions of the education program in order to realize the goals of the National Education and the school inside or outside the school (Demirel, 2015). In addition, there are researchers who argue that curriculum development actually includes curriculum evaluation (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2014). In line with this view, it can be said that the evaluation of the curriculums as much as the development is important in achieving the determined general and specific goals.

Curriculum evaluation, collecting data about the effectiveness of the education program, comparing and interpreting the collected data with the criteria that are the indicators of the effectiveness of the curricula, determining the success of students; In summary, it can be expressed as the process of making a judgment about the effectiveness of the curricula and increasing the quality of the curricula (Klenowski, 2010). Data can be collected systematically from different stakeholders such as documents, teachers, students, parents and the business world during the evaluation process of curricula in schools. If it is determined that the curricula are effective at the end of the evaluation, studies can be done to make the curricula more qualified. In cases where it is determined that the curricula are not effective, curriculum development studies are initiated to increase the effectiveness of the curricula (Gökmenoğlu, 2014). In this context, curriculum evaluation ensures that training curriculums are developed based on data and made more effective. While developing each curriculum, it should definitely be started by making an evaluation (Kalaycı & Baysal, 2020).

The Purpose and Importance of the Research

When the literature was reviewed, it was found that many studies were conducted on the Folk Culture course (Akyol Kasapoğlu, 2015; Çetin & Gürgil, 2013; Gürgil, 2017; Kutlu, 2009; Medkova, 2017). Among them, Çetin and Gürgil (2013), primary school students' opinions on the practices of Folk Culture; Gürgil (2017) examined pre-service teachers' perceptions of Folk Culture. Moreover, Akyol Kasapoğlu (2015), while conducting a systematic compilation study for the Folk Culture course in both Turkey and foreign countries, tried to reveal the perceptions and knowledge levels of social studies and Turkish teachers about folk culture. Medkova (2017), on the other hand, dealt with the problems of teaching traditional folk culture in Modern Russian general education schools. Finally, in the study conducted by Kutlu (2009), information on the importance of the Folk Culture course in Turkey was given. Only one study focused on comparing the Folk Culture Course Curriculum (2006-2007-2008) at the grade level (Yılmaz, 2012). However, there are no studies in which the Folk Culture Curriculums developed in 2006/2007/2008 and 2018 in Turkey are evaluated comparatively. This situation reveals a need in this area in terms of applying and evaluating the curriculum more effectively and developing / updating it according to the conditions of the time. Based on this need, the aim of the research is to make a comparative analysis of the Folk Culture Course Curriculum developed and implemented in 2006/2007/2008 and 2018. This study is important as it will be a data source and an exemplary study for field experts,

especially those working on folklore and culture, and researchers who aim to work in this field. In addition, this study will be a data source for the Ministry of National Education Board of Education and other units involved in the preparation of education programs. In line with this main purpose, the sub-questions of the research were determined as follows:

1. How are the formal features structured in the Folk Culture Curriculum?
   - What are the similarities / differences in educational purposes?
   - What are the similarities / differences in basic approaches?
2. How are the structural features structured in the Folk Culture Curriculum?
   - What are the similarities / differences in skills?
   - What are the similarities / differences in values?
   - What are the similarities / differences in learning areas?
   - What are the similarities / differences in the acquisition?
   - What are the similarities / differences in measurement and evaluation?

2. METHOD

Research Model

The model of this research is descriptive. In the descriptive model, the current situation is analyzed systematically and it is tried to be revealed as it is (Creswell & Poth, 2017). In this context, the descriptive model was used in the study, as the current situation was tried to be revealed by analyzing the Folk Culture Curriculum comparatively.

Study Group

The study group of the research was determined according to the criterion case sampling method. The basic understanding in this sampling method is to study all situations that meet a predetermined set of criteria (Büyüköztürk et al., 2015: 91). The 2006/2007/2008 and the 2018 curriculum were chosen as criteria because of the significant changes compared to the previously implemented curriculums in accordance with the principles of this sampling method.

Data Collection

The data collection in the study was carried out by taking the stages of the document analysis technique mentioned below into consideration.

