



Batmaz, O. (2022). Examination of primary school students' sensitivities and opinions on cultural heritage. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 10(1). 604-623.

Received : 05.10.2022
Revised version received : 11.12.2022
Accepted : 13.12.2022

EXAMINATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' SENSITIVITIES AND OPINIONS ON CULTURAL HERITAGE

Research article

Onur Batmaz  (0000-0001-9208-2645).

onur.batmaz@yobu.edu.tr

Yozgat Bozok University

Biodata:

Dr., Yozgat Bozok University, Vocational School Of Health Services, Child Development Program.

Copyright © 2014 by International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET). ISSN: 2148-225X.

Material published and so copyrighted may not be published elsewhere without written permission of IOJET.

EXAMINATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS' SENSITIVITIES AND OPINIONS ON CULTURAL HERITAGE

Onur Batmaz

onur.batmaz@yobu.edu.tr

Abstract

This research, which was conducted to examine primary school students' sensitivities and opinions on cultural heritage, was carried out with a mixed method. The study group, determined by the convenience sampling method, consists of 227 primary school 3rd and 4th grade students from primary schools in Yozgat. The data of the research were collected with the "Cultural Heritage Sensitivity Scale" developed by Halaç, Gürdoğan-Bayır and Çengelci-Köse (2021) and the "Open Ended Questionnaire Form" developed by researcher. SPSS program was used to analyze the quantitative data, and the descriptive analysis technique was used to analyze the qualitative data. As a result of the research; it was concluded that primary school 3rd and 4th grade students' sensitivity to cultural heritage was at the level of "totally agree". It was found that the students' sensitivity to cultural heritage showed a significant difference in favor of female students according to the gender variable, but did not show a significant difference according to the grade and family type variable. In addition, it was concluded that while the students' sensitivity to cultural heritage did not show a significant difference according to the mother's education level variable, it showed a significant difference according to the father's education level variable. It was found that the students expressed their opinions on both tangible and intangible cultural heritage elements in their opinions on cultural heritage.

Keywords: primary school, cultural heritage, sensitivity, opinion.

1. Introduction

Culture, which is the whole of the common material and spiritual elements that individuals come together, is a concept that ensures the continuity of societies and is unique to societies. According to the Turkish Language Institution, culture is "the sum of all the material and spiritual values created in the historical and social development process and the tools used in creating and transmitting them to the next generations, showing the extent of human dominance over their natural and social environment" (TDK, 2019). Ziya Gökalp, on the other hand, defines culture as "the harmonious whole of the lives of a single nation regarding religion, morality, law, reason, aesthetics, language, economy and technique" (Gökalp, 2012). Culture is the customs, traditions, lifestyles, beliefs, handicrafts, nutrition, values, etc. of a country, region or community from the past to the present. It is a comprehensive concept that includes elements (Diker & Deniz, 2017). Therefore, when we look at the definitions made, it is seen that the concept of culture is a multidimensional concept. Culture can be preserved by societies, enriched by interacting with different cultures, and can be passed on to future generations. Thus, the basis of cultural heritage is formed and the concept of cultural heritage emerges. The concept of cultural heritage is a series of data that an individual enriches by making use of his past experiences and provides continuity by transferring it to the next generations (Çankaya, 2006). The Council of Europe also defines cultural heritage as "resources inherited from the past that people define apart from property as an expression and reflection of their ever-changing values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions" (Council of Europe, 2005). In addition to creating a link between the past and the present, cultural heritage both contributes to social cohesion and helps individuals and society to be successful (George & Jones, 2008; Sidekli &

Karaca, 2013). The concept of cultural heritage, which included the preservation of great monuments that were only historically and artistically valuable in the early days, has now turned into a much more comprehensive concept that has a certain meaning for individuals and includes everything culturally (Ashworth, 1994; Aslan & Ardemagni, 2006; Howard, 2003). In the literature, classification has been made under two headings as tangible and intangible cultural heritage (Aksoy & Enlil, 2012; Aslan & Ardemagni, 2006; Oğuz, 2009; Şahin, 2010; UNESCO Convention for the Preservation of SOKUM, 2003). Ahmad (2006) also stated that towards the end of the twentieth century, the scope of cultural heritage was generally accepted as tangible and intangible cultural heritage in the international arena. While tangible cultural heritage constitutes movable and immovable elements from the past, intangible cultural heritage is expressed as practices and values that show the cultural texture of the society and are transferred from generation to generation (Demirezen & Aktaş, 2020). While tangible cultural heritage includes monuments, historical buildings and cities, archaeological sites, cultural areas and many tangible cultural values; Intangible cultural heritage includes traditions, oral history, religious ceremonies, sounds, values, traditional skills and technologies, performing arts, etc. (Bouchenaki, 2003; Tuncel & Altuntaş, 2020; Yeşilbursa, 2013). It is obvious that individuals and institutions in the society have important duties to increase awareness of cultural heritage and its elements, to protect them and transfer them to future generations. As a matter of fact, Scovazzi (2015) states that cultural heritage takes place from parents to their children in the family environment, and from teachers to students in school. Children first adopt the cultural heritage with what they see from their family and surroundings, what they learn, and then with the education they receive at school (Öztürk, 2021). Thus, with cultural heritage education, it is necessary to increase children's awareness and appreciation of cultural heritage elements (Hunter, 1992). Therefore, in order to achieve this, children are expected to create sensitivity towards cultural heritage elements from an early age and show sensitivity. According to the TDK, sensitivity is expressed as “the state of being sensitive, agitation and sensitivity”. Keskin & Öğretici (2013) define the concept of sensitivity as “to relate to the world and events in which we live and to take responsibility in this regard”. In addition, it is to take responsibility for the individual, the environment, society and cultural heritage with the awareness of sensitivity, preservation and sensitivity (Kuru, 2016). Sensitivity to cultural heritage, on the other hand, is the individual's attempt to recognize and understand the tangible and intangible cultural heritage elements, to value and take responsibility for protecting them. Sensitivity to cultural heritage plays an active role both in preserving culture as a value that needs to be developed in individuals and in carrying it to the future (Halaç, Gürdoğan-Bayır, & Çengelci-Köse, 2021). McMurray (2003) also states that sensitivity to cultural heritage includes more than being open to and respecting cultural differences; states that it requires understanding the dynamics of other cultures as well. Therefore, it is important for cultural heritage education to create sensitivity of individuals towards cultural heritage. While studies on intercultural sensitivity (Abaslı & Polat, 2019; Aksoy, 2016; Bae & Song, 2017; Bulduk, Usta & Dinçer, 2017; Cebrian & Cava, 2014; Demir & Üstün, 2017; Diker, 2019; Keskin & Öğretici, 2013; Öğüt & Olkun, 2018; Yıldırım & Çağlayan, 2020) are more common in the literature, studies on sensitivity to cultural heritage (Gürel ve Çetin, 2017; Halaç, Gürdoğan-Bayır & Çengelci-Köse, 2021; Kılcan & Akbaba, 2013; Kurtdede-Fidan, 2016; Taşdemir, 2018; Topkaya, 2019) are less common. It is seen that studies on sensitivity to cultural heritage at primary school level (Halaç, Gürdoğan-Bayır, & Çengelci-Köse, 2021; Kurtdede-Fidan, 2016) are very limited and at scale. However, the fact that there has not been any study that addresses both the sensitivity of students to cultural heritage and their opinions on cultural heritage at primary school level reveals the original value of this study. As a matter of fact, the sensitivities that emerge in children from an early age contribute to the preservation

