

Research Article

Copyright © RIGEO 2020

To cite this article: Karadeniz, C. B. (2020). Assessment for Awareness and Perception of the Cultural Heritage of Geography Students. *Review of International Geographical Education (RIGEO)*, 10 (1), Special Issue, 40-64. Retrieved from <http://www.rigeo.org/vol10no1/Number1Spring/RIGEO-V10-N1-2.pdf>

DOI: 10.33403/rigeo.640722

Submitted: October 31, 2019

Revised: December 17, 2019

Accepted: February 04, 2020

Assessment for Awareness and Perception of the Cultural Heritage of Geography Students*

Cemile BAHTİYAR KARADENİZ¹

Ordu University, Ordu, TURKEY

Abstract

It is the responsibility of every individual to ensure the continuity of the cultural assets and values that societies have. One of the important components in the protection of cultural heritage is awareness. In this study, it is aimed to determine the perception and awareness of the students taking geography undergraduate education towards the universal cultural heritage values and assets of Turkey. For this reason, case studies have been conducted. The study, a quantitative researches, was fictionalized in a survey design and conducted with 204 students. The data were collected using a form of 35 open-and closed-ended questions developed by the researcher that determine the awareness of Turkey's cultural assets and values. In general, the perception and awareness of our cultural heritage values and assets, which are tangible and non-tangible, were found to be moderate. In line with the findings, it is proposed to plan detailed studies on raising the cultural heritage awareness levels of the students, to place more emphasis on the subject in the courses, and to organize curriculum programs for this area.

Keywords

Perception of the Cultural Heritage, Awareness of the Cultural Heritage, Geography Students

Geography is the study of places and the relationships between people and their environment. Geographers explore both the physical properties of Earth's surface and the human societies spread across it. They also examine how human culture interacts with the natural environment, and the way that locations and places can have an impact on people. Geography seeks to understand where things are found, why they are there, and how they develop and change over time.

*A portion of this research was presented in 2. International Congress on Geographical Education (UCEK/ICGE-2019), 3-5 October 2019, Eskişehir-Turkey.

¹Assoc. Prof.: Ordu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu, Ordu, Türkiye, cbkaradeniz [at] odu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-3902-5251

Geography is a unique field of study. For example, it is an integrative, or holistic, science, the content of which spans both the physical and human elements of Earth's surface. In so doing, geography forms a bridge that closely links humans and the life-sustaining natural environment. Geography differs from all other sciences in yet another way. The science is identified and defined not by its content, but by its methodology. Geography's spatial methodology asks "where?" [In contrast, the primary historical, or temporal, question is "when?"] By organizing and analyzing information about Earth's natural and cultural features in a spatial context, geographers attempt to further our knowledge of Earth's locations and places, features and conditions, movements, interrelations and interactions, as well as regional distributions and patterns.

Geography literacy gives the individual the ability to recognize and understand natural, humanities and cultural resources and features. It is important to be aware of different cultures and to know them and to create a culture of common life. Geography and geographical education have an important role in accurately reading the global world while maintaining the locality. Understand the functioning of natural and human systems on a global scale and follow important developments from local to global in many areas such as energy, environment, transportation, industry, migration, culture, tourism and international relations (Alkış, 2007; Kocalar&Demirkaya, 2014). Recently, geography awareness has to develop in every individual of society, primarily decision makers and planners, for sustainable societies.

The individual who has geography education at higher education level is expected to develop high level skills such as analysis, interpretation, decision making and solution suggestions and to be equipped with general professional knowledge. Geographers who have graduated with the necessary professional knowledge and skills generally serve the community in two ways. One as a teacher to give much needed geography knowledge in primary and secondary education, and the other as expected from modern scientific geography, by contributing knowledge and scientific interpretations to spatial planning (Kayan, 2000).

The individuals who study geography are expected to be able to comprehend the location of places and the physical and cultural characteristics of these places, past and present, and explain the impact of geography on the change of living places and their environment. In addition, they need to be able to understand the "where" and "how" the places and events develop, and to develop a mind map of the community, city or region in which they live. In addition, an equipped geographer should be able to understand the spatial structure of society so that they can see the order in the distribution of people and places, and recognize spatial distributions at all scales to understand the complex relationships of people and places. In the study, the awareness of the geographical education students about the cultural heritage of Turkey will be determined and the attainment of the geography education attainments mentioned above will be determined.

Theoretical Background

Culture is the totality of learned behavior, which includes beliefs, knowledge, art, law, morality, traditions, certain abilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society (Oğuz, 2011). All the material and spiritual characteristics that a society

produces by passing them on from generation to generation form its social identity that distinguishes it from other societies. Heritage (Turkish Language Association, 2018), which is defined as "what a generation leaves to the generation that comes after it", can be either material or spiritual. Cultural heritage is all kinds of tangible and intangible assets and values that are of local and universal value that have been produced in the past and have survived to the present (Oğuz, 2013).

Cultural heritage that gives identity to the society to which it belongs is a reflection of knowledge, works, values, beliefs, structures and traditions from the past to the present. Heritage values ensure the continuity of the experiences and traditions that societies have accumulated throughout history, linking the past with the present, and making a solid reference to the correct construction of the future. Cultural heritage, which contains all the tangible and abstract values of the culture and history of the society that enrich people spiritually, reinforces the feelings of solidarity and unity with the sharing of the common past among the individuals of the society.

The scope of the definition of cultural heritage has expanded and prospered over time while focusing on monuments and has reached a much more inclusive understanding of heritage, which today includes all human cultural values. The definition of cultural heritage, which has been reinterpreted over time as a requirement of the age and dynamic process, has included an emphasis on cultural diversity and equality as well as human rights. Nowadays, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) etc. cultural heritage categories used in texts and conventions prepared by international institutions or in directives and laws used at the national level are:

1. Tangible cultural heritage (buildings, historical sites, monuments and all kinds of archaeological, architectural, technological and scientific works made by human hands).
2. Movable Cultural Heritage (sculptures, paintings, manuscripts, coins, archaeological artefacts, etc.)
3. Immovable cultural heritage (archaeological monuments, sites, historic city tissues, etc.)
4. Underwater Cultural Heritage (shipwrecks, underwater ruins and cities)
5. Intangible Cultural Heritage (rituals, oral traditions, performing arts, etc.)
6. Natural Heritage (natural sites with cultural dimension, cultural landscapes, biological, physical and geological formations etc.), (Can, 2009; Governership of İstanbul, 2014).

Tangible cultural heritage includes all material cultural values such as archaeological sites, cultural objects and landscapes, historic cities, buildings, or portable cultural assets. Tangible cultural heritage assets can or cannot be moved from an object as small as a needle, above ground, under and underwater, to a large entity such as a city. Intangible cultural heritage is traditional dance, rituals, music, folklore, language, cuisine, or popular culture based on hands-on or performance, closely connected to the geographic locality and less technology-free.

In other words, such as tangible cultural heritage, places and objects that represent the material culture of a society, while intangible cultural heritage assets, people, traditions, and the spiritual culture of the society it represents what they know. He defines intangible cultural heritage as “heritage that finds meaning in humans rather than inanimate objects” (Yeşilbursa, 2013). In 2003 the definition of cultural heritage in the 1972 UNESCO convention for the protection of cultural and natural heritage covers tangible values, necessitating the convention for the protection of intangible cultural heritage and its definition. Today, folklore is used with the term traditional culture, intangible heritage, oral and ultimately intangible cultural heritage (Oğuz, 2013).

Cultural heritage values, which add depth to the world and life, provide people with warm memories and good feelings, while nurturing creativity and the motivation to explore, especially young people with new opportunities for learning and development. Moreover, and most importantly, everyone should be protected because they have so much to learn from their past. The preservation of intangible cultural heritage is not the preservation of an object in the museum, such as a valuable carpet, a portrait of a qualified Karagöz, or a lingering writing. The main aim is to keep them alive by producing them, passing them on from generation to generation, and keeping them alive with all the elements of tradition, knowledge and knowledge (Oğuz, 2013). Historically and culturally important heritage values are of intellectual value as an asset that should be protected by humanity without any gain, while also having economic value in relation to the gains they have made through tourism (Gögebakan, 2016). If the society has the ability to recognize cultural heritage values and assets of aesthetic, historical, scientific and social importance, it can build its own cultural identity. Each of the non-governmental organizations, local people, politicians, public institutions and universities have separate assignments and responsibilities for cultural heritage and its survival. However, the cooperation of the stakeholders counted for the sustainability of cultural heritage is important (Vecco, 2010; Tören, Kozak & Demiral, 2012; Hazler, 2012).

