

# **Review of 2011 Turkish Literature Curriculum in terms of Objective-Contents Relationship**

By

***Saadettin Keklik***

Assistant Professor, Usak University, Faculty of Education, Usak, 64200, Turkey

## **Abstract**

*The objective of this study is to investigate the curriculum of the 2011 Turkish literature course, 2011 in terms of objective-contents relationship. The research is a survey model study performed by utilizing qualitative data analysis techniques. The research has three sub-questions related to its problem statement. During solution of its first sub-question, objectives of the literature course were established and the categorical analysis technique, which is one of content analysis techniques, was used. Examining the chronological method was utilized for solution of the second sub-question and the document review method was utilized for determination of the best method for presentation of contents. During the research, first of all, objectives of the literature course were established by 14 items. Then, it was determined that the chronological method was not an appropriate method in literary education. Instead, from near to far or thematic method was identified to be the most appropriate method in line with the opinions of the researchers. Accordingly, the contents should be consistent with the objectives of the Turkish literature course. In literary education, the contents should be arranged by selecting either from near to far or thematic method, rather than chronological method. Accordingly, the students should be faced with texts valuable in terms of their content that will meet their interests, needs and expectations.*

**Keywords:** *Literature Education, Curriculum of Turkish Literature Course, Thematic Method, Chronological Method.*

## **1. Introduction**

One of the concepts upon the definition of which no agreement can be reached is art. Art has an important role in human life. "Art shows us the inner realm of man with its breadth and depth" (Tarlan, 1981:22). "Art not merely reproduces life but also shapes it" (Wellek and Warren, 1983:135). According to Buğra (1979:146), "the only force that changes man is art".

"Art work comes to life when an artist carries his abstract feelings, thoughts, dreams and impressions to concrete by any means/material and turns them into an aesthetic object" (Çetişli, 2008:11). Name of art changes according to the material used by an artist. Such as art of painting, musical art, art of literature, etc.

Literature is an art which is based on and processes language. "An artist takes the language of his nation and creates his work by using it extremely carefully and rigorously. In the meantime, he processes, develops and enriches the language by assigning new meanings to words, creating new images and developing new forms of expression" (Çetişli, 2008:209). In this respect, literary artist is a person who uses the language of his work in the finest and effective way.

In literary works, mankind's loves, hopes, sufferings, sorrows, pride, compassion, sacrifices, dreams, ideals, inner worlds, experiences and relationships with their environment are addressed (Fowler, 1965). Therefore, literary texts are read to get an aesthetic pleasure, feel, understand, think and interpret, rather than to acquire knowledge. "Literature is a different window opening to life, a new horizon, a new point of view" (Uçan, 2005:63). "Literature is one of the ways by which man searches for and tries to make real the eternity in himself" (Inam, 2003:22). "Literature is an area of effectiveness which best sheds light or at least gives tips on any questions we cannot help asking such as What am I? Who am I? What kind of a

thing am I? ” (Uygur, 1969:158). Literature is quite important for a man to recognize himself and raise awareness in himself.

Language and literature are also one of the most important aspects of culture. Characteristics of a nation’s culture are best conceived in the language of that nation and literature works which are selected examples of that language (Karakuş, 2005; Kantemir, 1976; Kerman, 1988; Polat, 2006). Language and literature provide the greatest contribution to processing, development and enrichment of cultural values as well as fulfill the duty of passing the culture to future generations.

Literature promotes culture of a man’s own nation as well as helps man encounter cultural richness of other nations. According to Kılıç (2005:4), “Literature introduces others to us; since literary knowledge is an important component of great culture developed by mankind on the earth, it makes individuals partners of the earth’s heritage.” Literature introduces other cultures, nations, people, thus, common values of humanity are understood. For example, we see sacrifice in Father Goriot, divine aspect of love in Fuzuli and human tragedy in Shakespeare.

Literature is a course of culture. Through this course, it is intended to ensure that students acquire various skills, habits and attitudes as well as to pass on culture and arts of that nation. Literature course is taught pursuant to a literature curriculum.

## 2. Literature Curriculum

Literature course curriculum taught in Turkish high schools was first prepared in 1924 and this curriculum was changed in 1927, 1929, 1934, 1938, 1942, 1949, 1952, 1954, 1957, 1976, 1991, 1995, 2005 (Dursunoğlu, 2006). The most recent change was in 2011.

As from the academic year 2005-2006, the term of high school education was increased to four years. It was initiated to re-create curriculums, accordingly to a new teaching curriculum related to Turkish Language and Literature. According to this curriculum, literature course is discussed under two headings, namely “Turkish Literature” and “Language and Speech” . Turkish literature course curriculum, 2005 was reviewed again in the year 2011; however, no change was made in its general structure.