of their cultural heritage and strengthening their awareness. It is considered extremely important that children in this period get to know different cultures and raise awareness about cultures (Dönmez & Yeşilbursa, 2014; Uçar, 2014). Sustainable preservation and preservation of culture depends on children's awareness of cultural heritage and the awareness and participation of the society in this regard (Halaç, Mokrane & Turan, 2019). Therefore, it is thought that examining the sensitivity and opinions of students towards cultural heritage in the primary school period, which has an important place in cultural heritage education, will contribute to the literature.

Purpose of the research

In this study, which was conducted to examine primary school students' sensitivities and opinions on cultural heritage, answers to the following questions will be sought.

- What is the level of sensitivity of primary school students towards cultural heritage?
- Do primary school students' sensitivity to cultural heritage differ according to gender?
- Do primary school students' sensitivity to cultural heritage differ according to grade level?
- Do primary school students' sensitivity to cultural heritage differ according to the education level of their parents?
- Do primary school students' sensitivity to cultural heritage differ according to the type of family they live in?
- What are primary school students' opinions on cultural heritage?

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

In this study, which was conducted to examine primary school students' sensitivities and opinions on cultural heritage, a mixed method in which quantitative and qualitative research approaches were used together was used. According to Creswell (2017), the mixed method is a research approach in which researchers collect both quantitative and qualitative data in order to better understand their current problems, integrate these data, and reach results by using the advantages of this integration. Therefore, in this study, the mixed method was used, as it was aimed to reach a conclusion by collecting the students' sensitivity to cultural heritage with quantitative data and their opinions on cultural heritage with qualitative data.

2.2. Study Group

The study group the research consists of 227 primary school 3rd and 4th grade students in primary schools in Yozgat. In the determination of the study group of the research, convenient case sampling method was used due to the easy access of the researcher to the participants and the speed and practicality of the researcher in the data collection process. Convenience sampling provides speed and practicality to the research, allowing the researcher to choose a situation that is close and easy to access (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2016). Information about the study group is given in Table 1.

Table 1. *Information of the Study Group*

		Scale Number of Participants (f)	Number of Open-Ended Survey Participants (f)
Gender	Female	112	110
	Male	115	113
Grade Level	3rd Grade	97	96
	4th Grade	130	127
Mother Education Level	Primary School	39	39
	Middle School	31	31
	High School	87	84
	University	70	69
Father Education Level	Primary School	33	33
	Middle School	36	36
	High School	74	72
	University	84	82
Family Type	Nuclear family	179	175
	Extended family	48	48

According to Table 1, it was seen that 227 students who participated in the study completed the cultural heritage sensitivity scale. However, it was observed that four students scribbled on the open-ended questionnaire, and four questionnaires were not taken into consideration, and 223 students answered the questionnaire.

2.3. Data Collection Tools

Two data collection tools were used within the scope of the research. Information on data collection tools is given below.

2.3.1. Cultural Heritage Awareness Scale: The scale was developed by Halaç, Gürdoğan-Bayır, & Çengelci-Köse (2021), and consists of sub-dimensions of “Curiosity”, “Transferring to the Future” and “Preservation”. Scale items are scored as follows: 1 “I strongly disagree”, 2 “I do not agree”, 3 “I agree”, 4 “I completely agree”. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was calculated as .79, and the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient in this study was .79.

2.3.2. Open-Ended Questionnaire Form: An open-ended questionnaire was prepared by the researcher to determine primary school students' opinions on cultural heritage. Studies in the literature for the prepared form (Avcı & Memişoğlu, 2016; Sağ & Ünal, 2019; Sidekli & Karaca, 2013) were examined. Expert opinion was taken for the form in terms of its suitability for the purpose of the research, the clarity the questions and its suitability for the level of the student. In line with the expert opinions, corrections were made and the questionnaire was given its final form. Some of the corrections made in line with the expert opinion are as follows: “What comes to mind when you think of traditional children's games?”, “What comes to mind about oral traditions and expressions?” questions, “Are there any traditional children's games that you play at home, on the street or at school? If so, what are they?”, “Epics, legends, folk tales, proverbs, tales, anecdotes, etc. that we heard or knew from our elders. is there? If so, what are they?” corrected as questions. The questionnaire form consists of explanatory questions that also reveal the quantitative dimension of the research and questions to understand what the students' opinions on cultural heritage are. In the questionnaire, “What comes to mind when you think of cultural heritage?”, “What comes to mind when you think of

traditional clothes?”, “Are there any historical places you see, visit or know in your surroundings? If so, what are they?” etc. there are nine questions.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