In 1972 the idea of preserving Intangible Cultural Heritage originated and developed with the concept of folklore. In 1972 this idea developed into an international tool during the preparatory work of convention for the protection of natural and Cultural Heritage". Intangible cultural heritage is classified as oral traditions and narratives, feasts, crafts, rituals, performing arts, knowledge and practices related to nature and the universe, along with language that acts as a carrier (Tuna and Saral, 2018).

Cultural heritage values provide sustainability in the community and are of economic importance for the geography in which they are located with the tourism demand they create. Cultural assets must first be recognized, accepted and protected by the society to which they belong. In order to ensure the continuity of intangible cultural assets, awareness, which is one of the important components in the protection of cultural heritage, must be established in every member of society. Unconscious attitudes and behaviors regarding natural and cultural assets can lead to destruction and destruction of cultural assets, especially in young people who will inherit the heritage.

List of Cultural Heritage Sites in Turkey

The “Convention on the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage” was adopted in the context of the Paris meeting of UNESCO in 1972 in order to introduce to the world the cultural and natural beings with universal values that are considered the common heritage of all humanity, to create awareness of the universal heritage in society and to ensure the necessary cooperation for the Turkey officially joined the convention in 1983 (M. of C. & T.-Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2019). The admirable and protected monuments, sites and natural formations of universal importance are given “World Heritage” status. After a series of procedures that began with the application of member states to UNESCO and were completed at the end of the evaluation of applications by experts from the International Council on Monuments and sites (ICOMOS) and the International Union for Conservation of nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), the candidate assets gain this status in accordance with the decision of the World Heritage Committee. As of 2018, there are 1092 cultural and natural assets worldwide registered with the UNESCO World Heritage List, of which 845 are cultural, 209 are natural, and 38 are mixed (cultural/natural) assets. This number is increasing with the World Heritage Committee meetings taking place every year (Üçler, 2014; Kaygısız, 2019).

List of World Heritage Sites in Turkey

As of 2018, there are 17 assets in the UNESCO World Heritage List as a result of the research carried out under the responsibility of the Directorate General of Cultural Assets and Museums of Turkey. The Göbeklitepe archaeological site in Şanlıurfa was included in the UNESCO World Heritage List (2018) when evaluating the data after the students were surveyed (Figure 1).




Figure1. List of World Heritage Sites in Turkey (2018) (www.reshontheway.com)

It is accepted by all Geographers that geography does not consist of a superficial point of view, such as knowing which country a city is in or the capitals. This information, which is extremely insufficient to define the identity of geography, is inevitably within the science of geography. When examining a geographical event or phenomenon, students question the relationship between spatial and create mind maps related to spatial (Santelmann, Gosnell & Meyers, 2011).

The Historic Areas of Istanbul are a group of sites in the capital district of Fatih in the city of Istanbul, Turkey. These areas were added to the UNESCO World Heritage List in 1985.

This World Heritage Site includes buildings and structures such as the Sarayburnu, the Topkapı Palace, the Hagia Sophia, the Sultan Ahmed Mosque, the Hagia Irene, Zeyrek Mosque, Süleymaniye Mosque, Little Hagia Sophia and the Walls of Constantinople.

The World Heritage site covers four zones, illustrating the major phases of the city's history using its most prestigious monuments:

- the Archaeological Park, which in 1953 and 1956 was defined at the tip of the peninsula;
- the Süleymaniye quarter, protected in 1980 and 1981;
- the Zeyrek quarter, protected in 1979;
- the zone of the ramparts, protected in 1981.

The part of İstanbul historical Areas of İstanbul (1985): The part of İstanbul historical Areas of İstanbul (B.C) 7. century, which was also established, surrounded by the Bosphorus in the east, the Golden Horn in the North and the Sea of Marmara in the South, is today referred to as the “Historical Peninsula”. The list of heritage sites in İstanbul includes four sites: Sultanahmet Urban Archaeological Component Area (Hippodrome, Hagia Irini Church, Hagia Sophia and Little Hagia Sophia Mosque and Topkapı Palace), Süleymaniye Protected Area (Süleymaniye Mosque and its surroundings), Zeyrek Protected Area (Zeyrek Mosque and its environs) (M. of C.&T.2019).

Göreme National Park and Cappadocia (Nevşehir - 1985): The Cappadocia region, which has been a continuous settlement since the chalcolithic period, bordered by Yeşilhisar from the east, Aksaray from the west and Kırşehir from the northwest, Kızılırmak from the North, Hasan and Melendiz Mountains from the South, has been listed as a World Heritage Site due to its natural and cultural characteristics. Places carved by humans into the rocks (7 – 13 century) have an interior climate comfort suitable for all seasons (warm in winter, cool in summer), as well as extraordinary natural wear patterns such as fairy chimneys formed in the terrain with volcanic rifles, it is native to the locality), which was home to christians fleeing oppression. Göreme National Park, Karain Güvercinlikleri, Derinkuyu and Kaymaklı underground cities, Yeşilöz Theodoro and Karlık churches and Soğanlı Archaeological Site are on the Heritage List (M. of C.&T.2019).

Divriği Ulu Camii and Hospital (Sivas-1985): The mosque and a hospital adjacent to it (1228-1229) were built by Ahmet Shah and his wife during the period when the settlement was under the management of Mengücekoğulları of Divriği region, which had descended to the Hittites period. In addition to its architectural features, the cultural asset found in Sivas has been listed as a heritage site with its rich Anatolian traditional stonework examples. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Hattuşa (Boğazköy)-Hittite capital (Çorum-1986): Hattuşa (Çorum, Boğazköy) has been a very important center in Anatolia for centuries as the capital of the Hittite empire (M. of C.&T.2019).

The mount Nemrut (Adıyaman-Kahta-1987): King of Commagene I. Antiochos, 2150 m to show his gratitude to the gods and their ancestors. The tombs and monumental sculptures he built on the slopes of the mount Nemrut are the most magnificent ruins of the Hellenistic period with their unique landscapes (M. of C.&T.2019).

Pamukkale-Hierapolis (Denizli-1988): Pamukkale-Hierapolis has been placed on the world heritage list because of its natural and cultural properties. The archaeological city of Hierapolis, which contains splendid white travertines formed by calcium oxide-containing waters from the southern slopes of Çaldağ and remains from the late Hellenistic and early Christian periods, is one of the most striking centers reached from ancient times until today. The City of (B.C) II. King of Pergamon in the century. It is believed to have been founded by Eumenes. The city, famous for its metal and stone processing and woven fabrics, was the capital of the Phrygia region during the reign of Constantine the Great, and was the Episcopal center during the Byzantine period. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Xanthos-Letoon (Antalya-Muğla-1988): The located 46 km from Fethiye on the Antalya-Muğla border, near the village of Kınık, Xanthos was the largest administrative center of Lycia in ancient times. The located 4 km from Xanthos in the same period. Letoon is located in the distance and is the religious center of Lycia. In this sanctuary, along with the temples of Leto, Apollo and Artemis, are the remains of a monastery, a fountain and a theatre. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Safranbolu Şehri (Karabük-1994): From the Safranbolu, 14. century from the beginning of the Turks and especially 18. century during it was an important center of trade between Asia and Europe. An intact example of Turkish urban history, this city is listed on the World Heritage list as one of the rare cities whose wooden masonry houses, traditional urban texture and monumental structures have all been declared as sites. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Troy ancient city (Çanakkale-1998): Troy is one of the most famous ancient cities in the world, showing a continuous settlement of more than 3000 years with 9 layers identified. Located in a unique geography where the Aegean, Anatolia and the Balkans meet, Troy provides the monitoring of the civilizations of a wide geography. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Edirne Selimiye Mosque and Complex (Edirne-2011): The mosque 16. century, built in the name of Sultan II. Selim, is the most important monumental monument of Edirne, the capital of the Ottoman Empire before the conquest of İstanbul. (M. of C.&T.2019).

