JOURNAL of Interdisciplinary Education: Theory and Practice

EDUGARDEN

Middle School Students' Views on Common Heritage*

Cemil Cahit Yeşilbursa[1] Esra Üçarkuş[2]

1,2 Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Ankara, Türkiye

ABSTRACT	**ARTICLE INFO**
In this study 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th grade middle school students' views on common heritage was examined. This study was conducted in descriptive survey design. As generalization was not aimed one of the purposive sampling methods, convenient sampling was used. Within this scope, there are 127 5th grades, 59 6th grades, 59 7th grades and 85 8th grades, in total 330 middle school students in the study group. Data was collected in written by a data collection tool that consisted of open ended questions about their opinions and information questions with pictures of common heritage. Descriptive statistics what is used for data analysis. Besides, simple frequency and percentage calculations used to digitalize qualitative findings. According to the results obtained in the study, students' common heritage descriptions and literal descriptions show similarity. Students described the importance of the protection of the common heritage as cultural, historical and universal values, to hand down to the next generations, contribution to tourism and development social relations. The students described common heritage's contribution to humanity as tourism, economy, social relations, knowledge acquisition and cultural. The students stated that the factors that cause common heritage to extend are human, reckless behaviours of people, environmental pollution, wars, and urban architecture planning. They stated that the precautions that must be taken are security, awareness raising activities, legal protection and non-governmental organizations. Students specified individual precautions as security and non-governmental organizations. When students' recognition level of the pictures of common heritage elements evaluated, it was seen that the least known common heritage element is Divriği Ulu Mosque, and the most known common heritage elements are Leaning Tower of Pisa and Statue of Liberty.	

1. Introductıon

One of the main features that distinguish human beings from other living beings is that they have culture and can pass this culture on from generation to generation. Because of this privilege humankind has been creating culture since the beginning of history. In this sense, humankind has a history of many different cultures and civilizations. Material (sculpture, architecture, painting etc.) and moral (customs, traditions, lifestyle etc.) values that were created by these different cultures and civilizations provided a cultural wealth in the world. These values have a particular importance as being the whole humankind's cultural wealth heritage (Göğebakan, 2009). Due to its nature, humankind has made an effort to protect the structures that have an importance as monuments and the objects since the first human settlements. Taking measurements to protect monuments considered

as a habit or a tradition after a while; although it was because of intention of establishing sovereignty and religious reasons at first (Erder, 1999: 70). Around the world cultural properties that have a very important place for humankind and give us information about lifestyles of societies, their traditions, customs and beliefs, their way of understanding the world, their arts from past to present and from now to future came under attack for a lot of time by the humankind (Göğebakan, 2009). As a result of environmental problems reaching global scales after 1970s, natural environmental values started to be considered global environmental goods and local historical-cultural values as the common heritage of humanity. The concept of common heritage can be used instead of the concept of world heritage. In the past, the policies of conservation of historic-cultural heritage, which were used to create more common past and local or national identities, were considered as a global responsibility to pursue "the common heritage of humanity" or "global goods" in parallel to the discourse of globalization (Kiper, 2004). Therefore, it is possible to define concept of common heritage, also known as the World heritage, as follows "What remains of our past is our legacy, which we now exist with, and will leave to the future generations. Every one of our cultural and natural heritage, is irreplaceable sources of life and inspiration" (Torcu, 2013, as cited in Şakacı, 2015). It can be seen that the concept of common heritage relates to cultural and natural values.

Today, almost every country strives to protect its cultural and natural assets and promote them for reasons such as the desire to transfer existing values to future generations, and to have a respectable position in the world (Akpınar, 2007: 82). In this respect, while international organizations are working to protect the common heritage and international laws are enacted, education is also emphasized. Raising conscious citizens for the protection of the common heritage is becoming increasingly important. We see that concepts such as common heritage or cultural heritage are introduced in primary, secondary and high school curriculum programs. In our country, knowledge, concepts, skills and values related to the concept of common heritage are given in the social studies curriculum (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2005). In the fifth grade, it is aimed that the students gain the concept of common heritage with the learning outcome "He gives examples of common heritage elements found in various countries and realizes the importance of tourism in the recognition of the common heritage." In the sixth grade, the concept of common heritage is not directly mentioned but is implied in the program. The learning outcome "Evaluates the role of international culture, art, fair and sports activities in inter-communal interaction" aims to gain awareness on the concept of common heritage. In the seventh grade, it is aimed to introduce the concept of common heritage to the students with the acquisition of "Be aware of the responsibility of humanity in keeping the products of thought, art and literature, natural assets and historical environments alive as common heritage elements." Although it was observed that there is academic studies regarding cultural heritage (Yeşilbursa, 2011; Uçar, 2014; Avcı and Memişoğlu, 2016; Gürdoğan Bayır and Çengelci Köse, 2019), there were very few studies on common heritage, especially in terms of educational sciences (Göğebakan, 2009). This study apart from the concept of cultural heritage studies focuses on concept of common heritage. In this respect, it is thought that this study will contribute to the literature.