Necessary permissions were obtained to collect the data of the study. Before the data were collected, the school administration and primary school teachers were informed about the content of the research, and the research was conducted with the students in the classroom who wanted to participate voluntarily. The data of the research were collected in different lesson times with the "Cultural Heritage Sensitivity Scale" and an open-ended questionnaire. SPSS statistical program was used in the analysis of the quantitative data obtained during the research process, and descriptive analysis was used in the analysis of the qualitative data. Before analyzing the quantitative data, the normality distribution of the data was examined by looking at the test results (Kolmogorov-Smirnov), Skewness-Kurtosis values and Histogram graphs. It was found that the data showed a normal distribution due to the fact that the skewness values were between (-1) and (+1), and kurtosis values were between (-1) and (+2) (Huck, 2008) according to gender, grade level and the number of activities they participated in. The level ranges of the scale were calculated as 0.75 with the formula “score range = (highest value-smallest value)/number of options”. The ranges were determined as Strongly Disagree “1.00-1.75”, Disagree “1.76-2.50”, Agree “2.51-3.25”, and Totally Agree “3.26-4.00”. Descriptive analysis is the analysis of the question or subject in the data collection tools such as interview, observation or document used in the research (Ekiz, 2020). The data obtained from the answers given by the students to the open-ended questionnaire form were analyzed by the experts and consensus was achieved. In addition, in the analysis of qualitative data, the classification made by the General Directorate of Research and Education of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey for cultural heritage elements was also used.

3. Finding

3.1. Findings Related to the Sensitivity of Primary School 3rd and 4th Grade Students to Cultural Heritage

The findings regarding the sensitivity of primary school students to cultural heritage are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Cultural Heritage Sensitivity Levels of Primary School Students*

	\bar{x}	s.s.	Sensitivity Level
The Dimension of Curiosity	3.27	.49	Totally Agree
Dimension of Transfer to the Future	3.23	.58	Agree
Preservation Dimension	3.64	.50	Totally Agree
Cultural Heritage Sensitivity	3.34	.42	Totally Agree

According to Table 2, it was seen that primary school students' sensitivity to cultural heritage ($\bar{x}=34$) was at the level of "totally agree". It was found that the sub-dimensions of sensitivity to the cultural heritage of the students, curiosity and preservation, were at the level of "totally agree", while the dimension of transfer to the future was at the level of "agree". It can be said that students' sensitivity to cultural heritage is higher in the sub-dimension of preservation than in the sub-dimensions of curiosity and transfer to the future.

The findings regarding the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students according to the gender variable are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *T-Test Results on Cultural Heritage and Sub-Dimension Sensitivity Scores of Primary School Students by Gender Variable*

	Gender	\bar{x}	s.s.	t	p
The Dimension of Curiosity	Female	3.38	.47	3.467	.001
	Male	3.16	.49		
Dimension of Transfer to the Future	Female	3.35	.56	3.105	.002
	Male	3.12	.57		
Preservation Dimension	Female	3.69	.49	1.481	.140
	Male	3.59	.51		
Cultural Heritage Sensitivity	Female	3.44	.40	3.580	.000
	Male	3.25	.42		

According to Table 3, a t-test was conducted to determine whether the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students differed according to gender. As a result of the test, it was seen that the students' curiosity and transfer to the future sub-dimension and cultural heritage sensitivity scores showed a significant difference in favor of female students ($t= 3.467$ $p < .05$; $t= 3.105$ $p < .05$; $t= 3.580$ $p < .05$). Therefore, it can be said that female students' sub-dimension sensitivity to cultural heritage, curiosity and transfer to the future is higher than male students.

The findings regarding the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students according to the grade variable are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *T-Test Results on Cultural Heritage and Sub-Dimension Sensitivity Scores of Primary School Students by Grade Variable*

	Grade Level	\bar{x}	s.s.	t	p
The Dimension of Curiosity	3rd Grade	3.30	.53	.760	.448
	4th Grade	3.25	.46		
Dimension of Transfer to the Future	3rd Grade	3.31	.60	1.719	.087
	4th Grade	3.18	.55		
Preservation Dimension	3rd Grade	3.63	.59	-.098	.922
	4th Grade	3.64	.43		
Cultural Heritage Sensitivity	3rd Grade	3.38	.46	1.071	.286
	4th Grade	3.32	.39		

According to Table 4, a t-test was conducted to determine whether the cultural heritage and sub-dimension attitude scores of primary school students differ according to the grade variable. As a result of the test, it was concluded that there was no significant difference ($t= .760$ $p > .05$; $t= .1719$ $p > .05$; $t= -.098$ $p > .05$; $t= 1.071$ $p > .05$). According to the results of this finding, it can be said that the grade variable does not cause a significant difference in the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivities of primary school students.

The findings regarding the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students according to the mother education level variable are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Results on Cultural Heritage and Sub-Dimension Sensitivity Scores of Primary School Students by Mother Education Level Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Mother Education Level	\bar{x}	s.s.	sd	F	p	Significant Difference
The Dimension of Curiosity	Primary School	3.35	.50	3/223	.633	.595	-
	Middle School	3.32	.43				
	High School	3.25	.50				
	University	3.24	.50				
Dimension of Transfer to the Future	Primary School	3.28	.61	3/223	.718	.542	-
	Middle School	3.35	.43				
	High School	3.19	.57				
	University	3.21	.62				
Preservation Dimension	Primary School	3.53	.65	3/223	1.646	.180	-
	Middle School	3.74	.40				
	High School	3.70	.44				
	University	3.58	.51				
Cultural Heritage Sensitivity	Primary School	3.37	.48	3/223	.623	.601	-
	Middle School	3.42	.37				
	High School	3.33	.41				
	University	3.31	.44				

*p< .05 **A:** Primary School **B:** Middle School **C:** High School **D:** University

According to Table 5, ANOVA test was conducted to determine whether the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students differ according to the education level of the mother. According to the results of the ANOVA test, it was found that there was no significant difference in the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students according to the education level of the mother ($F_{223} = .633$ $p > .05$; $F_{223} = .718$ $p > .05$; $F_{223} = 1.646$ $p > .05$; $F_{223} = .623$ $p > .05$). It can be said that the educational level of the mother does not cause a significant difference in the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivities of primary school students.