The Neolithic City of Çatalhöyük (Konya-Çumra - 2012): The Neolithic city of Çatalhöyük is of exceptional universal value with its size of ruins, its continuity over time, the density of the living community, its strong artistic and cultural traditions (M. of C.&T.2019).

Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape (İzmir-2014): The Heritage Area in Bergama district, İzmir province, has been included in the world heritage list in the cultural landscape category. The multi-layered cultural landscape of Pergamon, which contains layers belonging to the Hellenistic, roman, eastern roman and ottoman periods, consists of nine components. The ancient Pergamon settlement at the top of castle Mountain shows the best example of Hellenistic urban planning with its monumental architecture. Mosques, inns, baths, are spread over layers belonging to the Roman and eastern roman periods etc. There is also Ottoman architecture (M.of C.&T.).

Bursa and Cumalıkızık (2014): Bursa and Cumalıkızık Heritage Area; Khanlar District (Orhangazi Complex and its environs), Hüdavendigâr (I. Murad) Complex, Yıldırım (I. Bayezid) Complex, Yeşil (I. Mehmed) Complex, Muradiye (II. Murad) Complex and Cumalıkızık village consists of six components (M. of C.&T.2019).

Diyarbakir Castle and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape (2015): The cultural heritage area consists of two main components: The Diyarbakir walls and Hevsel Gardens (M. of C.&T.2019).

Efes (İzmir-2015): List of World Heritage Sites; Ephesus ancient city and the house of the Virgin Mary, Ayasuluk Hill (Seljuk Castle, St. It consists of four components: John Basilica, İsa Bey Bath and mosque, Artemision) and Çukuriçi Höyük. Ephesus, one of the most important centers of the ancient period, started from the prehistoric period, Hellenistic, Roman, Eastern Rome, principalities and Ottoman periods during the nearly 9000 years of continuous settlement and has been a very important port city in all stages of its history as a cultural and commercial center. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Ani archaeological site (Kars-2016): Ani archaeological site, located on the border of Turkey and Armenia, dates from the 16. century of the early iron age. It is a multicultural Silk Road settlement, where settlement was continuous until the century, and where all the wealth and diversity of the development of the Middle Ages in terms of Urbanism, Architecture and art were seen together. Ani, which is the meeting point of Armenian, Georgian, Byzantine and Seljuk cultures, is recorded in the Heritage list with architectural design ideas and decoration details, construction materials and techniques (M. of C.&T.2019).

Afrosias ancient city (Aydın - 2017); the ancient city is located within the borders of Karacasu district, in the fertile valley formed by Dandalaz (Morsynus) stream, a tributary of the Meander River, about 600 m from the sea. It is located on a plateau at an elevation of historic at 5. B.C dating back to the middle of the millennium, the

settlement reveals an intense exchange of ideas and values that lasted from the late Hellenistic period to the Roman and Byzantine periods. The structures at Aphrodisias were built largely of marble, and the relief and inscriptions associated with them are exceptionally well preserved. The ancient city is about 2-3 km. it is recorded on the list along with ancient marble quarries located to the Northeast (M. of C.&T.2019).

List of Intangible Cultural Heritage in Turkey

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and cultural institution, whose short name is UNESCO, adopted the “convention for the protection of intangible cultural heritage” in 2003. Turkey became a party to the convention in 2006. As of December 2017, Turkey has 15 heritage values registered on the intangible cultural heritage representation list of humanity.

Meddahlık (2008): Meddahlık can be described as the art of storytelling in order to entertain the listener with imitations and recreations. Those who perform this art are called meddah in Arabic in the sense of praising and praising. Meddah sits on a chair while performing his art, using accessories such as a wand and handkerchief to animate and imitate his story (M. of C.&T.2019).

Mevlevi Sema ceremony (2008): it is a Sufi ceremony with detailed rules and qualities that symbolize the degrees of the way to reach God and which contain religious elements and themes. This Mevlevi ceremony was dedicated to Mevlana Jalaluddin Rumi (d. 17.12.1273) it is performed in a disciplined manner starting from the time of Sultan Veled and Ulu Arif Çelebi when it is performed without adhering to a certain rule (M. of C.&T.2019).

Karagöz (2009): Karagöz is a type of shadow play made of camel or buffalo skin, in which human, animal or ware shapes called depictions are attached to bars and moved on a white curtain with light reflected from behind (M. of C.&T.2019).

A history of minstrelsy tradition (2009): A history of minstrelsy tradition, an important expression of the cultural memory of Anatolia as well as its cultural diversity and richness, is a multifaceted art that includes poetry, music and storytelling, filtered from the experiences of centuries. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Chat meetings (2010): In different regions, rostrum conversation, cümbüş, lad organization, youth board, keyf, conversation, room organization, chat etc. traditional chat meetings, referred to as, are the general name of social solidarity function meetings where different groups of men come together in the winter months of the year and within the framework of certain rules (M. of C.&T.2019).

Kırkpınar Oil Wrestling Festival (2010): Wrestling, one of the oldest sports in human history, is defined as a mental and physical struggle in which two people perform in a certain area under equal conditions, with certain rules, without using any tools or equipment. Kırkpınar Oil Wrestling, it was born in Rumeli in the 14. century and dates back to the present day. Kırkpınar Oil Wrestling rituals, one of the oldest wrestling festivals in the world, with competitions and events conducted in accordance

with certain rules during the festival, identity elements such as pehlivan, Aga, cazgır etc. it was listed with cultural objects. (M. of C.&T.2019).

The Alevi-Bektaşî Semah ritual (2010): Alevi and Bektaşî, because of their faith, Cem Semah performed in service, with instrumental accompaniment and spoken words stole done with owner's zakir mystical and aesthetic movements with the rhythm of music is the way to reach God (M. of C.&T.2019).

Ceremonial Keşkek tradition (2011): The special food made by cooking wheat and meat together in large cauldrons in open field fires with the collective sharing and participation of men and women groups is called keşkek, and the rituals around this dish are also called ceremonial Keşkek tradition. The tradition and ceremony of the rituals and rules for as they run regularly, Adana, Amasya, Antalya, Aydın, Çorum, Yozgat, Tokat, Çankırı, Sinop, Turkey, Erzincan and Uşak, Muğla, Turkey, Kırşehir, İzmir, Afyon, Uşak, although it is common in cities such as Kastamonu, Turkey is widely practiced. Ceremonial keşkeki circumcision and marriage weddings, Ramadan and Eid al-Adha, Muharram month, Hajj visit dinner, mass rain prayers, mevlit and Hıdırellez are cooked and distributed on special occasions such as (M. of C.&T.2019).

Mesir Paste of Manisa (2012): Mesir paste tradition (Mesir Macunu in Turkish) is a very old tradition in the history of Manisa, an Anatolian city in the Aegean region, dating back to almost 500 years. Mesir paste was started as a medicine invention during the Ottoman period but later on it became an important part of local festivity in this city. (M. of C.&T.2019).

Turkish coffee culture and tradition (2013): Turkish coffee culture and tradition began serving coffee in İstanbul coffeehouses 16. century it extends to. The tradition has two famous aspects that make its taste unique and contribute to socialization (M. of C.&T.2019).

The Turkish Art of Marbling (2014): Marbling is the art of creating colorful patterns by sprinkling and brushing color pigments on a pan of oily water and then transforming this pattern to paper. The special tools of the trade are brushes of horsehair bound to straight rose twigs, a deep tray made of unknotted pinewood, natural earth pigments, cattle gall and tragacanth. It is believed to be invented in the thirteenth century Turkistan. This decorative art then spread to China, India and Persia and Anatolia. Seljuk and Ottoman calligraphers and artists used marbling to decorate books, imperial decrees, official correspondence and documents. New forms and techniques were perfected in the process and Turkey remained the center of marbling for many centuries. Up until the 1920's, marblers had workshops in the Beyazit district of Istanbul, creating for both the local and European market, where it is known as Turkish marble paper (M. of C.&T.2019).