Accordingly, the aim of this study is to research middle school students' opinions of the concept of common heritage. In-line with this purpose the following research questions were asked:

1. How do the middle school students define the common heritage?
2. What are the middle school students' opinions on importance of common heritage?
3. What are the middle school students' opinions on common heritage's contribution to humanity?
4. What are the middle school students' opinions on the factors that affect extinction of common heritage?
5. What are the middle school students' opinions on the protection of common heritage?
6. What is the middle school students' state of recognizing some of the common heritage elements?

2. Method

Descriptive research was used in this study. In educational research descriptive method is generally used to determine a selected group's attitudes, beliefs and opinions on a specific topic (McMillan and Schumacher, 2006). In this study, descriptive survey method was used as it was wanted to investigate middle school students' views on common heritage.

2.1. Study group

Convenient sampling method was used to determine the study group. It is stated that the convenient sampling method is a frequently used method by the researchers as it's easier to access the participants and the participants are eager to participate (Kemper, Stringfield, and Teddie, 2003; Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2016). In this context, convenient sampling was used in terms of easy accessibility to the participants and their willingness to participate in the study. The authors reached 342 middle school students. However, the answers of twelve of them were not included in the study group because they did not provide data suitable for the purpose of the research. Finally, in study group there are 127 5th grades, 59 6th grades, 59 7th grades and 85 8th grades, in total 330 middle school students. In the scope of the study feedback forms were sent to 330 middle school students, but during the analysis it was found that went to twenty-seven participants' feedback forms were incomplete and incorrect. Therefore, these forms were not evaluated. Thus, 303 feedback forms were analysed.

2.2. Data collecting tools

Data was collected in written by using the data collecting tool that included open ended questions about common heritage and knowledge questions with pictures. The questions generated from the literature and social studies textbooks. Regarding the questions, two social studies, one history education, one assessment and evaluation specialist and one social studies teacher were consulted. As a result of expert opinions, after making the necessary arrangements in the data collection tool, it was adapted to a group of 20 students, different from the study group. Their views on whether the data collection tool was understood or not were received, and final corrections were made. The following are the opinion questions into data collecting tool.
1. What is common heritage?
2. Is protecting common heritage important? Why?
3. What are the contributions of common heritage elements to humankind?
4. What are the factors that affect extinction of common heritage elements?
5. What kind of precautions should be taken to protect common heritage? What can you do about that?
6. Please write the names of the structures in the pictures under them.

2.3. Data analysis

Descriptive analysis was used to evaluate the data of the study. The data collected via descriptive analysis is summarized and interpreted, and direct questions are included frequently. Besides, the data is digitized by simple percentage and frequency calculations (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2016: 239). Researcher triangulation was used for the validity and reliability of the data. In this sense, different from the authors, the data were analyzed by another expert. The categories and themes agreed upon were included in the study. Triangulation is often the process of using multiple perceptions to explain meaning, verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation (Işık and Semerci, 2019).

3. Results

3.1. Results about the first sub-problem question

In the first question of the study middle school students' definitions of common heritage analysed. Students were asked "What is common heritage?" In this regard, analysis about the first sub-problem question is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Middle school student's opinions of the question "What is common heritage?"