The findings regarding the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students according to the father education level variable are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. ANOVA Results on Cultural Heritage and Sub-Dimension Sensitivity Scores of Primary School Students by Father Education Level Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Father Education Level	\bar{x}	s.s.	sd	F	p	Significant Difference
The Dimension of Curiosity	Primary School	3.66	.50	3/223	4.052	.008	A-B
	Middle School	3.07	.67				A-C
	High School	3.23	.45				
	University	3.29	.47				
Dimension of Transfer to the Future	Primary School	3.65	.45	3/223	3.092	.028	A-C
	Middle School	3.12	.52				
	High School	3.16	.59				
	University	3.26	.57				
Preservation Dimension	Primary School	3.69	.39	3/223	.565	.639	-
	Middle School	3.70	.36				
	High School	3.59	.53				
	University	3.67	.50				

Cultural Heritage Sensitivity	Primary School	3.66	.40	3/223	3.554	.015	A-B
	Middle School	3.23	.41				A-C
	High School	3.29	.43				
	University	3.37	.41				

* $p < .05$ **A:** Primary School **B:** Middle School **C:** High School **D:** University

According to Table 6, ANOVA test was conducted determine whether the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students differ according to the education level of the father. According to the results of the ANOVA test, it was observed that there was a significant difference in the sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students about cultural heritage and curiosity and transfer to the future ($F_{223} = 3.554$ $p < .05$; $F_{223} = 4.052$ $p < .05$; $F_{223} = 3.092$ $p < .05$). However, in the sub-dimension of preservation, it was found that there was no significant difference according to the father's education level of the students ($F_{223} = .565$ $p > .05$). Tukey test was used to determine between which groups the significant difference occurred. As a result of the test, it was concluded that the significant difference in cultural heritage and curiosity sub-dimension sensitivity scores was in favor of fathers with primary school education between fathers with primary, secondary and high school education, according to father's education level. On the other hand, it was found that the significant difference in the sensitivity scores of the transfer to the future sub-dimension was in favor of the fathers with a primary school education level between fathers with primary and high school education. Therefore, according to the results of these findings, it can be said that the educational status of the father is effective in the sensitivity of the primary school students to cultural heritage, and the sensitivity of the children of the fathers with the primary school education to the cultural heritage is also higher.

The findings regarding the cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivity scores of primary school students according to the family type they live in are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. *T-Test Results on Cultural Heritage and Sub-Dimension Sensitivity Scores of Primary School Students by Type of Family*

	Family Type	\bar{X}	s.s.	t	p
The Dimension of Curiosity	Nuclear family	3.24	.47	-1.642	.102
	Extended family	3.38	.55		
Dimension of Transfer to the Future	Nuclear family	3.23	.58	-.064	.949
	Extended family	3.23	.55		
Preservation Dimension	Nuclear family	3.66	.51	.957	.339
	Extended family	3.58	.48		
Cultural Heritage Sensitivity	Nuclear family	3.33	.42	-.641	.522
	Extended family	3.38	.43		

According to Table 7, a t-test was conducted to determine whether the cultural heritage and sub-dimension attitude scores of primary school students differ according to the type of family they live in. As a result of the test, it was concluded that there was no significant difference ($t = -1.642$ $p > .05$; $t = -.064$ $p > .05$; $t = .957$ $p > .05$; $t = -.641$ $p > .05$). According to the results of this finding, it can be said that the family type variable they live in does not cause a significant difference in cultural heritage and sub-dimension sensitivities.

3.2. Findings Related to Primary School 3rd and 4th Grade Students' Opinions on Cultural Heritage

Primary school 3rd and 4th grade students “What comes to mind when you hear the word “Cultural Heritage?” question has been asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Cultural Heritage*

			f
Intangible Cultural Heritage	Social Practices, Rituals and Feasts	Traditions-customs, Wedding, Sending off soldiers, Circumcision, Engagement etc.	72
	Performing Arts	Traditional games, Folk dances	29
	Knowledge of Nature and the Universe Appl.	Traditional food, Turkish coffee	14
	Craft Tradition	Weaving	1
Tangible Cultural Heritage	Immovable Cultural Heritage	Historic buildings, Historic sites	71
	Movable Cultural Heritage	Daily used items, Ancient coins, Traditional clothing, Traditional war tools, Historical pictures	68
Inheritance from Grandfather and Father		House, land, private belongings etc.	28
No Opinion Expressed/No			19

According to Table 8, the opinions of primary school students on cultural heritage are discussed under the headings of intangible cultural heritage, tangible cultural heritage, inheritance from father and grandfather, and no opinions are specified. When the students' opinions on cultural heritage were examined, they mostly (f=139) expressed their opinions on concrete cultural heritage. An important part of the students also expressed their opinions on intangible cultural heritage elements. Some of the students (f=28) expressed the cultural heritage as the inheritance from the grandfather and father. 19 students did not express any opinion.

To primary school 3rd and 4th grade students, “Are there any traditional children's games that you play at home, on the street or at school? If yes, what are they?” was asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 9.