➤ *Access to Documents:* Documents (Folk Culture Curriculum), which are the data source of the research, can be found on the web site of the Board of Education (http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Programlar.aspx)

➤ *Checking Originality:* Documents are available from the website of the relevant institution; that is, it is original because it is obtained from an official institution.

➤ *Understanding the Documents:* The curriculum downloaded from the web site of the Board of Education was examined comparatively and the accuracy of the data was checked.

➤ *Analyzing the Data:* The documents were compared by the researchers in the context of analysis units and analyzed with document analysis forms.

➤ *Using Data:* The results of the analysis were shared with two curriculum development experts and expert opinion was obtained (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016).

Data Analysis

a) *Choosing a sample from the data subject to analysis:* The sample was created by sampling criteria, one of the purposeful sampling methods.

b) *Developing categories:* Categories are not pre-determined. As the message items were handled and reviewed, the categories were determined; that is, open coding approach was preferred (Bilgin, 2014). In this context, the features of the analysis units were determined by examining the curriculum over and over again. The researchers created individual categories and the categories were compared with their own categories on 3 units randomly determined from the categories belonging to the analysis units created by the researchers, and the rates of consensus and disagreement were determined in the comparisons, and the reliability of the categories was determined by Miles & Huberman's (1994) formula (Reliability = consensus / opinion). It was calculated as 0.91 by using unity + difference of opinion). This coefficient of fit shows that the categories have high reliability.

c) *Determining the unit of analysis:* The unit of analysis of the 2006-2007-2008 and 2018 Folk Culture Curriculum; curriculum approach, objectives, content, teaching-learning process and evaluation dimensions were formed. In the research, the curriculum evaluation approach based on the elements of Bloom's curriculum was taken as the basis and accordingly curriculum approach, objectives, content, teaching-learning process and evaluation dimensions were determined as the analysis units of the research.

d) *Digitization:* This stage consists of determining the frequencies of the categories quantitatively. At this stage, firstly, each document was examined one by one and it was determined whether the analysis units exist in the documents; that is, the frequencies are determined. The data obtained in this way were presented in tables and sample citations from the documents were included in order to support the comments made by the researcher.

3. FINDINGS

Formal Features

Findings regarding the comparison of the curriculums in terms of formal features are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of the curriculums in terms of formal features

Formal Features	Curriculums			
	2006 (6th grade)	2007 (7th grade)	2008 (8th grade)	2018 (5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grades)
Commission list	✓	✓	✓	X
Aims of Turkish National Education	✓	✓	✓	X
General purposes	✓	✓	✓	X
Special purposes	X	X	X	✓
Definition and purpose of folklore	✓	✓	✓	X
Description of the Folk Culture lesson	✓	✓	✓	X
The basic approach of the curricula	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Competencies)
Individual development and curriculums	X	X	X	✓
Curriculum structure — Skills	✓	✓	✓	X
Curriculum structure — Values	✓	✓	✓	✓
Curriculum structure — Learning areas	✓	✓	✓	✓
Curriculum structure — Acquisition	✓	✓	✓	✓
Curriculum structure — Measurement and evaluation approaches	✓	✓	✓	✓
Learning-teaching processes / Activity examples	✓	✓	✓	X
Symbols used and their meaning	✓	✓	✓	X
Notes on the implementation of the curricula	✓	✓	✓	✓
Daily lesson plan examples	✓	✓	✓	X
Utilized references	✓	✓	✓	X
Basic references that can be used	✓	✓	✓	X
Number of pages	126	146	241	19

Note: "X": It means that the feature does not exist. "✓": It means that the feature exists. These symbols (X, and ✓) are used with the same meaning in all tables in the "Findings" section.