Grade	Theme/Codes	f	%	Grade	Theme/Codes	f	%
5	**Common heritage**			7	**Common heritage**		
	Something belongs to all humanity	34	33,3		Something belongs to all humanity	22	47,8
	Natural and human elements	26	25,5		Historical structures/ Past	18	39,1
	Historical structures/ Past	25	24,5		Material and nonmaterial values/Natural	5	10,9
	To be seen by everybody/ recognisability	7	6,9		UNESCO	1	2,2
	Beautiful and precious	6	5,9		**Total**	**46**	**100**
	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)	4	3,9	8	Historical structures	34	47,2
	Total	**102**	**100**		Something belongs to all humanity	26	36,1
6	Something belongs to all humanity	21	65,6		Material and nonmaterial values	9	12,5
	Historical structures/ Past	11	34,4		Something handed down to the next generations	3	4,2
	Total	**32**	**100**		**Total**	**72**	**100**

Table 1 shows the codes obtained from the students' definitions of the concept of common heritage. Accordingly, from the expressions of 5th grade students, something belongs to all humanity (f = 34; 33,3%), natural and human elements (f = 26; 25,5%), historical structures / past (f = 25; 24,5%), to be seen by everybody / recognisability (f = 7; 6,9%), beautiful and precious (f = 6; 5,9%), UNESCO (f = 4; 3,9%); from the statements of the 6th grade students, historical structures / past (f = 11; 34,4%), something belongs to all humanity (f = 21; 65,6%); from the expressions of 7th grade students, something belongs to all humanity (f = 22; 47,8%), historical structures / past (f = 18; 39,1%), material and nonmaterial values / natural (f = 5; 10,9%), UNESCO (f = 1; 2,2%); from the expressions of 8th grade students, historical structures (f = 34; 47,2%), something belongs to all humanity (f = 26; 36,1%), material and nonmaterial values (f = 9; 12,5%), something handed down to the next generations (f = 3; 4,2%) codes were reached.

Some of students' definitions of the common heritage are "Common heritage is not the heritage of one country. It belongs to other countries as well" (5th grade), "Common heritage means that natural and artificial artifacts are known and protected worldwide" (5th grade), "They are important works that were handed to us from past generations" (6th grade), "Common heritage is the legacy of the world"(6th grade), "They are the natural historical artefacts that are under protection by UNESCO" (7th grade), "Common heritage are important works and architectures for all cultures" (7th grade), "They are works of historical importance left to future generations in the world" (8th grade), "Common heritage is not a national but something that belongs to everyone"(8th grade).

3.2. Results about the second sub-problem question

Middle school students' opinions of the importance of the common heritage were analysed with the second question. Therefore, students were asked "Is protecting common heritage important? Why?" In this regard, analysis about the second sub-problem question is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Middle school students' opinions of the question "Is protecting common heritage important? Why?"

Grade	Theme/Codes	f	%	Grade	Theme/Codes	f	%
	Importance				**Importance**		
5	Historical importance/Information	34	35,8	7	Historical importance	24	54,5
	Universal value	17	17,9		Next generations	8	18,2
	Next generations	17	17,9		Cultural importance	6	13,6
	Tourism	8	8,4		Universal value	3	6,8
	Danger of extinction	8	8,4		Social relations	2	4,5
	Aesthetic	7	7,4		Tourism/Economy	1	2,3
	Cultural importance	4	4,2		**Total**	**44**	**100**
	Total	**95**	**100**	8	Historical importance/Learn about the past	29	55,8
6	Historical importance/Learn about the past	8	38,1		Next generations	18	34,6
	Universal value	4	19,0		Tourism	5	9,6
	Tourism	3	14,3		**Total**	**52**	**100**
	Next generations	3	14,3				
	Aesthetic	2	9,5				
	Cultural importance	1	4,8				
	Total	**21**	**100**				

In Table 2, the codes obtained from the expressions of the students about the importance of protecting the common heritage are given. Accordingly, from 5th grade students' expressions, historical importance / information (f = 34; 35,8%), universal value (f = 17; 17,9%), next generations (f = 17; 17,9%), tourism (f = 8; 8,4%), danger of extinction (f = 8; 8,4%), aesthetic (f = 7; 7,4%), cultural importance (f = 4; 4,2%) codes were reached. From the expressions of 6th grade students historical importance / learn about the past (f = 8; 38,1%), universal value (f = 4; 19,0%), tourism (f = 3; 14,3%), next generations (f = 3; 14,3%), aesthetic (f = 2; 9,5%), cultural importance (f = 1; 4,8%) codes were obtained. Among the expressions of 7th grade students, historical importance (f = 24; 54,5%), next generations (f = 8; 18,2%), cultural importance (f = 6; 13,6%), universal value (f = 3; 6,8%), social relations (f = 2; 4,5%) tourism / economy (f = 1; 2,3%) codes have been reached. From the expressions of 8th grade students, historical importance / learn about the past (f = 29; 55,8%), next generations (f = 18; 34,6%), tourism (f = 5; 9,6%) codes have been obtained.