Table 9. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Traditional Children's Games*

	f
The game of hiding (Hide and seek)	107
Jump-jump-bounce games (High off the ground, Hop-hop, Leap-on, Skipping rope, Longdonkey)	85
Ball games (Dodgeball, Stop, Dahlia, Rat in the middle)	44
Dumb-confused-joking games (Körebe, Hand fried, Hot-cold)	33
Stone games (Three stones, Five stones, Nine stones, Mangala)	32
Melodic games (Open the door, the head of the bazaar, I sell oil, I sell honey, Old mattress)	23
Lover-marble games	19
Run-chase-grab games (Handkerchief grab, Corner grab)	10
Dramatic games (Household, Grocery)	8

Stick games (Steel-rod)	2
Paper games (Name-city, Thief-cop)	2
Other (Topaç, Ear to ear)	8
Out of scope opinions (Computer, tablet, etc. games)	26

According to Table 9, when the opinions of primary school students on traditional children's games are examined, a significant part of the students (f=107) expressed their opinions on the hiding game. In addition, the students expressed their opinions on jump-jump-bounce (f=85), ball (f=44), dumb-confused-joking (f=33), stone (f=32), melodious (f=23), lover-marble (f=19), running-chase-grabbing (f=10), dramatic (f=8), stick (f=2), paper (f=2) and other games (f=8). 26 students did not express an out-of-scope opinion.

Primary school 3rd and 4th grade students were asked the question "What comes to mind when you say traditional clothes". The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Traditional Dress*

	f
Old time clothes	51
Folklore clothes	43
Shalwar	37
Henna clothes	27
Yemeni	8
Fez	6
Circumcision clothes	5
Different country clothes	5
Other (Cape, local dress, belt, cap, vest, sandal, aba, loincloth)	15
Out of scope opinions (shorts, t-shirts, suits, etc.)	38
No Opinion Expressed/No	16

According to Table 10, when primary school students' opinions on traditional clothes are examined, the students mostly (f=51) expressed their opinions on old-time clothes. In addition, the students expressed their opinions on folklore clothes (f=43), shalwar (f=37), henna clothes (f=27), yemeni (f=8), fez (f=6), circumcision clothes (f=5), different country clothes (f=5) and other clothes (f=15). While 38 students gave an out-of-scope opinion, 16 students did not express an opinion.

To primary school 3rd and 4th grade students, "Are there any historical places around you that you see, visit or know? If so, what are they?" question has been asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 11.

Table 11. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Historical Places*

	f
Historical sites (Sumela Monastery, Anıtkabir, Sarıkaya Roman Bath, Maiden's Tower, Göbekli Tepe, Maiden's Castle, Galata Tower, Ephesus Ancient City, Side Ancient City, Yozgat High School etc.)	84
Mosques (Çapanoğlu, Hagia Sophia, Selimiye, Süleymaniye, Sultanahmet etc.)	62
Museums (Sivas, Yozgat, Ankara, Aydıncık etc.)	59

Natural areas (Pamukkale Travertines, Fairy Chimneys, Ballica Cave, Yozgat Çamlık National Park)	15
Out of scope opinions (Items, Aquariums, Clothing, Natural stone etc.)	9
No Opinion Expressed/No	40

According to Table 11, when the opinions of primary school students on historical places are examined, the students mostly (f=84) expressed their opinions on historical sites. In addition, students made opinions about mosques (f=62), museums (f=59) and natural areas (f=15). While 9 students expressed out-of-scope opinions, 40 students did not.

Primary school 3rd and 4th grade students “What comes to mind when you say traditional items?” question has been asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 12.

Table 12. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Traditional Items*

	f
Items used daily (crocery, jug, copper coffee pot and glass, ewer, cauldron etc.)	94
Old time/Private items	36
Dowry/Dowry Chest	22
Woven items (Carpet, Rug, Booties, etc.)	10
Coffee Mill	9
Pocket Watch	8
Other (Sword, Spear, Shield, Oil Lamp etc.)	7
Out of scope opinions (Gold, History, Artifact, Telephone, Memories, Seat etc.)	25
No Opinion Expressed/No	27

According to Table 12, when primary school students' opinions on traditional items are examined, the students mostly (f=94) expressed their opinions on daily used items. In addition, students made opinions about old time/private items (f=36), dowry/dowry chest (f=22), woven items (f=10), coffee mill (f=9), pocket watch (f=8) and other items (f=7). While 25 students expressed out-of-scope opinions, 27 students did not.

Primary school 3rd and 4th grade students “What comes to mind when you think of traditional celebrations, entertainments or holidays?” question has been asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 13.

Table 13. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Traditional Celebrations, Entertainments or Holidays*

	f
Social practices, rituals and feasts (Wedding, Henna Night, Circumcision, Engagement, Soldier Farewell, Holiday Visit, Hand Kissing)	90
Religious holidays (Feast of Ramadan, Feast of sacrifices)	84
National holidays (23 April National Sovereignty and Children's Day, 29 October Republic Day, 30 August Victory Day)	67
Folk dances (Zeybek, Horon, Halay)	28
Old fun/memories/holidays	10
Happiness/Joy/Excitement	10
Out of scope opinions (Balloon, Heritage, Culture, Travel etc.)	8
No Opinion Expressed/No	23

According to Table 13, when primary school students' opinions on traditional celebrations, entertainments and holidays are examined, the students mostly (f=90) expressed their opinions on social practices, rituals and feasts. In addition, students made opinions about religious holidays (f=84), national holidays (f=67), folk dances (f=28), old fun/memories/festivals (f=10) and happiness/joy/excitement (f=8). While eight students expressed out-of-scope opinions, 23 students did not.

Primary school 3rd and 4th grade students "What comes to mind when you say traditional handicrafts?" question has been asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. *Primary School Students' Opinions on Traditional Handicrafts*

	f
Marbling	88
Materials made of earth (Plate, Vase, etc.)	33
Tile making	17
Weaving	13
Stonework	10
Sculpture	5
Dowry (Lace, Needle Lace, Wire Break, Sewing-Embroidery)	5
Other (Tinning, Calligraphy, Wood Carving)	3
Out of scope opinions (Art, History, Colors, Phone, Money etc.)	25
No Opinion Expressed/No	23

According to Table 14, when the opinions of primary school students on traditional handicrafts are examined, the students mostly (f=88) expressed their opinions on the art of marbling. In addition, the students made opinions about materials made from earth (f=33), tile making (f=17), weaving (f=13), stonework (f=10), sculpture (f=5), dowry (f=5) and other arts (f=3). While 25 students expressed out-of-scope opinions, 23 students did not.