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that Folk Culture Curriculums have various similarities and differences in terms of formal features. These are stated as follows:

- It has been determined that "values, learning areas, acquisition, explanations about the implementation of the curricula and measurement and evaluation approaches" are included in all of the Folk Culture Curriculums.
- In 2006, 2007 and 2008 curricula, "commission list, aims of Turkish National Education, general purposes, definition and purpose of folklore, explanation of folk culture lesson, basic approach, skills, learning-teaching processes / activity examples, symbols used and their meanings, although there are sections such as daily lesson plan examples, used references and basic references that can be used, these sections are not included in the 2018 curriculum; it was also determined that the word competencies was used instead of basic approach. In addition, it is seen that the 2006 curriculum has 126 pages, the 2007 curriculum has 146 pages, the 2008 curriculum has 241 pages, and the 2018 curriculum is 19 pages.
- It has been determined that departments such as "special purposes, individual development and competencies" in the 2018 curriculum are not included in the 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula. Although it is not included in the 2006/2007 and 2008 curricula, there is a "competencies" heading in the 2018 curriculum. In this title, competencies are defined as "skill range". Although the difference in meaning between the words skill and competence is blurred, this may not mean that competencies can be considered as "skills". Because skill is the human, technical and

social characteristics expected from the person for the relevant job/task. On the other hand, competence is evaluated as an indicator of an individual's ability, behavior, and knowledge for the relevant job (McNeill, 2021; Turan, 2015).

Educational Purposes

Findings regarding the comparison of the curriculums in terms of educational purposes are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of the curriculums in terms of educational purposes

Educational purposes	Curriculums			
	2006	2007	2008	2018
Understands the relationship between culture, folk culture and folklore.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Ensuring them understand the relationship between culture and folk culture.)
It perceives the change and continuity by determining the similarities and differences between the social practices experienced in different periods and places in Turkish folk culture.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Identifying the similarities and differences between social practices experienced in different periods and places in folk culture and ensuring that they perceive change and continuity.)
Realizes the place and importance of verbal expressions in folk culture.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Ensuring them realize the place and importance of verbal expressions in folk culture.)
It examines the knowledge produced by the people and the fields of knowledge production (folk knowledge) in our culture with a critical point of view.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (To enable people to think critically about the knowledge and knowledge production areas (folk knowledge) produced by the people in folk culture.)
Determines the place and importance of folk arts in folk culture.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Ensuring them realize the place and importance of folk arts in folk culture.)
It determines the place of music, games and entertainment in folk culture and their current forms.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Ensuring them to determine the place of performing arts in folk culture and their current forms)
Realizes the necessity of preserving, preserving and developing the cultural heritage that creates Turkish folk culture and national consciousness in the process of globalization.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Ensuring them realize the necessity of preserving, transferring, preserving and developing the cultural heritage defined in the Convention on the Protection of Intangible Cultural Heritage to which the Republic of Turkey was a party in 2006.)
It adopts the elements of Turkish folk culture and tries to adopt it at every opportunity.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Ensuring that they adopt the elements of folk culture and try to adopt them at every opportunity.)
It believes in the importance of social and cultural participation.	✓	✓	✓	X

Table 3. Comparison of curricula in terms of basic approaches / competencies

Basic Approaches / Competencies	Curriculums			
	2006	2007	2008	2018
Learning to learn.	✓	✓	✓	✓
To be able to observe, research and compile.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Mathematical competence and basic competencies in science / technology.)
To be physically and emotionally healthy and happy.	✓	✓	✓	X
To adopt universal values by focusing on national identity.	✓	✓	✓	X
Understanding cultural wealth.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Cultural awareness and expression.)
Using experiences and interacting with the environment.	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Social and civic competencies.)
Individualizing learning and teaching.	✓	✓	✓	X
Creating a portfolio.	✓	✓	✓	X
Communicating in mother tongue.	X	X	X	✓
Communicating in foreign languages.	X	X	X	✓
Digital competence.	X	X	X	✓
Taking initiative and entrepreneurship.	X	X	X	✓

According to Table 2, it was determined that 1 item in the 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula was removed from the 2018 curriculum, and 8 items were changed. When the changes made in the purpose statements are examined, it is seen that in the 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula, there are expressions reflecting behavioral outcomes (such as "realizes, perceives"); however, in the 2018 curriculum, it is seen that the verb stem "ensuring" is used at the end of the verbs in the purpose statements. Along with these, it has been determined that although "cognitive (such as perceiving) and affective (striving, believing and adopting) educational purposes" take place together in all curricula, the cognitive level is higher.