Some of students' opinions of the protection of common heritage are "It's important. Because common heritage artefacts help us learn about the past" (5th grade), "Yes, it's important because common heritage elements are very precious. Besides, they belong to everyone" (5th grade), "Yes, if we don't protect historical artefacts, the tourists won't come to our country" (6th grade), "Yes, because some structures are our history, in other words they give clues about a country's history, and they provide information" (7th grade), "They're important because they promote the relationship between countries" (7th grade), "It's important. As they are visited by tourists, they have an economic importance" (7th grade), "It's important. Because it symbolizes our history" (8th grade), "It's important because next generations should see these beauties" (8th grade).

3.3. Results about the third sub-problem question

Middle school students' opinions of the contributions of common heritage elements to humankind were analysed with the third question. Therefore, students were asked "What are the contributions of common heritage elements to humankind? Why?" In this regard, analysis about the third sub-problem question is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Middle school students' opinions of the question "What are the contributions of common heritage elements to humankind? Why"

Grade	Theme/Codes	f	%	Grade	Theme/Codes	f	%
	Contribution				**Contribution**		
5	Tourism/Economy	28	35	7	To know about the past	30	58,8
	Knowledge acquisition	16	20		Material and nonmaterial values	10	19,6
	Social relations	14	17,5		Tourism	7	13,7
	To know about the past	14	17,5		Social relations	4	7,8
	Cultural development	4	5		**Total**	**51**	**100**
	Create awareness	4	5	8	Learn about the history	30	45,5
	Total	**80**	**100**		Cultural	11	16,7
6	Tourism	14	41,2		Helping each other	10	15,1
	Social integration/Peace	10	29,4		Tourism	8	12,1
	Cultural development	4	11,8		Handing down to the next generations	7	10,6
	Knowledge acquisition	4	11,8		**Total**	**66**	**100**
	Pay attention to the values	2	5,9				
	Total	**34**	**100**				

Table 3 shows the codes obtained from the answers of the students regarding the contribution of common heritage to humanity. According to this finding, from the explanations of 5th grade students, tourism / economy (f = 28; 35%), knowledge acquisition (f = 16; 20%), social relations (f = 14; 17,5%), to know about the past (f = 14; 17,5%), cultural development (f = 4; 5%), create awareness (f = 4; 5%) codes were obtained. From the explanations of 6th grade students, tourism (f = 14; 41,2%), social integration / peace (f = 10; 29,4%), cultural development (f = 4; 11,8%), knowledge acquisition (f = 4; 11,8%), pay attention to the values (f = 2; 5,9%), codes have been reached. From the statements of 7th grade students to know about the past (f = 30; 58,8%), material and nonmaterial values (f = 10; 19,6%), tourism (f = 7; 13,7%), social relations (f = 4; 7,8%) codes were determined. From the answers of 8th grade students learn about the history (f = 30; 45,5%), cultural (f = 11; 16,7%), helping each other (f = 10; 15,1%), tourism (f = 8; 12,1%), handing down to the next generations (f = 7; 10,6%) codes were obtained.

Some of students' opinions on how common heritage contributed to humankind are as below; "If the tourists like the places that have our heritages and come frequently, they tell the people around them about these places. If these people come here too, it will contribute to tourism" (5th grade), "People go to the countries which have artefacts, in other words common heritage, and this contributes to tourism" (6th grade), "It supports our values and makes us appreciate the importance and value of everything" (6th grade), "We can get information about the past, and we also learn about material and nonmaterial values of the lives in past" (7th grade), "It's a source for tourism" (7th grade), "It makes people learn about their history" (8th grade), "It supports sharing, solidarity, and cooperation" (8th grade).

3.4. Results about the fourth sub-problem question

Middle school students' opinions of the factors that affect extinction of common heritage elements were analysed with the fourth question. Therefore, students were asked "What are the factors that affect extinction of common heritage elements?" In this regard, analysis about the fourth sub-problem question is given in Table 4.

Table 4. Middle school students' opinions of the question "What are the factors that affect extinction of common heritage elements?