To primary school 3rd and 4th grade students, "Are there any epics, legends, folk tales, proverbs, tales, anecdotes, etc. that we heard or know from our family elders? If so, what are they?" question has been asked. The findings that emerged from the analysis of the data obtained are presented in Table 15.

Table 15. *Opinions of Primary School Students Regarding Epics, Legends etc.*

	f
Anecdote (Nasreddin Hodja)	64
Proverbs (Drop by Drop Makes a Lake, What's Wrong With One Hand, Two Hands Have Voices, It's Time to Hide the Hay, etc.)	61
Fairy Tale (Keloğlan)	13
Legend (Bride Rock)	10
Folk tales (Leyla and Majnun, Arzu and Kamber)	6
Story (Dede Korkut)	5
No Opinion Expressed/No	94

According to Table 15, when primary school students' opinions on epics, legends, etc., which they heard or knew from their elders, were examined, the students mostly expressed their opinions on anecdotes (f=61). In addition, students made opinions about proverbs (f=61),

fairy tales (f=13), legends (f=10), folk tales (f=6) and stories (f=5). A significant part of primary school students (f=94) did not express any opinion.

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

It was concluded that primary school 3rd and 4th grade students' sensitivity to cultural heritage was at the level of "totally agree". In addition, it was seen that the students' sensitivity to cultural heritage sub-dimension scores were higher than curiosity and transfer to the future sub-dimension scores. It can be said that students' sensitivity to cultural heritage is mostly in the dimension of preservation. Tuncel & Altuntaş (2020) also emphasized that it is extremely important to respect and protect all cultural heritage through national laws and international agreements. In the study conducted by Kurtdede-Fidan & Yazıcı (2021), it was concluded that the students perceived the value of sensitivity as helping those in need, being sensitive, not being unresponsive to those around them, and being united against various rights. Studies in the literature (Erdoğan, 2009; Kurtdede-Fidan, 2016) have also found that primary school students have high levels of sensitivity. In addition, in the cultural heritage sensitivity studies of Kılcan & Akbaba (2013), it was concluded that the majority of the students perceived the value as protecting-watching.

It was concluded that the cultural heritage sensitivity scores of primary school 3rd and 4th grade students differed significantly according to gender. The significant difference was found to be in favor of female students. Therefore, it can be said that female students' sensitivity to cultural heritage is higher than male students. In addition, it was concluded that the grade level variable did not cause a significant difference in the sensitivity of the 3rd and 4th grade students to cultural heritage.

It was concluded that the students' cultural heritage sensitivity scores did not show a significant difference according to the mother's education level variable. However, it was found that there was a significant difference in the cultural heritage sensitivity scores of the students according to the father education level variable. It was concluded that there was a significant difference between fathers with primary, secondary and high school education, in favor of fathers with primary school education, according to father's education level. Therefore, it has been observed that the educational status of the father is effective in the sensitivity of the primary school students to cultural heritage, and it can be said that the children of the fathers with primary school education have a higher sensitivity to the cultural heritage. It can be stated that fathers with primary school education are more successful in transferring cultural heritage elements to their children.

It was concluded that the cultural heritage sensitivity scores of primary school 3rd and 4th grade students did not show a significant difference according to the family type variable. However, considering the students' sensitivity to cultural heritage, it can be said that the extended family type has higher sensitivity to cultural heritage than the nuclear family type. The fact that children living in the extended family type have a high sensitivity to cultural heritage may have been effective in gaining knowledge or awareness about cultural heritage from family elders such as grandparents or grandparents.

It has been concluded that primary school 3rd and 4th grade students' opinions on cultural heritage are mostly oriented towards tangible cultural heritage elements. An important part of the students also expressed their opinions on intangible cultural heritage elements (traditional games and meals, weddings, engagements, sending off soldiers, etc.). It can be said that the fact that the students are in the concrete operational stage from a developmental point of view is effective in expressing their opinions on the concrete cultural heritage elements. In the study

conducted by Tuncel & Altuntaş (2020) with students, it was seen that the students included concrete cultural heritage elements, which are more visual indicators, with pictorial narratives. In the study conducted by Ünal (2013), it was determined that the most common elements of seasonal holidays, children's games, marriage, embroidery, women's clothing-dressing-ornament, food-food-drink, Karagöz, proverb, folk music/instrument, Turkish folk dances, wrestling and javelin folk culture were included in the textbooks. In Avcı's (2014) study, students' opinions on cultural heritage were expressed as artifacts from the past, traditions and customs, folk dances, holidays, weddings and games. In their research, Gürdoğan-Bayır & Çengelci-Köse (2019) found that students gave examples of both tangible and intangible cultural heritage elements such as historical monuments and structures, eating and drinking culture and folk dances.

The students gave more opinions about the hiding game (hide and seek) than the traditional children's games. In addition, it has been observed that students play games such as jump-jump-bounce, ball, dumb-confused-joking, stone, melodious, lover-marble, running-chase-grabbing etc. at home, on the street or at school. In the study conducted by Sağ & Ünal (2019), it was concluded that almost all of the students had knowledge about traditional children's games. It can be said that the fact that children are in the age of play is effective in having knowledge and awareness of traditional children's games. Primary school 3rd and 4th grade students gave the most opinion about traditional clothes as old-time clothes. In addition, the students expressed their opinions on folklore clothes, shalwar, henna clothes, yemeni, fez, circumcision clothes, clothes from different countries, etc.