Distribution of subjects in Turkish literature curriculum, 2011 for 9th to 12th grades is shown in Table 1:

**Table 1: 9-12. Distribution of Grade Subjects**

Grades	Subjects			
	Unit 1	Unit 2	Unit 3	Unit 4
9	Fine arts and literature	Verse	Literary texts created based on events	Tutorial texts
10	Turkish literature through History	Turkish literature during epic period	Turkish literature that developed based on Islamic civilization (between 11th and 19th centuries)	
11	Introduction to Turkish literature under Western influence	Literature during Tanzimat reform era	Servet-i Fünûn Literature and Fajr-i Âti	Development of National literature
12	Development of Turkish literature during Republic period	Tutorial texts	Verse	Literary texts created based on events

In view of Table 1, it is understood that in Turkish Literature curriculum, the subjects were divided into units and they were arranged according to information and analysis of text in ninth grade, and according to literary periods and schools in tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades. It is apparent that the contents were prepared by history of literature or chronological method. In other words, Turkish literature was addressed from its beginning to present day.

Although weekly schedule of Turkish Language and Literature course varies according to high school and type of departments, it was recommended that texts that best represent literary taste and understanding of the era should be included in the curriculum without changing its structure and contents.

### ***Problem Status***

Many researchers reported that Turkish education system as well as literary education in high schools has a wide range of problems and deficiencies. These problems can be summarized under the following headings: teacher training, the fact that teachers have high teaching load, crowded classes, class layout, physical infrastructure, use of the library, course tools and supplies, curriculums and practices, inadequate time for the course, presentation of contents, textbooks, teaching methods, selection of texts, nature of questions about the text, historical development and change of Turkish language, assessment and evaluation, rote-based education, quality of students, lack of reading habit, lack of vocabulary, economic reasons, the media, publishing, university exam, education policies, entertainment culture, social and cultural gaps, etc. (Aydemir, 2006; Büyükkantarçioğlu, 2006; Çelik-Özer, 2010; Çetin and Uzun, 2010; Demir, 2010; Demiral, 2011; Eyüp et al., 2012; Günay, 2006; Işıksalan, 2011; İspirli and Gülbahçe, 2009; Kurudayıoğlu et al., 2008; Oğuz, 2011; Özarlan, 2006; Uzun, 2009; Yavuz, 2012).

Among the above mentioned problems, the curriculum has an important place. Husband (2004) stated that learning and teaching activities are created by a curriculum, and that the curriculum describes what is created by considering and why it is planned. Quality of a curriculum directly affects, in a positive or negative way, textbooks, educational materials and tools, teaching process, the teacher and the student. Particularly, contents of a curriculum, how they are presented, quality of texts directly influence the student.

I wonder whether literary education by chronological method is one of the reasons for failure of students to develop habit of reading, acquire reading culture, for decline in students' interest towards poetry, novels and theatre, and inadequacies in their understanding and narrating skills. In light of this question, a need for review of literature curriculum has emerged in terms of objective-contents.

Problem statement of the research is "Is literature curriculum, 2011 appropriate/adequate in terms of objective-contents relationship?"

Sub-questions of the research are as follows:

1. What are the objectives of literary education?
2. For the purposes of the objectives of literary education, is the current method-chronological method- appropriate?
3. If chronological method is not appropriate in terms of objective-contents relationship, by which method should the contents be prepared?

### **3. Method**

The research is a survey model study performed by utilizing qualitative data analysis techniques. The research has three sub-questions related to its problem statement. Data collection and analysis of these questions were carried out in a phased manner.

Objectives of the literature course were identified for the solution of the first sub-question of the research. "categorical analysis technique", one of the analysis techniques, was used while identifying these

objectives. Categorical analysis refers to “classification under a specified theme of concepts derived from the content analysis”(Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011: 228). In this study, the opinions of the researchers were pooled and based on these result, objective items were written.

Process of coding in the study took place in two phases. First, two researchers individually coded general objective statements. A sentence was taken as the basis during this coding. Differences between coding of two encoders were checked by a third researcher and deficiencies were corrected. Objective sentences expressed by at least three different people were included in the study.

Examining chronological method was utilized for solution of the second sub-question of the study and document review method was utilized for determination of the best method for presentation of contents. “Document examination includes analysis of written materials that contain information about the fact(s) which is/are the subject(s) of the research (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011:187).” Opinions of many researchers were examined to solve second and third questions.

### 3. Findings and Discussion

Findings and discussion were addressed under three headings according to sub-questions.