Traditional Craftmanship of Çini-Making (2016): Glazed tile and ceramic household stuffs or wallboards of several colours and motifs made by firing the pulped clay soil are called "çini". Çini-making means the craftmanship shaped around traditional Turkish art of çini since 12th century with its own specific production and adornment techniques like "minai", "luster", "polishing", "underglaze" Since art of çini has been used for mental healing for centuries, it is used as adornment on the public and religious

building fronts. Apart from its being an important part of the city identity for Kütahya, İznik and Çanakkale, it is a special part of the city image in terms of giving characteristics to symbolic buildings in metropolises like Antalya, Konya, Kayseri, Sivas and İstanbul (M. of C.&T.2019).

Nowruz (2016): International Nowruz Day was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly, in its resolution of 2010, at the initiative of several countries that share this holiday (Afghanistan, Albania, Azerbaijan, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkey and Turkmenistan. Inscribed in 2009 on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity as a cultural tradition observed by numerous peoples, Nowruz is an ancestral festivity marking the first day of spring and the renewal of nature. It promotes values of peace and solidarity between generations and within families as well as reconciliation and neighbourliness, thus contributing to cultural diversity and friendship among peoples and different communities (M. of C.&T.2019).

Flatbread Making and Sharing Culture (2016): The culture of making and sharing flatbread in communities of Azerbaijan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkey carries social functions that have enabled it to continue as a widely-practised tradition. Making the bread (lavash, katyrma, jupka or yufka) involves at least three people, often family members, with each having a role in its preparation and baking. In rural areas, neighbours participate in the process together. Traditional bakeries also make the bread. It is baked using a tandyr/tanūr (an earth or stone oven in the ground), sāj (a metal plate) or kazan (a cauldron). Besides regular meals, flatbread is shared at weddings, births, funerals, various holidays and during prayers. In Azerbaijan and Iran, it is put on the bride's shoulders or crumbled over her head to wish the couple prosperity while in Turkey it is given to the couple's neighbours. At funerals in Kazakhstan it is believed the bread should be prepared to protect the deceased while a decision is made from God and in Kyrgyzstan sharing the bread provides a better afterlife for the deceased. The practice, transmitted by participation within families and from master to apprentice, expresses hospitality, solidarity and certain beliefs that symbolize common cultural roots reinforcing community belonging (M. of C.&T.2019).

Hıdırellez (Cosmopolitan-2017): Hıdırellez is regarded as one of the most important seasonal bayrams (festivals) in both Turkey and countries mentioned. Called Day of Hızır (Ruz-ı Hızır) in Turkey, Hıdırellez is celebrated as the day on which the prophets Hızır (Al-Khidr) and İlyas (Elijah) met on Earth. The words Hızır and İlyas fused to create the present term. Known as Aid al-Khidr it is also one of the most important social celebrations in Syria. Hıdırellez Day falls on May 6 in the Gregorian calendar and April 23 in the Julian calendar. In other countries the day has mostly been connected with pagan and Saint George cults (M. of C.&T.2019).

Literature Review

Cultural heritage studies are an interdisciplinary field handled by the humanities, social and natural sciences. There are researches in the literature that deal with the subject with different approaches.

Blake's (2000) works on the development of International cultural heritage law, problems with cultural heritage, nature of cultural heritage, definitions on cultural heritage such as cultural heritage, identity, rights, and property. The distinctiveness of people to cultural heritage properties in Arizona (USA) was examined by Nyaupane & Timothy (2009). The study, which was surveyed by telephone with 1238 people to measure public awareness, provides important information for heritage protection managers and policymakers. Contrary to the view of heritage conservationists, it is suggested that heritage sites could be opened to the public and help raise awareness of tourists.

Ocampo & Delgado (2014) is addressed the challenges and expectations in basic education in the Philippines by drawing attention to the importance of cultural heritage education. Srivastava (2015) researched the cultural heritage awareness of teachers at the university level according to different variables. It was determined that the overall score of female teachers was higher than that of male teachers, and that female teachers experienced much greater awareness than male teachers, especially in the cultural literature dimension.

Rouhi (2017) is cultural heritage and categories, to enter the list of heritage to examine and revealed the necessary features. Ahmed (2017) Suidi Arabia has researched the cultural heritage awareness of Hail university preparatory class students. His study with 178 students found that there was a statistically significant relationship between the variables of familial interest, personal interest and dwelling place and the protection of national heritage. Shimray & Ramaiah (2019) examined the cultural heritage awareness level of Pondishery University students (over 201 samples) based on variables such as gender, age, subject history and region. The study found that the participants' language awareness had the highest average score of 3.6020, while festival awareness had the lowest score of 3.1045 in cultural awareness.

Kolaç (2009) addressed the importance of Turkish education in preserving intangible cultural heritage, creating awareness and sensitivity. Okuyucu and Somuncu (2012) identified the perceptions and attitudes of local people in the protection of cultural heritage and its use for tourism purposes in the case of Osmaneli district center. Çengelci (2012), 4, 5, 6 and 7. grade examined examples of attainment and activity related to intangible cultural heritage in social sciences course programs.

Kılcan and Akbaba (2013) 8. social studies of students in grades 6 and 7. She has researched how she perceives the value of sensitivity to the cultural heritage involved in the classroom teaching program. Ay, Fidan and Nuray (2013) in his research, which examined the metaphors that teachers developed regarding cultural heritage, he concluded that the most commonly used metaphors were history and language. Yeşilbursa (2013) explored the views of sixth graders towards concrete cultural heritage elements. Arıkan and Doğan (2013) In the study primary education in Adiyaman province 7. grade investigated the attainment levels and attitudes of the class students regarding cultural heritage items according to some variables who participated. Students' achievements towards cultural heritage were found to be moderate, while attitudes towards cultural heritage were found to be positive. In addition, a positive

relationship between attitude towards cultural heritage and success towards cultural heritage has been determined.

Dönmez and Yeşilbursa (2014) in social studies examined the impact of heritage education on students ' attitudes towards concrete cultural heritage. Külcü (2015) addresses the importance of the concept of cultural heritage in terms of Education. Öztürk and etc. (2015) Avcı and Memişoğlu (2016) identified the views of social sciences courses on cultural heritage education. It was determined that the participating teachers gave importance to the issue of cultural heritage and its education. Yazıcı (2016) Students of Karabük University Department of geography evaluated the views of the geographical elements in Turkish paper money in the Republican period. Buluk (2017) explored cultural heritage awareness about Çanakkale. Akkuş et al. (2015) and Yılmaz, Şahbudak, Akkuş and Işkın (2017) examined the awareness of Cumhuriyet University students towards the cultural heritage values of Sivas province according to different variables.

Karakuş (2017) 4. Grade has identified the place of associations in Intangible Cultural Heritage gains in the social studies teaching program. Güneş and Alagöz (2018) study in which students studying tourism examine their attitudes towards cultural heritage found that in general, students ' attitudes towards cultural heritage elements were positive. Tuna and Saral (2018) examined scientific studies on the protection of intangible cultural heritage in education in Turkey. Karadeniz, Sarı and Özdemir (2018) investigated the cultural heritage awareness of Ordu University students and determined a moderate level of awareness. Atalan (2018) study in which he discusses the importance of cultural heritage and conservation concepts in architecture education, Atalan explored the adequacy of courses on conservation and cultural heritage in the curriculum.

The literature survey did not show a study with geography students. Research conducted with the university students showed that the awareness of young people about the cultural heritage elements and values of the province was low or moderate, leading to the need to do the research presented. "What level is the perception and awareness of cultural heritage of the students studying geography on a national basis?" the answer to the question is sought. When the answer to the question is found, the level of geography education in higher education will also be determined in terms of the relevant subject. The research presented is important in terms of eliminating the deficiencies identified.

Methodology

Research Design

Since the perception and awareness of the geography department students towards the cultural heritage values of our country are examined according to different variables, without any different process being included, the study was carried out according to the survey model, which is a quantitative research method. A survey model is an approach that aims to describe a situation that exists in the past or in the present as it exists (Karasar, 1999).

Data Collection and Data Processing

Giresun University Geography Department students constitute the universe of the research. The sample of the study was determined by random sampling method. The study was conducted with 204 students based on volunteerism.