When the opinions of the students on historical places were examined, the opinions on the historical areas (Sumela Monastery, Anıtkabir, Sarıkaya Roman Bath, Maiden's Tower, Göbekli Tepe etc.) were mostly stated. In addition, students made opinions about mosques, museums and natural areas. However, a significant part of the students either did not express an opinion or expressed an out-of-scope opinion. The students' opinions on traditional items were mostly about the items used daily. Students made opinions about old time/private items, dowry/dowry chest, woven items, coffee mill, pocket watch etc. 52 teachers, on the other hand, either did not have an opinion on traditional items, or they made out-of-scope opinions. In the study of Sağ & Ünal (2019), it was concluded that students had partial awareness of items with cultural value.

When the opinions of the students on traditional celebrations, entertainments and holidays were examined, they mostly found opinions about social practices, rituals and feasts. In addition, students made opinions about religious holidays, national holidays, folk dances, old fun/memories/festivals and happiness/joy/excitement. In their students' opinions on traditional handicrafts, while the students mostly expressed their opinions on the art of marbling, they expressed their opinions on earthen materials, tile making, weaving, stonework, sculpture, dowry and other arts. A significant part of the students either expressed an out-of-scope opinion or did not express an opinion. In the study of Sağ & Ünal (2019), it was concluded that the students had partial knowledge about traditional handicrafts, traditional celebrations and entertainments and gave examples. However, in the study, it was found that the number of students who gave an opinion as "I don't know" was not low. In the study conducted by Özbek & Çevik (2018), it was concluded that the needlework works are mostly diverse, traditional handicrafts are given importance in Gönen, and there are efforts to transfer this heritage to future generations through various collaborations. In addition, in the study, it has been concluded that traditional handicrafts have a share in the economic development of the district and in tourism and promotion activities.

When the students' opinions on epics, legends, etc., which they heard or knew from their family elders, were examined, the students mostly expressed their opinions on anecdotes. In addition, students made opinions about proverbs, fairy tales, legends, folk tales and stories. An important part of primary school students did not express any opinion. In the study conducted by Sağ & Ünal (2019), it was concluded that the students could only give examples of proverbs and idioms, and could not give examples of oral and written literary products such as epics, fairy tales, stories, anecdotes. In addition, it was stated that the students were not sufficiently informed about the literary products of Turkish culture. However, according to the findings of this study, the students made opinions about anecdotes, proverbs, tales, legends, folk tales and stories.

As a result of the study, studies can be carried out to increase the level of the sub-dimension of transferring the sensitivity of the cultural heritage of the primary school students to the future. When students' opinions on cultural heritage are examined, it can be ensured that in-class and out-of-class activities can be increased to reduce the number of students with out-of-scope opinions. Different quantitative or qualitative studies can be conducted to determine the sensitivity of primary school students to cultural heritage.

References

- Abasli, K., & Polat, S. (2019). Examination of students' opinions on intercultural sensitivity and cultural intelligence. *Anemon Mus Alparslan University Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 193-202.
- Ahmad, Y. (2006). The scope and definition of heritage: From tangible to intangible. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12 (3), 292-300.
- Aksoy, Z. (2016). A study on the intercultural sensitivity development of students in intercultural communication education. *Selcuk Communication*, 9(3), 34-53.
- Aksoy, A., & Enlil, Z. (2012). *Contemporary approaches to cultural heritage management*. Eskisehir: Anadolu University Press.
- Ashworth, G. J. (1994). *From history to heritage – from heritage to identity: In search of concepts and models*. In it, G.J. Ashworth and P.J. Larkham (Eds.), *Building a new heritage: Tourism, culture and identity in the new Europe* (pp. 13-30). New York: Routledge.
- Aslan, Z., & Ardemagni, M. (2006). *Introducing young people to the protection of heritage sites and historic cites*. Rome: MAXTUDIO, ICCROM.
- Hunter, M. (2014). *Student and teacher opinions on cultural heritage education in social studies course*. Unpublished master's thesis, Abant İzzet Baysal University, Bolu.
- Avcı, M., & Memişoğlu, H. (2016). Opinions of social studies teachers on cultural heritage education. *Primary Education Online*, 15(1), 104-124.
- Bae, S., & Song, H. (2017). Intercultural sensitivity and tourism patterns among international students in korea: using a latent profile analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 22(4), 436-448.
- Bouchenaki, M. (2003, October). The Interdependency of the tangible and intangible cultural heritage. *ICOMOS 14th General Assembly and Scientific Symposium*, Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe.
- Bulduk, S., Usta, E., & Dinçer, Y. (2017). Identification of intercultural sensitivity and affecting factors: An example of vocational school of health services. *Duzce University Journal of Health Sciences Institute*, 7(2), 73-77.
- Cebrian, M., & Cava, M. (2014). Intercultural sensitivity, empathy, self-concept and satisfaction with life in primary school students. *Journal for the Study of Education and Development*, 37(2), 342-367.
- Council of Europe (2005). *Council of Europe framework convention on the value of cultural heritage for society*. <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/199.htm> (Accessed 14 June 2010).
- Creswell, W. J. (2017). *Introduction to mixed methods research*. (M. Sözbilir, Trans.) Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Cankaya, E. (2006). *Conservation of intangible cultural heritage in the context of museology*. (Master's Thesis).
- Demir, S., & Üstün, E. (2017). Examination of pre-service teachers' levels of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism in terms of various variables. *YYU Journal of Education Faculty*, XIV(I), 182-204.