Comparison of Basic Approach / Competencies

Findings regarding the comparison of the curriculum in terms of basic approach / competencies are presented in Table 3.

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the curricula have various similarities and differences in terms of basic approach / competencies. These are stated as follows:

- It has been determined that "learning to learn" is included in all of the curriculums.
- 4 basic approaches in 2006, 2007 and 2008 curricula were not included in the 2018 curriculum; in addition, it was determined that 4 competencies in the 2018 curriculum were not included in other curricula.
- It has been determined that the 3 basic approaches in the 2006, 2007 and 2008 curricula were changed and included in the 2018 curriculum.

Structural Features

Comparison of Skills

Findings regarding the comparison of curricula in terms of skills are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of curriculums in terms of skills

Skills	Curriculums			
	2006	2007	2008	2018
Thinking critically.	✓	✓	✓	X
Thinking creatively.	✓	✓	✓	X
Contact.	✓	✓	✓	X
Research.	✓	✓	✓	X
Problem solving.	✓	✓	✓	X
Using information technologies.	✓	✓	✓	X
Entrepreneurship.	✓	✓	✓	X
To use Turkish correctly, beautifully and effectively.	✓	✓	✓	X
Observation.	✓	✓	✓	X
Compilation.	✓	✓	✓	X
Perceiving change and continuity.	✓	✓	✓	X
Social and cultural participation.	✓	✓	✓	X
Total	12	12	12	X

When Table 4 is analyzed, it is determined that although "skills" part was included in the 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula, it was not included in the 2018 curriculum.

Comparison of Values

Findings regarding the comparison of curriculums in terms of values are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. *Comparison of curriculums in terms of values*

Values	Curriculums			
	2006	2007	2008	2018
Solidarity.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Aesthetic.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Tolerance.	✓	✓	✓	X
Hospitality.	✓	✓	✓	✓
To respect differences.	✓	✓	✓	X
Responsibility.	✓	✓	✓	X
Helpfulness.	✓	✓	✓	X
Sensitivity to keeping cultural heritage alive.	✓	✓	✓	✓
To give importance to family unity.	X	X	X	✓
Humility.	X	X	X	✓
Diligence.	X	X	X	✓
Confidence.	X	X	X	✓
Mercy.	X	X	X	✓
Sharing.	X	X	X	✓
Saving.	X	X	X	✓
Loyalty.	X	X	X	✓
Total	8	8	8	12

69

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that the curricula have various similarities and differences in terms of values. These are stated as follows:

- It has been determined that the values of "solidarity, aesthetics, hospitality and sensitivity" are included in all curriculums.
- The 4 values (tolerance, respect for differences, responsibility and helpfulness) included in the 2006, 2007 and 2008 curricula were not included in the 2018 curriculum; in addition, it was determined that the 8 values included in the 2018 curriculum (family unity, humility, diligence, confidence, mercy, sharing, saving and loyalty) were not included in other curricula.

Comparison of Learning Areas

Findings regarding the comparison of curricula in terms of learning areas are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of curricula in terms of learning areas

Learning Areas	Curriculums			
	2006	2007	2008	2018
Folklore	✓	✓	✓	X
Social practices	✓	✓	✓	✓
Folk arts	✓	✓	✓	X
Verbal expressions	✓	✓	✓	✓
Folk knowledge	✓	✓	✓	✓
Music, games, entertainment	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Performing arts)
Globalization and folk culture	✓	✓	✓	Changed (Preserving intangible cultural heritage)
Handicraft tradition	X	X	X	✓
Total	7	7	7	6

70

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that the curricula have various similarities and differences in terms of learning areas. These are stated as follows:

- It has been determined that the learning areas of "social practices, verbal expressions and folk knowledge" are included in all curricula.
- Two learning areas included in 2006, 2007 and 2008 curricula were not included in the 2018 curriculum; in addition, it was determined that 1 learning area included in the 2018 curriculum was not included in other curricula.
- It was determined that 2 learning areas included in the 2006, 2007 and 2008 curricula were changed and included in the 2018 curriculum.