Grade	Themes /Codes	f	%	Grade	Themes /Codes	f	%
5	**Human factors**			7	**Human factors**		
	People	35	33,6		People	30	43,5
	Reckless behaviours of people	23	22,1		Reckless behaviours of people	16	23,2
	Environmental pollution	10	9,6		Environmental pollution	7	10,1
	Wars	9	8,7		Wars	6	8,7
	Ignoring	6	5,8		Urban architecture planning	3	4,3
	Natural factors				**Natural factors**		
	Natural disaster	21	20,2		Natural disaster	7	10,1
	Total	**104**	**100**		**Total**	**69**	**100**
6	**Human factors**			8	**Human factors**		
	People	16	43,2		People	36	45,6
	Reckless behaviours of people	7	18,9		Ignoring	9	11,4
	Urban architecture planning	4	10,8		Environmental pollution	5	6,3
	Wars	3	8,1		Urban architecture planning	5	6,3
	Natural factors				Historical artefact smuggling	2	2,5
	Natural disaster	7	18,9		Wars	2	2,5
	Total	**37**	**100**		**Natural factors**		
					Natural disaster	20	25,3
					Total	**79**	**100**

In Table 4, students' opinions about the factors that affect the destruction of common heritage are presented in the form of themes and codes. According to this result, 5th grade students' views include people (f = 35; 33,6%), reckless behaviors of people (f = 23; 22,1%), environmental pollution (f = 10; 9,6%), wars (f = 9; 8,7%), ignoring (f = 6; 5,8%), natural disaster (f = 21; 20,2%) codes were determined. From the expressions of 6th grade students, people (f = 16; 43,2%), reckless behaviors of people (f = 7; 18,9%), urban architecture planning (f = 4; 10,8%), wars (f = 3; 8,1%), natural disaster (f = 7; 18,9%) codes were reached. From the descriptions of 7th grade students, people (f = 30; 43,5%), reckless behaviors of people (f = 16; 23,2%), environmental pollution (f = 7; 10,1%), wars (f = 6; 8,7%), urban architecture planning (f = 3; 4,3%), natural disaster (f = 7; 10,1%) codes were obtained. Among the answers of the 8th grade students, people (f = 36; 45,6%), ignoring (f = 9; 11,4%), environmental pollution (f = 5; 6,3%), urban architecture planning (f = 5; 6,3%), historical artefact smuggling (f = 2; 2,5%), wars (f = 2; 2,5%), natural disaster (f = 20; 25,3%) codes were reached.

Middle school students' opinions of the factors that affect extinction of common heritage elements are as below; "I think the factor that affect extinction of common heritage elements is people" (5th grade), "I think the reason of extinction of common heritage elements is not known, and they are not cared enough" (5th grade), "The war between countries" (5th grade), "The harm and misdoings of people without knowing it" (6th grade), "New settlement, rapid urbanisation" (6th grade), "Natural disasters" (6th grade), "People's reckless behaviours are effective" (7th grade), "Urbanisation, wars, increase in population and environmental pollution are the factors" (7th grade), "Environmental pollution, historical artefacts smuggling, wars" (8th grade), "Erosion caused by natural disasters" (8th grade).

3.5. Results about the fifth sub-problem question

Middle school students' opinions of the precautions that should be taken to protect common heritage were analysed with the fifth question. Therefore, students were asked "What kind of precautions should be taken to protect common heritage? What can you do about that?" In this regard, analysis about the fifth sub-problem question is given in Table 5.

Table 5. Middle school students' opinions of the question "What kind of precautions should be taken to protect common heritage? What can you do about that?"

Grade	Themes/Codes	f	%	Themes/Codes	f	%
	Precautions			**Personal**		
5	Safety measure	42	48,3	Awareness raising	18	40,9
	Awareness raising	23	26,4	Safety measure	12	27,3
	Environmental cleaning	7	8,0	I don't do anything	7	15,9
	UNESCO	6	6,9	I can get help	4	9,1
	Legal protection	6	6,9	Environmental cleaning	3	6,8
	Non-governmental organizations	3	3,4			
	Total	**87**	**100**	**Total**	**44**	**100**
6	Safety measure	8	40	Awareness raising	6	60
	Awareness raising	8	40	Safety measure	3	30
	Environmental cleaning	2	10	I don't do anything	1	10
	Urban architecture planning	2	10			
	Total	**20**	**100**	**Total**	**10**	**100**
7	Awareness raising	27	54	Awareness raising	10	76,9
	Safety measure	13	26	I don't do anything	2	15,4
	Legal protection	7	14	Safety measure	1	7,7
	Non-governmental organizations	3	6			
	Total	**50**	**100**	**Total**	**13**	**100**
8	Awareness raising	26	61,9	I don't do anything	4	57,1
	Safety measure	12	28,6	Awareness raising	3	42,9
	Legal protection	3	7,1			
	Non-governmental organizations	1	2,4			
	Total	**42**	**100**	**Total**	**7**	**100**