- Demirezen, S., & Aktaş, G. (2020). Determining the views of social studies teachers on teaching intangible cultural heritage. *Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty*, 15(30), 413-434.
- Diker, E. (2019). *Testing the effectiveness of a multicultural psychoeducation program on intercultural sensitivity and empathy skills of primary school students*. (Master's thesis).
- Diker, O., & Deniz, T. (2017). *Tangible cultural heritage and Turkey from the perspective of geography and history*. Ankara: PegemA.
- Dönmez, C., & Yeşilbursa, C. C. (2014). The effect of cultural heritage education on students' attitudes towards concrete cultural heritage. *İlkogretim Online*, 13(2), 425-442.
- Ekiz, D. (2020). *Scientific research methods*. Ankara: Memoir Publishing.
- Erdoğan, M. (2009). *Fifth grade students' environmental literacy and the factors affecting students' environmentally responsible behaviors*. Thesis Doctor Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- George, J. M., & Jones, G. R. (2008). *Understanding and managing organizational behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Gokalp, Z. (2012). *Fundamentals of Turkism*. Istanbul: Anonymous Publications.
- Gürdoğan-Bayır, Ö., & Çengelci-Köse, T. (2019). Opinions of secondary school students on cultural heritage and its conservation. *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, 27(4), 1827-1840.
- Gürel, D., & Çetin, T. (2017). Evaluation of secondary school students' opinions on intangible cultural heritage in terms of sensitivity to cultural heritage. *VI. International Social Studies Education Symposium*, Eskişehir, Turkey, 134-135.
- Halaç, H. H., Gürdoğan-Bayır, Ö., & Çengelci-Köse, T. (2021). The validity and reliability study of the scale of sensitivity to cultural heritage for primary school students. *Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty*, 16(31), 197-218.
- Halaç, H. H., Mokrane, H., & Turan, S. (2019). Cultural heritage and conservation awareness of TÖMER students. Eskişehir Anadolu University sample. *Journal of Awareness*, 4(2), 185-204.
- Howard, P. (2003). *Heritage: Management, interpretation, identity*. New York: Continuum.
- Huck, S. W. (2008). *Reading Statistics and Research*. Pearson: Boston.
- Hunter, K. (1992). A commitment to education: Designing a heritage education for National Trust: A final report. *Historic Preservation Forum*, 6(1), 15-20.
- Keskin, Y., & Tutorial, B. (2013). Gaining the value of "sensitivity" through activities in social studies course: A qualitative research. *Journal of Values Education*, 11(25), 143-181.
- Kilcan, B., & Vulture, B. (2013). Investigation of student perceptions on the value of sensitivity to cultural heritage in the social studies curriculum. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken. Journal of the World of Turks*, 5(3), 113-137.
- Kurtdede-Fidan N., & Yazıcı, S. (2021). Perceptions of primary school students about the value of sensitivity in their case studies. *International Journal of Eurasian Education and Culture*, 6(14), 1622-1657.

- Kurtdede-Fidan, N. (2016). Sensitivity of students to the natural environment, animals, social problems and cultural heritage. *International electronic journal of elementary education*, 8(3), 403-424.
- Kuru, H. (2016). Analysis of Ayşe Yamaç's children's novels in terms of values education and language richness [Unpublished master's thesis]. Usak University.
- McMurray A. (2003). *Community, health and wellness: A sociological approach*. Elsevier, New South Wales, Australia.
- Oguz, M. O. (2009). Intangible cultural heritage and diversity of cultural expression. *National Folklore*, 21(82), 6-12.
- Öğüt, N., & Olkun, E.O. (2018). Intercultural sensitivity level of university students: Selcuk University example. *Selcuk Communication*, 11, 54-73.
- Ozbek, O., & Agile, S. (2018). Traditional handicrafts as carriers of intangible cultural heritage: The living heritage of Gönen district. *Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies*, 6(4), 588-603.
- Ozturk, H. M. (2021). Cultural heritage transfer in early childhood, environmental education in early childhood. Ankara: Educating Book.
- Right, C., & Ünal, F. (2019). Determining students' awareness of intangible cultural heritage. *Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 19(4), 1550-1560.
- Scovazzi, T. (2015). *Intangible cultural heritage as defined in the 2003 UNESCO convention*. In Cultural Heritage and Value Creation (pp. 105-126). Springer, Cham.
- Sidekli, S., & Karaca, L. (2013). Pre-service teachers' opinions on the use of local and cultural heritage items in social studies teaching. *Gaziosmanpaşa Journal of Scientific Research*, (5), 20-38.
- Sahin, D. I. (2010). *Digitization of local cultural heritage and public libraries*. (Master's Thesis).
- Tasdemir, M. (2018). *Investigation of secondary school sixth grade social studies textbook texts in terms of sensitivity to cultural heritage*. (Unpublished master's thesis).
- Topkaya, Y. (2019, October). *Student opinions on educational comics in transferring the value of sensitivity to cultural heritage*. In International Educational Sciences Congress. 11-13 October 2019, Konya, 80-85.
- Tuncel, G., & Altuntaş, B. (2020). Cultural heritage perception of 4th grade primary school students: A semiotic analysis. *International Journal of Field Education*, 6(1), 123-140.
- Turkish Language Association [TDK]. (2019). *Turkish dictionary*. Ankara: Turkish Language Association Publications.
- Uçar, M. (2014). Evaluation of the effectiveness of education on cultural property and conservation at primary school level and the contribution of non-governmental organizations to education. *Megaron*, 9(2), 85.
- UNESCO Convention for the Preservation of ICH (2003). Convention for the protection of intangible cultural heritage. Accessed from <https://aregem.ktb.gov.tr/TR-50837/somut-olmayan-kulturel-mirasin-korunmasi-sozlesmesi-hakkinda.html>.

- Unal, F. (2013). Evaluation of folk culture elements in social studies textbooks. *Adiyaman University Journal of Social Sciences Institute Social Studies Teaching Special Issue*, 6(14), 611-644.
- Yesilbursa, C. C. (2013). *Sixth grade students' opinions on tangible cultural heritage*. *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, 21(2), 405-420.
- Yildirim, K., & Çağlayan, S. (2020). Intercultural sensitivity perceptions of university students. *Süleyman Demirel University Faculty of Arts and Sciences Journal of Social Sciences*, (50), 77-103.
- Yildirim, S., & Şimşek, F. (2016). *Qualitative research methods in the social sciences*. Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.