Comparison of Acquisition

Findings regarding the comparison of curriculums in terms of acquisition are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *Comparison of curriculums in terms of acquisition*

Learning Areas	Acquisition								
	5th grade	6th grade		7th grade		8th grade		Total	
	2018*	2006	2018	2007	2018	2008	2018	2006-2007 and 2008 curriculums	2018
Folklore	-	3	-	4	-	3	-	10	-
Social practices	3	6	2	4	3	3	7	13	15
Folk arts	-	3	-	6	-	4	-	13	-
Verbal expressions	5	3	6	7	5	7	4	17	20
Folk knowledge	4	5	4	2	3	8	2	15	13
Music, games, entertainment	-	3	-	9	-	3	-	15	-
Globalization and folk culture	-	3	-	1	-	3	-	7	-
Handicraft tradition	4	-	3	-	6	-	4	-	17
Performing arts	3	-	8	-	3	-	3	-	17
Preserving intangible cultural heritage	2	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	7
Total	21	26	25	33	22	31	21	90	89

*: It has been decided that the Folk Culture course for 5th graders will be taught in 2018.

When the distribution of the acquisitions in the curriculum according to Table 7 is examined according to the learning areas; although the total number of acquisitions is almost equal to each other; it is seen that the frequency values of the acquisitions are different from each other according to the class levels.

Comparison of Measurement and Evaluation Dimensions

Findings regarding the comparison of curricula in terms of measurement and evaluation dimensions are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Comparison of curriculums in terms of measurement and evaluation dimensions*

Measurement-Evaluation Methods and Tools	Curriculums			
	2006	2007	2008	2018
Interview	✓	X	X	X
Observation	✓	X	X	X
Oral presentation	✓	✓	✓	X
Performance evaluation	✓	✓	✓	X
Project	✓	✓	✓	X
Self-assessment	✓	✓	✓	X
Anecdotal records	X	✓	X	X
Control list	X	✓	✓	X
Rating scale	X	✓	✓	X
Rubric	X	✓	✓	X
Peer review	X	✓	✓	X
Portfolio	X	✓	✓	X
Open-ended questions	X	✓	✓	X

When Table 8 is examined; it is stated that in 2006-2007 and 2008 curricula, measurement and evaluation dimensions are given in detail; however, it is seen that the 2018 curriculum does not include measurement and evaluation methods and tools. In the 2018 curriculum, it was emphasized that only process and product-based measurement and evaluation should be made.

4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

When the curriculums are compared in terms of their formal features, it is seen that the curriculums developed in 2006/2007 and 2008 were prepared in accordance with the basic principles, rules and procedures of curriculum development; on the other hand, it was concluded that the 2018 curriculum was developed by neglecting some principles, rules and procedures of curriculum development in education. In this sense, the 2018 curriculum; it can be said that it was not developed within the scope of research and development studies depending on the need, it is not known whether it was developed/developed with the steps revealed by scientific studies, and whether different groups work in a coordinated manner in the curriculum is not clearly included. In particular, the fact that the "special expertise commission, the definition and purpose of folklore and explanations on the nature of the Folk Culture course" are not included in the 2018 curriculum creates a great deficiency in terms of planning, designing, drawing attention of practitioners and research and development. Because these topics are basic reference points in understanding the theoretical foundations of the curriculum (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2014). On the other hand, in the 2018 curriculum, different from the 2006/2007 and 2008 curricula; it was concluded that individual differences were taken as basis, the teacher was given the opportunity to make the necessary adjustments in the process of achieving the acquisitions, and the teacher was given flexibility. This situation is positive in terms of teacher's autonomy (Haapaniemi et al., 2020).