In Table 5, the answers given by the students regarding what kind of measures should be taken for the protection of the common heritage and what they can do themselves are shown in the form of themes and codes. According to this result, 5th grade students expressed what needs to be done as; safety measures (f = 42; 48,3%), awareness raising (f = 23; 26,4%), environmental cleaning (f = 7; 8,0%), UNESCO (f = 6; 6,9%), legal protection (f = 6; 6,9%), non-governmental organizations (f = 3; 3,4%). They stated that raising awareness (f = 18; 40,9%), safety measures (f = 12; 27,3%), I don't do anything (f = 7; 15,9%), I can get help (f = 4; 9,1%), and environmental cleaning (f = 3; 6,8%) are what they can do themselves. The opinion of 6th grade students in the direction of awareness raising (f = 8; 40%), safety measure (f = 8; 40%), environmental cleaning (f = 2; 10%), urban architecture planning (f = 2; 10%). It was concluded that their opinions about what they can do themselves are awareness raising (f = 6; 60%), safety measure (f = 3; 30%), I don't do anything (f = 1; 10%). 7th grade students stated that awareness raising (f = 27; 54%), safety measures (f = 13; 26%), legal protection (f = 7; 14%), non-governmental organizations (f = 3; 6%) must be done. According to their opinion awareness raising (f = 10; 76,9%), I don't do anything (f = 2; 15,4%), safety measures (f = 1; 7,7%) are what they can do by themselves. 8th grade students explained what need to be done as awareness raising (f = 26; 61,9%), safety measures (f = 12; 28,6%), legal protection (f = 3; 7,1%), non-governmental organizations (f = 1; 2,4%). Their statement on what they can do themselves is I don't do anything (f = 4; 57,1%) and raise awareness (f = 3; 42,9%).

Opinions of middle school students about the precautions that should be taken to protect common heritage included; "Special forces or voluntary citizens keep watch and ward" (5th grade), "The ways should be explained to people and people should be informed" (5th grade), "I would prepare a poster with this slogan 'We should protect our common heritage' " (5th grade), "It should be kept clean" (6th grade), "People shouldn't construct buildings" (6th grade), "I would get in contact with newspapers to make them write columns, and I would publish posters in the newspapers and magazines" (6th grade), "Raising awareness with signboards" (7th grade), "Security guards should be placed in common heritage areas" (7th grade), "Campaigns for restoring old and tumbledown artefacts can be organized" (8th Grade), "I don't think I will do anything" (8th grade), "I would design a website about it and inform people on this website" (8th grade).

3.6. Results about the sixth sub-problem question

In the sixth sub-problem question of the study, middle school students' recognition of some common heritage elements was examined. In this context, photographs of 8 common heritage items were given to the students and their names were asked. In this regard, the analyses made on the sub-problem question are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Middle school students' recognition of some common heritage items.

Pictures	5th grade		6th grade		7th grade		8th grade	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Divriği Ulu Mosque	7	2,2	0	0	18	6,6	25	5,8
Ephesus	38	12,1	41	15,0	40	14,8	59	13,8
Keops Pyramid	47	15,0	25	9,2	29	10,7	31	7,2
Leaning Tower of Pisa	71	22,6	51	18,7	49	18,0	79	18,5
Mount Nemrut (Statue)	63	20,1	39	14,3	39	14,3	46	10,7
Old Bridge – Mostar	8	2,5	26	9,5	25	9,2	33	7,7
Statue of Liberty	68	21,7	50	18,3	53	19,5	82	19,2
Sultan Ahmet Mosque	12	3,8	41	15,0	19	6,9	73	17,1
Total	**314**	**100**	**273**	**100**	**272**	**100**	**428**	**100**