As a data collection tool, a researcher-developed, four-part Cultural Heritage Awareness Survey was used. The first part of the survey consists of demographic questions, while the second part consists of four closed-ended questions aimed at the concept of cultural heritage. In this section, students were asked to understand the level of knowledge related to the concept of "cultural heritage" and asked to select the appropriate option (I have no knowledge, low, medium, high). It was asked which of the options the international organization was that created (determines) the World Heritage List.

The European Union has declared 2018 The Year of European cultural heritage with the philosophy that 'cultural heritage' shapes our society and way of life. Did you know that 2018 has been declared the European Year of Cultural Heritage? His question was addressed. In this section, finally, "did you take a cultural heritage course during your education life?" the question is posed.

In the third part of the survey form, intangible cultural values of Turkey are listed and rated as (1), I have some knowledge (2), I have a lot of knowledge (3) for the first time. Those who know that the heritage element is on the list are assessed as (1) and those who do not (0). In the fourth section of the survey, cultural heritage sites are listed and they are rated as (1) not knowing (0), I have no knowledge (1), I have some knowledge (2), I have quite knowledge (3). Those who know that the heritage element is on the list are assessed as (1) and those who do not (0). Responses to the survey were subject to frequency analysis and evaluated. The highest score from the survey is 145 and the lowest is 32. The range of 32-69, 67 points was low, the range of 69, 68-107, 34 was moderate, and the range of 107. 35-145 points was also high awareness. Scoring for tangible cultural assets is 17-39, 67 low, 39, 68-62.34 moderate and 62, 35-85 points range also indicate high awareness, while for intangible cultural heritage values 15-30 low, 31-45 medium, and 46-60 points are high awareness.

In the study, it was assumed that the data collection tool was suitable for the purpose of the research, that the students responded correctly to the questionnaire applied for the purpose of collecting data, and that the questionnaire applied was applicable to all students. The research is limited by the students of Giresun University's Department of geography and the accuracy of the answers to the questionnaires and the way the researcher interprets the subject.

Findings

204 geography students surveyed, 107 (52.5%) were female and 97 (47.5%) were male students. 98.5% of the students in the research group are in the age range of 8-25 years, 28.9% are in third grade, 28.4% are in first grade, 25% are in second grade and 17.6% are in senior grade (Table 1).

Table 1
Demographics of the Students Participating in the Study

		f	%
Gender	Female	107	52,5
	Male	97	47,5
Age	18-25	201	98,5
	26-30	2	1,0
	31 +	1	,5
Grade	1.	58	28,4
	2.	51	25,0
	3.	59	28,9
	4.	36	17,6

Students in the research group were asked if they had taken a “cultural heritage course” during their education life.

Table 2
Status of Students Taking Courses with Cultural Heritage Content

		Yes		No		Total
		f	%	f	%	F
Gender	Female	43	40,2	64	59,8	107
	Male	46	47,4	51	52,6	97
Age	18-25	87	43,0	114	57,0	201
	26-30	1	50,0	1	50,0	2
	31 +	1	100	0	0,0	1
Grade	1.Grade	11	19,0	47	81,0	58
	2.Grade	23	45,1	28	54,9	51
	3.Grade	22	37,3	37	62,7	59
	4.Grade	33	91,7	3	8,3	36
Total		89	43,6	115	56,4	204

In the study of the students sample 56.4% stated that they did not take a cultural heritage course during their education. In the curriculum of the geography departments, usually human geography courses are included from the 2. grade onwards. Also 3 in the curriculum. And 4. grade include culturally themed electives. Therefore 81% in the students of 1. grade did not take cultural heritage courses, while this rate fell to 8.3% in the last year (Table 2).

When asked about their perception of their level of knowledge for the concept of cultural heritage, 157% of the students responded with a rate of 77% medium, 10.3% high, and 9.8% low. All 20 students who respond to low are in the range of 18 to 25 years and 11 are female and 9 are junior of the 6 students who answered, 3 were first grade, two were 2., one of the 3. it is studied in the grade (Table 3).

Table 3
Perception the Level of Knowledge for the Concept of Cultural Heritage of the Department of Geography Students

		Any information		Low		Medium		High		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gender	Female	3	2,8	11	10,3	85	79,4	8	7,5	107	52,5
	Male	3	3,1	9	9,3	72	74,2	13	13,4	97	47,5
Age	18-25	5	3,0	20	10,0	155	77,0	20	10,0	200	98,0
	26-30	0	0	0	0	1	50,0	1	50,0	2	1,0
	31 +	0	0	0	0	1	50,0	1	50,0	2	1,0
Grade	1.Grade	3	5,2	9	15,5	43	74,1	3	5,2	58	28,5
	2.Grade	2	3,9	3	5,9	41	80,4	5	9,8	51	25
	3.Grade	1	1,7	4	6,8	45	76,3	9	15,3	59	28,9
	4.Grade	0	0	4	11,1	28	77,8	4	11,1	36	17,6
Total		6	2,9	20	9,8	157	77,0	21	10,3	204	100

Students of the Department of geography were asked about the international organization that created the Cultural Heritage List and were given the option of the organization for Economic Development and cooperation (OECD), the European Union (EU), UNESCO and the Union of Islamic countries.

Table 4
Views of Geography Students on the Organization That Determines the Cultural Heritage List

		OECD		AB		UNESCO		Union of Islamic Countries		Total	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
Gender	Female	6	5,6	0	0,0	101	94,4	0	0,0	107	52,5
	Male	8	8,2	1	1,0	88	90,7	0	0,0	97	47,5
Age	18-25	13	6,5	1	0,5	187	93,0	0	0,0	201	98,5
	26-30	1	50,0	0	0,0	1	50,0	0	0,0	2	1,0
	31+	0	0,0	0	0,0	1	100,0	0	0,0	1	0,5
Grade	1.Grade	6	10,3	0	0,0	52	89,7	0	0,0	58	28,5
	2.Grade	4	7,8	1	2,0	46	90,2	0	0,0	51	25
	3.Grade	4	6,8	0	0,0	55	93,2	0	0,0	59	28,9
	4.Grade	0	0,0	0	0,0	36	100,0	0	0,0	36	17,6
Total		14	6,9	1	0,5	189	92,6	0	0,0	204	100

Of the 204 students who participated in the study, 189 marked the UNESCO answer, with a ratio of 92.6%. There were no students who marked the Union of Islamic countries option among the participants. Among geography department students, the number of OECD respondents was 14 and 6.9% (Table 4).

Students involved in the study were asked if they knew that 2018 had been declared a "Year of cultural heritage" by the EU. Students stated that they did not know with a rate of 77.9%. Students' awareness increases as their grade level increases (Table 5).

Table 5
Awareness Year of Cultural Heritage 2018

		Yes I know		I don't know		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
Gender	Female	27	25,2	80	74,8	107	52,5
	Male	18	18,6	79	81,4	97	47,5
Age	18-25	44	22,0	157	78,0	201	98,5
	26-30	1	50,0	1	50,0	2	1,0
	31+	0	0,0	1	100,0	1	0,5
Grade	1. Grade	12	20,7	46	79,3	58	28,5
	2. Grade	10	19,6	41	80,4	51	25
	3. Grade	11	18,6	48	81,4	59	14,2
	4. Grade	12	33,3	24	66,7	36	17,6
Total		45	22,1	159	77,9	204	100

Cultural Heritage Sites of Awareness

Three questions were asked to determine the students' awareness of Turkey's cultural heritage sites. First of all, those who were asked to write down the province where the cultural value was found were not aware of it. The second question is the level of knowledge for cultural value, and the third question is whether the cultural asset in question knows it is on the Heritage List. When the responses to the questions were evaluated, they were generally found to be moderate and above.