When curricula are compared in terms of structural features, it is seen that skills are not included in the 2018 curriculum. This situation causes the teachers not to know which skills students should acquire in the Folk Culture lesson. Also in terms of teaching-learning process; removing the examples of activities, symbols used and their meanings and daily lesson plans from the 2018 curriculum, which are included in the 2006/2007 and 2008 curricula and are guiding the teacher; in measurement and evaluation dimension; the removal of sample assessment and evaluation tools and definitions in the 2006/2007 and 2008 curriculum from the 2018 curriculum creates problems in understanding the relational structure between the elements of the curriculum. This situation may cause basic scientific mistakes in applying the curriculum. As such, since the 2018 curriculum supports teachers' curriculum adaptation efforts, it can be said that a flexible curriculum approach is based on. Therefore, the 2018 curriculum does not limit the activities as in-class or extra-curricular activities as in the previous curriculums, but leaves the activities, where and how to use them, how to measure and evaluate, to the teacher and his/her creativity. This situation may cause the teacher to make various scientific mistakes while applying the curriculum. Because first of all, the social studies teachers who are assigned to teach this course have little knowledge about Folk Culture and social studies teachers tend to apply the curriculum of different courses in the Folk Culture course (Akyol Kasapoğlu, 2015). Moreover, social studies teachers do not take a course on Folk Culture in their pre-service education (Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu [YÖK], 2021). Nevertheless, leaving the teaching of the Folk Culture course to the initiative of social studies teachers constitutes an obstacle, especially in transferring the content in line with scientific principles. In addition, it can be said that a teacher who cannot structure the content can make scientific mistakes in the learning-teaching process and evaluation steps. Because a curriculum is developed with an integrated and gradual structure, which is dependent on one step of the other (Ertürk, 2016). On the other hand, the fact that the Folk Culture lesson will be taught for 5th graders with the 2018 curriculum and the duty of teaching this lesson to social studies teachers is important in terms of seeing the Folk Culture lesson as a lesson taught on a middle school basis. This situation shows that the Folk Culture lesson may become a compulsory course in middle schools in the future. In the studies carried

out, it is witnessed that the tendency in this direction is revealed (Ajayi, 2019; Barker & Rice, 2019; Dundes, 2019; Kapaniaris & Varvounis, 2019; Tangherlini, 2017).

When all the results are evaluated together, although the acquisitions are included in the 2018 curriculum in a standard way; it can be said that the 2018 curriculum has a framework quality compared to other curricula, there is no guiding curriculum to guide the teacher, and does not explain what the teacher should do at every step of the way in an algorithm manner. As such, it is thought that the 2018 curriculum was developed based on the thesis that social studies teachers knew the curriculum and the Folk Culture lesson, compared to other curricula. Based on all results and findings, the followings are recommended:

- ✓ In the curriculums to be developed or updated in the future in the context of the Folk Culture lesson, "the special expertise commission that develops the curriculum, the skills, the teaching evaluation methods and tools, the daily lesson plan examples, and the explanations about the Folk Culture lesson" should be included.
- ✓ In order to analyze the relationship between the Folk Culture Curriculum and the textbook, MoNE should publish a book for the Folk Culture lesson and distribute it to schools.
- ✓ It is recommended to test how much of the determined acquisitions can be gained according to class levels and to design future programs accordingly.
- ✓ Since there is not a certain standard among the values in the curriculum, values education studies should be carried out in order to determine the values for the lesson and to decide which values will be included in the curriculum to be developed or updated in the future.

REFERENCES

Ajayi, E. A. (2019). The role of traditional folklore in facilitating adult learning in Nigeria. *International Review of Education, 65*, 859–877. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-019-09807-z

Akkoç, A. (2019). Consumption society's effect on social values. *Journal of Sociological Research, 22*(2), 1-25.

Akyol Kasapoğlu, P. (2015). *Intangible cultural heritage (ICH) and education: Example of Folk Culture course* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Barker, K. D., & Rice, C. (2019). *Folk illusions children, folklore, and sciences of perception*. USA: Indiana University Press.

Bilgin, N. (2014). *Sosyal bilimlerde içerik analizi teknikler ve örnek çalışmalar*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitapevi.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2015). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design.* USA: Sage.

Çavdarcı, M. (2002). *Türkiye'de sosyal değerlerin aşınması ve kültür sömürgeciliği* (Unpublished master'y thesis). Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.

Çetin, T., & Gürgil, F. (2013). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin Halk Kültürü dersi uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken / Journal of World of Turks, 5*(2), 73-86.

Çobanoğlu, Ö. (2020). *Halkbilimi kuramları ve araştırma yöntemleri tarihine giriş.* Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.