Table 6 includes the results regarding the students' recognition of common heritage elements. It was determined that 5th grade students know Divriği Ulu Mosque (f = 7; 2,2%), Ephesus (f = 38; 12,1%), Keops Pyramid (f = 47; 15,0%), Pisa Tower (f = 71; 22,6%), Nemrut Mountain (f = 63; 20,1%), Mostar Bridge (f = 8; 2,5%), Statue of Liberty (f = 68; 21,7%), Sultan Ahmet Mosque (f = 12; 3,8%) among the common heritage elements. When the 6th grade students' recognition status is examined result is as following; Divriği Ulu Mosque (f = 0; 0%), Ephesus (f = 41; 15,0%), Keops Pyramid (f = 25; 9,2%), Pisa Tower (f = 51; 18,7%), Mount Nemrut (f = 39; 14,3%), Mostar Bridge (f = 26; 9,5 %), Statue of Liberty (f = 50; 18,3%), Sultan Ahmet Mosque (f = 41; 15,0%). Looking at the recognition status of 7th grade students the outcome is Divriği Ulu Mosque (f = 18; 6,6%), Ephesus (f = 40; 14,8%), Keops Pyramid (f = 29; 10,7%), Pisa Tower (f = 49; 18,0%), Mount Nemrut (f = 39; 14,3 %), Mostar Bridge (f = 25; 9,2%), Statue of Liberty (f = 53; 19,5%), Sultan Ahmet Mosque (f = 19; 6,9%). Considering the recognition status of 8th grade students the result is Divriği Ulu Mosque (f = 25; 5,8%), Ephesus (f = 59; 13,8%), Keops Pyramid (f = 31; 7,2%), Pisa Tower (f = 79; 18,5%), Mount Nemrut (f = 46; 10,7 %), Mostar Bridge (f = 33; 7,7%), Statue of Liberty (f = 82; 19,2%), Sultan Ahmet Mosque (f = 73; 17,1%).

4. Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The views of middle school students on the concept of common heritage were investigated in this study. The results of the study in general suggest that middle school students define common heritage as historical buildings, material and spiritual values, belonging to all human beings, and assets protected by UNESCO. The results are similar to the definitions in literature related to common heritage (Kiper, 2004; Uçar, 2014; Şakacı, 2015; Göğebakan, 2009; Avcı and Memişoğlu, 2016). It can be said that this result is also similar to the results of Gürdoğan Bayır and Çengelci Köse's (2019)

research. The majority of the students answered the question of why it is important to preserve the common heritage as historical importance, universal value, and transfer to future generations, contribution to tourism, development of social relations, cultural importance and aesthetic characteristics. The question of how the common heritage contributes to humanity was answered by the majority of the students as contribution to tourism/economy, development of social relations, knowledge acquisition and cultural development. It can be said that this result is similar to the expressions emphasized in the literature about the importance of cultural heritage (Madran and Özgönül, 2005; Aslan and Ardemagni, 2006; Kiper, 2004; Pearson and Sullivan, 1995; Ashworth, 1994). Student views also suggested that the factors affecting the destruction of the common heritage are irresponsible behavior, environmental pollution, wars, urban architectural planning (Ahunbay, 2007; Sey, 2003; Karpuz, 1990; Aslan and Ardemagni, 2006; Güner, 2009). The majority of the students answered the question of how to take measures to protect the common heritage as security measures (fencing, guard, glass cover, etc.), awareness (posters, seminars, public conferences, etc.), state protection and non-governmental organizations. The answers to the question of how to take individual precautions were security measures and raising awareness. There are also a small number of students who expressed that they would not take any measures. The findings of the study are similar to the findings in Yeşilbursa's (2011) study. For the last question, students were asked to write the names of 8 photos of common heritage. 4 of these are in Turkey and 4 of them are located in other countries. The most known common heritage among fifth grade students was the Leaning Tower of Pisa and the least known was Divriği Ulu Mosque. Among sixth grade students, the most known common heritage was the Leaning Tower of Pisa and the least known was Divriği Ulu Mosque. The most known common heritage among seventh grade students was the Statue of Liberty and the least known was Divriği Ulu Mosque. The Statue of Liberty was the most known common heritage among eighth grade students and the Divriği Ulu Mosque was the least known. In 4 out of 4 grades, the least known common heritage is located in Turkey (Divriği Ulu Mosque). Regarding the least known Divriği Ulu Mosque, it can be stated that although its name is included in the 5th grade textbook, the absence of a visual for this common heritage element is effective. In addition, it can be said that the fact that it is not included in the 6th and 7th grade textbooks both as a name and visually is effective in making this common heritage element less known. Looking at the common heritage items (Leaning Tower of Pisa and Statue of Liberty) that students know the most at all four grade levels, it is seen that there are architecturally specific structures. It can be stated that this has an effect on becoming more known. This results is similar to Uçar (2014)'results as the "monuments and buildings are evaluated as cultural assets by the majority of students".

The results of this study are limited to the study group. Similar studies are thought to contribute to the field.