Table 6
Geography Students' Awareness of Cultural Heritage Sites

	Province of the Heritage Site				Related to Heritage Site						It is on the UNESCO Cultural Heritage List			
	I don't know		Yes I know		Any information		Some Information		Many information		I didn't know		I did know	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
İstanbul T. M.	6	2,9	198	97,1	1	0,5	140	68,6	63	30,9	46	22,5	158	77,5
Kapadokya	14	6,9	190	93,1	2	1,0	100	49,0	102	50,0	8	3,9	196	96,1
Div.Ulu C.	44	21,6	160	78,4	16	7,8	129	63,2	59	28,9	78	38,2	126	61,8
Hattuşa	78	38,2	126	61,8	39	19,1	116	56,9	49	24,0	104	51,0	100	49,0
Nemrut	55	27,0	149	73,0	11	5,4	110	53,9	83	40,7	74	36,3	130	63,7
Pamukkale	26	12,8	178	87,3	4	2,0	108	52,9	92	45,1	52	25,5	152	74,5
Xanthos	172	84,3	32	15,7	101	49,5	85	41,7	18	8,8	169	82,8	35	17,2
Safranbolu	54	26,5	150	73,5	13	6,4	127	62,3	64	31,4	61	29,9	143	70,1
Troya	48	23,5	155	76,0	23	11,3	119	58,3	62	30,4	66	32,4	138	67,6
Selimiye	50	24,5	154	75,5	16	7,8	138	67,6	50	24,5	62	30,4	142	69,6
Çatalhöyük	63	30,9	141	69,1	25	12,3	134	65,7	45	22,1	81	39,7	123	60,3
Bergama	96	47,1	108	52,9	30	14,7	139	68,1	35	17,2	100	49,0	104	51,0
Cumalıkızık	107	52,5	97	47,5	66	32,4	99	48,5	39	19,1	120	58,8	84	41,2
Diyarbakır	8	3,9	196	96,1	32	15,7	129	63,2	43	21,1	118	57,8	86	42,2
Ephesus	37	18,1	167	81,9	14	6,9	140	68,6	50	24,5	37	18,1	167	81,9
Ani	126	61,8	78	38,2	67	32,8	115	56,4	22	10,8	138	67,6	66	32,4
Afrodissias	144	70,6	60	29,4	77	37,7	111	54,4	16	7,8	145	71,1	59	28,9

The correct answer was the highest given by the presence of the historical sites in Istanbul and the walls of Diyarbakır. Since the names of these two places indicate the provinces in which they are located, it is necessary to exclude them. 93.1% of the

students are from Cappadocia, 87.3% are from Pamukkale and 81.9% are from Ephesus. The proportion of students who do not know the province where Pamukkale travertine is located is 12% of the majority of these students in the analysis. It is understood that he was studying in the 1. grade classroom. Xanthos-Letoon and Ani Harebes had the lowest level of awareness in Cappadocia and Pamukkale (Table 6).

When asked about their perception of the cultural heritage sites listed in this study, 49.5% of the students stated that they had no knowledge of Xanthos, 37.7% of Aphrodisias, and 32.8% of the Ani. 50% of the students state that they know a lot about Cappadocia, 45.1% Pamukkale and 40.7% about Mount Nemrut. The answers to the question posed to test students' awareness that 17 heritage sites are on the UNESCO Cultural Heritage list are as follows. Historical sites in Cappadocia with 96.1%, Ephesus with 81.9% and Istanbul with 77.5% have the highest awareness. 82.8% of students state that they did not know Xanthos-Letoon was on the list.

The student who says "I have no knowledge of the historical areas of Istanbul" is 1 person among 204 students. 68.6% of the participating students stated that they had little knowledge of these venues and 77.5% knew that these venues were on the list. Cappadocia has been identified as a heritage site with the highest awareness. 93.1% of the students know that the province has heritage and 96.12% are on the list. Only 2 out of 204 students have selected the "I have no knowledge of Cappadocia" option. 78.4% of respondents know the province where Divriği Ulu Mosque and Hospital are located, while 44 students do not (38 empty, 6 wrong). 6 the wrong answer is given in Bursa and Edirne. 63.2% of students state that they have some knowledge of this heritage and 61.8% know that this heritage site is on the list.

While 56.9% of the participants state that they have some knowledge about Hattusa (Boğazköy), 51% state that they do not know that this heritage is on the list. 61.8% of the students know the province where Hattusa is located. 73% of the students participating in the research know in which province of Mount Nemrut. 53.9% of the students state that they know a little about Mount Nemrut and 63.7% know that they are on the heritage list. The awareness of the participants on Pamukkale is high. 178 students know that the province they are in and 74.5% know that they are on the heritage list. Only 4 of the students marked I have no information about Pamukkale.

The list of students 84.3% do not know the province where this heritage site is located, 49.5% say they have no knowledge of it, and 82.8% say they do not know it is on the list. 73.5% of the students surveyed knew which province Safranbolu was in, while 62.3% said they had little knowledge of the cultural heritage, while 70.1% said they knew that the cultural asset was on the heritage list. 76% of geography students know the province where the ancient city of Troy is located, 58.3% say they have some knowledge, 67.6% say they know it is on the UNESCO cultural heritage list. 75.5% of the students surveyed know the province where the Selimiye Mosque is located. In addition to the empty answers, 5 wrong answers were taken as Bursa and Istanbul. 67.6% of the students have little knowledge of Selimiye and 69.6% know that Selimiye is on the heritage list.

The list of the students 69% surveyed do not know that Çatalhöyük is located in the province, while 60.3% do not know that it is on the heritage list. 65.7% of the students state that they have some knowledge of Çatalhöyük. 52.9% of the participating students are familiar with the city where the Pergamon historical sites are located. 68.1% of the students stated that they had some knowledge of Pergamon, while 51% were aware that this cultural entity was on the list. Participating students have low awareness on Cumalıkızık. 52.5% of respondents stated that they did not know where he was, 58.8% did not know that this heritage was on the list, and 48.5% had moderate knowledge of Cumalıkızık.

In this study of geography students 32.4% have no knowledge of Diyarbakır Castle and Hesvel Gardens and 57.8% do not know that this area is on the list. The proportion of students who know that Ephesus is located in the province and cultural heritage list is 81.9% and the proportion of those who know a little about Ephesus is 68.6%. The archaeological site of Ani is one of the cultural heritage sites where the students surveyed showed the lowest awareness. 61.8% of respondents did not know the province where Ani is located, and 67.6% were not aware that Ani is on the cultural heritage list and 32.8% selected the “I have no knowledge of Ani” option. Student awareness of the ancient city of Aphrodisias can be said to be low. 70.6% of the students do not know where the city is, 54.4% say they have some knowledge and 71.1% do not know that this cultel entity is on the list.

Awareness of Intangible Cultural Heritage List

The lowest awareness of intangible cultural heritage values of geography department students belongs to the heritage value of “making and sharing flatbread” with a ratio of 62.7%. Out of 204 students, 128 (62.7%) stated that they had heard of this heritage value for the first time. This heritage value is followed by “ceremonial keşkesi” and “chat” (Table 7).

The highest awareness among intangible cultural heritage values (69.1%) belongs to Karagöz. Karagöz is followed by Nowruz with 58.3% and marbling art with 53.4%. The proportion of geography students who have a good knowledge of the Turkish coffee tradition is 52.9%.

The students of surveyed, 56.9% said they had some knowledge of the value of Meddah and 57.8% said they knew this value was on the heritage list. The students of 56.9% surveyed stated that they had some knowledge of the value of Mevlevi Sema ceremony and 57.8% knew that this value was on the heritage list. And the students of surveyed, 69.1% said they knew a lot about Karagöz, while 82.4% said they knew it was on the UNESCO cultural heritage list.

On the minstrel tradition, 45.1% of students state that they have quite a knowledge and 59.3% know that this tradition is on the heritage list. 42.6% of respondents said they had some knowledge of the tradition of chat meetings, while 69.1% said they did not know that this tradition was on the list. 51.1% of the participants stated that they had some knowledge of Kırkpınar oil wrestling tradition, while 73% of the students knew that this tradition was on the list. 28.4% of the students surveyed stated that they had heard the Alevi Bektaşî ritual value for the first time,

while 52.9% had some knowledge of it. 67.2 of the students stated that they did not know that this value was on the cultural heritage list.