Demirel, Ö. (2015). *Eğitimde program geliştirme.* Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.

Dundes, A. (2019). The devolutionary premise in folklore theory. In *Analytic essays in folklore* (pp. 17-27). Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110903768-005

Ertürk, S. (2016). *Eğitimde program geliştirme.* Ankara: Edge Akademi Yayıncılık.

Gökmenoğlu, T. (2014). Geniş açı: Modeller ve yaklaşımlar açısından Türkiye'de program değerlendirme çalışmaları. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instructional Studies, 4*(7), 55-70.

Gürgil, F. (2017). An Investigation of pre-service teachers' perceptions of folk culture. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research, 6*(6), 523-541.

Kalaycı, N., & Baysal, S. F. (2020). Comparative analysis of social studies curricula (2005-2017-2018). *Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Social Sciences, 22*(1), 106-129.

Kapaniaris, A., & Varvounis, M. (2019). E-Learning program "Introduction to the Science of Folk Culture": Evaluation of the semester course "Introduction to Folklore". *World Wide Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development, 5(*5), 1-10.

Klenowski, V. (2010). Curriculum evaluation: Approaches and methodologies. P. Peterson, E. Baker, & B. McGaw (Ed.). In *International enclyclopedia of education*. Oxford: Elsevier Press.

Kutlu, M. (2009). Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın korunmasında eğitime yönelik ilk adım: Halk Kültürü dersi. *Milli Folklor Dergisi, 21*(82), 13-18.

Haapaniemi, J., Venäläinen, S., Malin, A., & Palojoki, P. (2020). Teacher autonomy and collaboration as part of integrative teaching – reflections on the curriculum approach in Finland. *Journal of Curriculum Studies.* DOI: 10.1080/00220272.2020.1759145

McNeill, J. (2021). *Skills vs. competencies what's the difference, and why should you care?* Retrieved from https://social.hays.com/2019/10/04/skills-competencies-whats-the-difference/

Medkova, E. S. (2017). Teaching traditional folk culture at modern Russian general education school. *Revista, 38*(56), 30-45.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded Sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MoNE. (2006). *İlköğretim Halk Kültürü (6. sınıf) dersi öğretim programı ve kılavuzu.* http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr (Erişim tarihi: 08.06.2018). Ankara: Board of Education.

MoNE. (2007). *İlköğretim Halk Kültürü (7. sınıf) dersi öğretim programı ve kılavuzu.* http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr (Erişim tarihi: 08.06.2018). Ankara: Board of Education.

MoNE. (2008). *İlköğretim Halk Kültürü (8. sınıf) dersi öğretim programı ve kılavuzu.* http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr (Erişim tarihi: 08.06.2018). Ankara: Board of Education.

MoNE. (2018). *İlköğretim Halk Kültürü dersi öğretim programı.* Ankara: Board of Education.

Oğuz, Ö. (2007). Folklor: Ortak bellek veya paylaşılan deneyim. *Millî Folklor, 74*, 5-8.

Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins. F. P. (2014). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and ıssues*. (Trans. A. Arı). Konya: Eğitim Publication.

Tangherlini, T. (2017). Folklore unbound: A concise introduction. *Folklore, 128*(2), 214-216.

Turan, N. (2015). *Çalışma yaşamında yetenek, beceri, yetkinlik, yeterlilik.* Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Turhan, Ç., & Gürgil, F. (2013). The opinions of primary school students about the Folklore course applications. *Journal of World of Turks, 5*(2), 73-86.

UNESCO. (2003). *Somut olmayan kültürel mirasın korunması sözleşmesi.* 21.01.2006 tarih ve 26056 sayılı Resmi Gazete.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, A. (2012). The comparison of elective Folk Culture course curriculum with the different levels of teaching level. *Millî Folklor, 24*(93), 112-124.

YÖK. (2021). *https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Kurumsal/egitim_ogretim_dairesi/Yeni-Ogretmen-Yetistirme-Lisans-Programlari/Sosyal_Bilgileri_Ogretmenligi_Lisans_Programi09042019.pdf* 20.08.2021 tarihinde erişilmiştir.