References

Ahunbay, Z. (2007). *Tarihi çevre koruma ve restorasyon.* (4. bs). İstanbul: Yapı.

Akpınar, E. (2007). Place of Turkey in the world heritage list and a new candidate proposal. *Erzincan University Journal of Education Faculty*, *9*(1), 81-106. Erişim adresi: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/erziefd/issue/6006/80082

Ashworth, G. J. (1994). From history to heritage – from heritage to identity: Insearch of concepts and models. In 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 cities*, (2nd Ed.). UNESCO ICCROM. Erişim adresi: https://www.iccrom.org/sites/default/files/ICCROM_09_ManualSchoolTeachers_en.pdf

Avcı, M., & Memişoğlu, H. (2016). Views of social studies teachers about the cultural heritage education. *Elementary Education Online*, *15*(1), 104-124. http://dx.doi.org/10.17051/io.2016.42123

Erder, C. (1999). *Tarihi çevre kaygısı.* Ankara: ODTÜ Mimarlık Fakültesi Yayınları.

Göğebakan, Y. (2009). The reflection of two ideas according to the income distribution in the world; culture existence is the common heritage of the humanity culture existence belongs to a nation *Journal of Art and Human, 1*(2), 22-30. Erişim adresi: http://sanatveinsan.com/yil-2009-cilt-1-sayi-2/

Güner, S. (2009). *Savaşlar ve kültürel miras: Kültürel miras; savaşların silahlı çatışmaların masum kurbanları olmaya devam ediyor.* II. Uluslararası strateji ve güvenlik çalışmaları sempozyumu. İstanbul: Beykent Üniversitesi. Erişim adresi: https://kumid.net/storage/UNwI9pucX1yVD7Kc5jtffAPdMmVvVid.pdf

Gürdoğan Bayır, Ö., & Çengelci Köse, T. (2019). Secondary school students' views about cultural heritage and preserving cultural heritage. *Kastamonu Education Journal, 27*(4), 1827-1840. doi: 10.24106/kefdergi.3393

Işık, E., & Semerci, Ç. (2019). Focus group interviews, individual interviews and observations as data triangulation in qualitative studies in education. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies, 6*(3), 53-66. Erişim adresi: https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/837751

Karpuz, H. (1990). Eski eser ve anıtların korunmasında halkın eğitimi. *Ankara University the Journal of the Faculty of Languages and History-Geography, 34* (1.2), 405-408. Erişim adresi: http://dtcfdergisi.ankara.edu.tr/index.php/dtcf/article/view/3382/2944

Kemper, E., Stringfield. S., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Mixed methods sampling strategies in social science research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social & behavioral research* (pp. 273-296). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kiper, H. P. (2004). *Küreselleşme Sürecinde Kentlerin Tarihsel-Kültürel Değerinin Korunması-Türkiye-Bodrum Örneği* (Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Madran, E., & Özgönül, N. (2005). *Kültürel ve doğal değerlerin korunması.* Ankara: TMMOB Mimarlar Odası.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2006). *Research in education evidence-based inquiry*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

Ministiry of National Education [MoNE] Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2005). *İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretim Programı (4-5. Sınıflar).* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Ministiry of National Education [MoNE] Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı. (2005). *İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretim Programı (6-7. Sınıflar).* Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı.

Pearson, M., & Sullivan, S. (1995). *Looking after heritage places: The basic of heritage planning for managers, landowners and administrators.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Sey, Y. (2003). Sürdürülebilir kalkınma / tarihi kültürel mirasın korunması. *Çevre ve sürdürülebilir kalkınma tematik paneli, vizyon 2023: bilim ve teknoloji stratejileri teknoloji öngörü projesi.* Erişim adresi: https://tubitak.gov.tr/tubitak_content_files/vizyon2023/csk/CSK_son_surum.pdf

Şakacı, B. K. (2015). Natural and cultural heritage's vital problem: Outstanding universal value (UNESCO World Heritage List, *Cankiri Karatekin University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, 6*(1): 455-472. Erişim adresi: 472. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jiss/issue/25890/272815

Uçar, M. (2014). The effectiveness of cultural property and conservation learning in elementary education and evaluation of the contribution of non-governmental organizations. *MEGARON, 9*(2), 85-102. doi: 10.5505/MEGARON.2014.02996

Yeşilbursa, C. C. (2011). *Sosyal bilgilerde miras eğitiminin öğrencilerin somut kültürel mirasa karşı tutumlarına ve akademik başarılarına etkisi* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

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