Table 7
Awareness of Intangible Cultural Heritage Values in Geography Students

	Intangible Cultural Heritage						It is on the UNESCO Cultural Heritage List			
	Fist time		Some information		Many information		I didn't know		I did know	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Meddahlık	8	3,9	116	56,9	80	39,2	86	42,2	118	57,8
Mevlevi Ceremony	26	12,7	117	57,4	61	29,9	92	45,1	112	54,9
Karagöz	1	,5	62	30,4	141	69,1	36	17,6	168	82,4
Minestrly Trad.	38	18,6	74	36,3	92	45,1	83	40,7	121	59,3
Chat	61	29,9	87	42,6	56	27,5	141	69,1	63	30,9
Kırkpınar	5	2,5	104	51,0	95	46,6	55	27,0	149	73,0
Alevi Bektaşî ritual	58	28,4	108	52,9	38	18,6	137	67,2	67	32,8
Ceremonial Keşkek	120	58,8	69	33,8	15	7,4	175	85,8	29	14,2
Mesir Paste	53	26,0	106	52,0	45	22,1	124	60,8	80	39,2
Turkish Coffe	10	4,9	86	42,2	108	52,9	72	35,3	132	64,7
Marbling	2	1,0	93	45,6	109	53,4	52	25,5	152	74,5
Çini	4	2,0	120	58,8	80	39,2	62	30,4	142	69,6
Nowruz	4	2,0	81	39,7	119	58,3	60	29,4	144	70,6
Flatbread	128	62,7	55	27,0	21	10,3	171	83,8	33	16,2
Hidrellez	20	9,8	98	48,0	86	42,2	90	44,1	114	55,9

The students of surveyed, 58.8% said they had heard about ceremonial keşkek heritage value for the first time, while 33.8% had some knowledge of it. 85.8% of the students stated that they did not know that this tradition, which they often experienced in their daily lives, was on the UNESCO cultural heritage list. The participants' awareness of this cultural value was found to be low.

As a result of the study, 26% of the students who participated in the mesir paste festival heard it for the first time, while 52% of the students stated that they had little knowledge of this tradition. The surveyed of students 60.8% stated that they did not know that this tradition was on the Heritage List. 52.9% of the respondents stated that they had a lot of knowledge of Turkish coffee culture and 64.7% knew that this tradition was on the intangible cultural heritage List. 53.4% of the students stated that they had a lot of knowledge of marbling art and 74.5% knew that this art was on the list.

I have some knowledge of the tradition of tile craftsmanship of the students who participated in the survey while 58.8% of the respondents, 69.6% of those who knew that this cultural value is in the list of intangible cultural heritage was determined. Nowruz is the heritage value with the highest awareness among the participating students. 58.3% determined that they had a lot of student knowledge, while 70.6% realised that this tradition was on the heritage list. About half of the students for Hidrellez value have some knowledge. 55.9% of respondents reported that Hidrellez

was on the heritage list, with results structured mainly following questions in the table above, reflecting the operational definition of system thinking adopted in this study.

Conclusion and Discussion

All works and values of universal value formed generations ago are generally referred to as cultural heritage. In the study we tried to determine the students' awareness of our tangible cultural assets and intangible cultural values, the overall (total) awareness was found to be $\bar{X}=98.81$ and was found to be moderate (69, 6-107,3 intermediate). Their awareness of our tangible cultural assets was found to be moderate at $\bar{X}=57.43$ (moderate to 39.6-62.4). The average score of the participants for intangible cultural heritage values was $\bar{X}=41.38$ (intermediate between 30-45).

This level of awareness is expected to rise higher for geography students. However, Akkuş, Karaca and Polat (2015) and Yılmaz et al. (2017) Cumhuriyet University students' awareness of the cultural heritage values of the Sivas province has been low in their studies. Buluk (2017) research conducted with the students of the Faculty of Tourism showed that the awareness of cultural heritage of the Çanakkale province, where students are studying, was low in general terms. In addition, Öztürk et al. (2015) found that students studying tourism had greater knowledge of intangible heritage values than concrete heritage elements. The result is that there are many courses related to the subject in the curriculum and there is no experience for most of the concrete cultural place.

While low level awareness results are achieved in similar studies mentioned, moderate level awareness from geography students is satisfactory in terms of achieving the program goals. In the analysis 1. grade through 4. in grade the level of awareness increases as goes on. This means that if more attention is given to the issue of cultural heritage in Platoon programs, a high level of awareness can be raised. The overall level of awareness of cultural heritage values and elements in the study conducted by Karadeniz et al. (2018) with 351 university students is $\bar{X}=76.64$ (69.67-107.31) intermediate. A difference of about 22 points was determined between students who did not study geography and those who did not study geography.

Karadeniz et al. (2018) in the study of Pamukkale, 7.4% of the students who do not know the province, 12% of the study group consisting of geography students should be investigated with details of the reasons. Xanthos/Letoon has the lowest level of awareness in both research groups and its follow-up. While 172 students left information about the Xanthos - Letoon value on the Antalya - Muğla border, where they did not know where it was 9 students answered İzmir, one student answered Aydın, İstanbul and Çanakkale. The second of the heritage sites that the students do not know about is Aphrodisias, which is located in Aydın province. Out of 144 students who did not know (140 null), the answer was received from 1 person in Manisa and 3 people in İzmir. The third cultural heritage value is the ruins of Ani in Kars. 126 students who do not know where (122 null) 2 people Trabzon, 2 people received the response from Aydın. Besides these, it was found that Pamukkale was inscribed with Antalya, Bursa, Çanakkale, Aydın and 4 Nevşehir. 50 students who do not know the city where the Selimiye Mosque is located; 21 İstanbul, 4 Bursa responses were received (25 null).

There are those who write in Bitlis, Van, Siirt, Diyarbakır, where the Nemrut heritage site is located in Adıyaman, while there are geography students who write that Cumalıkızık heritage site is located in Eskişehir and Mardin. The province of Divriği Mosque and Darüşüfasının ilen as Edirne and Bursa, Pergama multi-layered cultural landscape in Antalya, Ankara, and Balıkesir were written as students of geography. To think that Çatalhöyük is in Çorum can be considered as mixing, but to know the provinces where the Heritage site is located in Urfa, Antalya, Karabük and Adana is very low awareness. The answer to Antalya, Aydın and Muğla for the ancient city of Ephesus, the wrong answer to İzmir and Bursa for Troy, Bolu for Safranbolu, Kütahya, Amasya, Amasra and Trabzon should be questioned starting from primary and Secondary Education.

The threat of urbanization, industrialization, large-scale agriculture, mining, erosion and an increasing number of conscious visitors to cultural heritage sites is increasing. The difficulties faced by intangible cultural heritage are that, with globalization, societies are more easily influenced by other societies, especially young people who will protect this heritage, and the belief that these values should be protected by past generations is diminished. In this context, it is obvious that the protection of intangible cultural heritage is more difficult than concrete cultural heritage (Can, 2009). In order to ensure the continuity of cultural heritage, awareness, which is one of the important components in the protection of cultural heritage, should be established in every member of society, especially in young people.

Geography education serves to educate people who are aware of the place they live in, who know its value and who believe that it should be protected, and who are useful to society. At this point, efforts to raise awareness of young people about cultural heritage are gaining importance. Student clubs, workshops, workshops, seminars and conferences within universities are one of the prominent outreach modes to enable students to learn about cultural heritage (Shankar & Swamy, 2013). The success of heritage conservation initiatives depends on the understanding and involvement of the local community. The relevant organizations, local authorities, policy makers, decision makers and education managers should act together to take the necessary steps to produce policies that can raise public awareness of this issue.

As a result, one of the characteristics of education is to deliver the cultural values and behavior model of society to its younger members. Through this Conservative function of education, social cohesion is experienced in society and traditional ways of life are maintained. The perception and awareness studied is not only a phenomenon that can be gained in higher education. National education policies should be given more importance and supported by local and national non-governmental organizations to start gaining in primary and secondary education. Important national events such as cultural organizations, national and regional festivals, celebrations such as 23 April National Sovereignty and Children's Day, commemoration of national leaders are among the practices that can increase respect and awareness of heritage. It will also be able to increase awareness and commitment in the community when marches, street Games, light and sound performances, heritage festivals, awards and incentives are held at appropriate times in appropriate areas. In addition, attention should be given to

communication channels such as written and visual media, especially social media, which young people use a lot for the effective management and protection of the heritage site.

References

- Ahmed, T.S.A. (2017). Assessment of students' awareness of the national heritage (Case study: The preparatory year students at the University of Hail, Saudi Arabia). *Cogent Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1-26.
- Akkuş, G., Karaca, Ş. Polat, G. (2015). Heritage awareness and experience: an exploratory study on universty students. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 50,71-81.
- Alkış, S. (2007). The rising paradigm in teaching geography: a sustainable world. *Marmara Coğrafya Dergisi*, 15, 55-64.
- Arıkan, İ.; Doğan, Y. (2013). Analyzing the success levels and attitudes of elementary education 7th grade students related to cultural heritage (Adıyaman province case). *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 6 (15), 29-68.
- Atalan, Ö. (2018). Importance of cultural heritage and conservation concept in the "architectural education". *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 15 (3), 1700-1710.
- Avcı, M.; Memişoğlu, H. (2016). Views of social studies teachers about the cultural heritage education. *Elementary Online*, 15(1), 104-124.
- Ay, T. S.; Fidan, K. N. (2013). Metephors of teacher candidates regarding the concept of "cultural heritage". *Turkish Studies*, 8 (12), 1135-1152.
- Blake, J. (2000). On Defining the Cultural Heritage. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 49(1), 61-85.
- Buluk, B. (2017). Cultural heritage awareness of tourism undergraduate students: the case of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. *International Congress of Tourism and Cultural Heritage*, Muğla.
- Can, M. (2009). Cultural heritage and museology study report. Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Retrieved from <https://teftis.ktb.gov.tr/Eklenti/1279,muserrefcanpdf.pdf?0>
- Çengelci, T. (2012). Place of intangible cultural heritage in social studies education program. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 25 (1), 185-203.
- General Directorate for Cultural Heritage and Museums (2019). World Heritage List. Retrieved from <https://kvmgm.ktb.gov.tr/TR-44423/dunya-miras-listesi.html>
- Dönmez, C.; Yeşilbursa, C. C. (2014). The effect of cultural heritage education on students' attitudes toward tangible heritage. *Elementary Online*, 13(2), 425-442.
- Governorship of İstanbul (2014). Protection of cultural heritage. İstanbul Seismic Risk Reduction and Emergency Preparedness Project. Retrieved from https://www.ipkb.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ISMEP1_ISMEP-1.pdf
- Göğebakan, Y. (2016). The contribution of word's cultural entities to tourism and economy. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Sanat ve Tasarım Dergisi*, 1 (5), 48-77.
- Güneş, E.; Alagöz, G. (2018). A research on the attitudes of studets of tourism toward cultural heritage. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10 (29), 753- 777.

- Hazler, V. (2012). Perception of culturel heritage and monument protection. *Traditiones*, 41 (2), 123–134.
- ICOMOS (2019). International Council on Monuments and Sites. Turkey in the World Heritage List. Retrieved from http://www.icomos.org.tr/?Sayfa=Dunyamirasi_liste_sinde_turkiye&dil=tr
- Karadeniz, B. C., Sarı, S., Özdemir, N. (2018). Ordu University Students' cultural heritage perceptions and their awareness. 3. *Uluslararası Felsefe, Eğitim, Sanat ve Bilim Tarihi Sempozyumu*, Giresun.
- Karakuş, C. (2017). Intangible cultural heritage acuirements affilitations in the social studies curriculum. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Education*, 4(1), 8-16.
- Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 9. Basım,
- Kayan, İ. (2000) The geography education in Turkey universities. *Aegean Geographical Journal*, 11, 7-22.
- Kaygısız, İ. (2019). 18 Areas that Enter UNESCO World Heritage List. Retrieved from <https://www.irfankaygisiz.com/2018/09/11/turkiyeden-unesco-dunya-kultur-miras-listesine-giren-18-alan/>
- Kılcan, B.; Akbaba, B. (2013). Examining students' perceptions on sensitivity to cultural heritage value in social sciences teaching program. *Journal of World of Turks*, 5 (3), 113-137.
- Kocalar, A. O.; Demirkaya, H. (2014). Why is geography important to learn? Perception of high school students. *Doğu Coğrafya Dergisi*, 19 (32), 123-143.
- Kolaç, E. (2009). The importance of Turkish language education in protecting and raising awareness on intangible cultural heritage. *Millî Folklor*, 21 (82), 19-31.
- Külcü, Ö. T. (2015). The importance of the concept of cultural heritage in education. *Akademia Disiplinlerarası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1 (1), 27-32.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism (2019). Cultural Heritage. Retrieved from <https://www.ktb.gov.tr/TR-96283/kulturel-miras.html>
- Nyaupane, N. P.; Timothy, D. (2009). Public awareness and perceptions of heritage buildings in Arizona, USA. *Travel and Tourism Research Association: Advancing Tourism Research Globally*. 32.
- Ocampo, M. C. B.; Delgado, P.I. (2014). Basic education and cultural heritage: prospects and challenges. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4 (9), 201-209.
- Oğuz, E.S. (2011). The concept of culture in social sciences. *Journal of Faculty of Letters*, 28 (2), 123-139.
- Oğuz, M. Ö. (2013). Intangible cultural heritage as a Term. *Millî Folklor*, 25 (100), 5-13.
- Okuyucu, A.; Somuncu, M. (2012). Determination of local people's perceptions and attitudes protection of cultural heritage and use of tourism purpose: case of centre of Osmaneli District. *Ankara Üniversitesi Çevre Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4 (1), 37-51.
- Özdemir, Ü. (2011). Safranbolu's cultural heritage resources and their protection. *Eastern Geographical Review*, 16 (26), 129-142.

- Öztürk, A., Kılıçarslan, D., Demir, Y., Caber, M. (2015). Degree level education in the field of tourism knowledge and experience of Turkey identification of students with elements of cultural heritage. *16. Ulusal Turizm Kongresi, Çanakkale*.
- Reshontheway (2019). 18 heritage in Turkey. UNESCO cultural heritage list. Retrieved from <https://reshontheway.com/unesco-kultur-mirasi-turkiye/>
- Rouhi, J. (2017). Definition of cultural heritage properties and their values by the past, *Asian Journal of Science and Technology*, 08 (12), 7109-7114.
- Santelmann, M., Gosnell, H., Meyers, S. M. (2011). Connecting children to the land: place-based education in the Muddy Creek Watershed, Oregon. *Journal of Geography*, 110 (3), 91-106.
- Shankar, B.; Swamy, C. (2013). Creating awareness for heritage conservation in the city of mysore: issues and policies. *International Journal of Modern Engineering Research (IJMER)*, 3(2): 698-703.
- Shimray, S.R.; Ramaiah, C (2019). Cultural heritage awareness among students of Pondicherry University: a Study, *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 25 (16), 1-10.
- Srivastava, S. (2015). A study of awareness of cultural heritage among the teachers at university level. *Universal Journal of Educational Research* 3(5), 336-344.
- Tören, E., Kozak, N., Demiral, G.N. (2012). The role of public institutions in the protection of cultural heritage assets of Eskişehir. *Aksaray Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 4(2), 69-88.
- Tuna, T.S.; Saral, E. (2018). A bibliographical study on the scientific studies on safeguarding intangible cultural heritage in Turkey. *MSKU Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 5 (1), 68-78.
- Türk Dil Kurumu (2018). Culture. Retrieved from <https://sozluk.gov.tr/>
- Üçler, F. (2014). Valuation of concrete and abstract cultural heritage takes place in the book Yedi İklim Türkçe and İstanbul. *Route Educational and Social Science Journal*, 5(14), 731-748.
- Vecco, M. (2010). A definition of cultural heritage: From the tangible to the intangible, *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 11, 321–324.
- Yazıcı, Ö. (2016). Student Perceptions concerning geographical elements on Turkish banknotes of republic period. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 9 (46), 366-380.
- Yeşilbursa, C.C. (2013). The sixth grade students' views toward tangible heritage. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(2), 405-420.
- Yılmaz, K. Ş., Şahbudak, E., Akkuş, G. Işkın, M. (2017). Cultural heritage awareness: study of an application for the Cumhuriyet University Students. *Journal of Academic Researches and Studies*, 9 (16), 86-100.

Biographical Statement

Cemile Bahtiyar Karadeniz is an associate professor in the Ordu University, Social Sciences Vocational School of Tourism and Hotel Management Program Faculty. Her studies includes geography teaching, geography learning strategies and tourism geography.