#### *Objectives of Literary Education*

Any and all activities in education and teaching are performed to achieve specific objectives. Objectives should be identified very well while preparing the curriculum. Gains, contents, method, activities, assessment and evaluation are planned in line with the objectives. In the case of teaching Turkish Language and Literature, first objectives should be identified and then other dimensions should be set. Many scholars, intellectuals, writers and teachers have expressed their views on literary education. These were written as objective sentences, as described in the method. Related names are arranged and numbered in alphabetical order under Table 2.

**Table 2: Objectives of Literature Course**

No	Objectives of Literature Course	Numbers of researchers	Total
1	Ensure that students gain aesthetic or artistic taste through literature courses.	4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25.	16
2	Ensure that students encounter, are introduced to literary works, perceive artistic values in texts and grasp meanings of language it has acquired in texts. In other words, ensure that students enter into the world of literature.	2, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27.	15
3	Cause students to gain skills of thinking, reasoning, criticising and interpreting. In other words, ensure that students develop their mental skills and produce their own ideas.	1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27.	15
4	Ensure that students express themselves well verbally and in writing. In other words, cause them to acquire good and effective speech, good writing and creative writing skills.	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27.	15
5	Cause students acquire a love and habit of reading through literature courses.	2, 3, 9, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 27.	14
6	Help students develop human emotions, values such as kindness, friendship, tolerance, solidarity, hard work, and honesty. In other words, cause them to acquire sensitivity and provide them with sensual training.	2, 4, 6, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 25, 27.	10
7	Provide students with theoretical, general or basic	4, 5, 8, 14, 19, 22.	6

	information about language and literature.		
8	Develop, enrich and deepen students' imagination	2, 14, 15, 16, 27.	5
9	Teach cultural/national values to students and cause them acquire a national identity.	1, 6, 14, 15, 27.	5
10	Make students develop a liking for Turkish language and acquire national language awareness.	14, 17, 24, 27.	4
11	By courtesy of literary works, help students get to know themselves and become aware by recognizing people and the environment. In other words, ensure that they have a multi-faceted personality.	14, 17, 22, 27.	4
12	Ensure that students recognize, understand universal values by national culture as well as world literature, and create an awareness of protecting them.	8, 11, 12, 14.	4
13	Create opportunities for students having talent in any field of literature to set forth their talent.	8, 11, 25.	3
14	Make students socialize and make them compatible with the society. In other words, make them acquire the ability of co-existence.	6, 14, 15.	3

1. Atatürk (Korkmaz, 1992) 2. Ataç (Çılgın, 2006) 3. Büyükkantarçioğlu, 2006 4. Cemiloğlu, 2003, 2004 5. Croftand Cross, 2003 6. Çetin and Uzun, 2010 7. Çetişli, 2006 8. Çotuksöken, 2002 9. Enginün, 1988 10. Eyüp et al. 2012 11. İpşiroğlu, 2005 12. Gökalp-Alpaslan, 2000 13. Günay, 2006 14. Güzel, 2006 15. Karakuş, 2005 16. Kantemir, 1976 17. Kavcar, 1987, 1993, 1994 18. Kılıç, 2005 19. Kudret, 1983 20. Marshall, 1974 21. Saraç, 2006 22. Taşdelen, 2006 23. Tuncer, 2005 24. Tural, 2003 25. Uçan, 2006 26. Yalçın, 2002 27. Teachers' opinions (Kantemir, 1976; Saraç, 2009)

In consideration of the table, it is apparent that first five items are in the forefront. It is understood that the most important objective of literature course is to make students gain artistic taste or aesthetic taste. General objectives of Turkish literature course curriculum, 2011 were identified by 22 items (MEB, 2011). When 14 items determined in the study are compared with 22 items in the curriculum, it emerged that nine articles are compatible and articles 6, 8, 12, 13, and 14 in the study are not compatible. Accordingly, it can be concluded that their objectives match in general.

The second thing to do after the determination of objectives is to identify the contents. The contents are of great importance since they are the tools that will ensure that the objectives are reached. In the case of contents in a curriculum, an answer is sought to the question "what should we teach to achieve the specified objectives?" (Demirel, 2003; Işıksalan, 2011; Kantemir, 1976, 1988; Kavcar, 1987; Saraç, 2006). While preparing Turkish literature curriculum, subjects or contents should be determined in accordance with objectives and achievements. Answers to questions such as "What kind of contents should be prepared?" "What should be taught and to what extent?" "To what should we focus in contents?" are sought.

Before answering these questions, it is useful to examine status related to current contents. It is seen in the curriculum that beginning from tenth grade, literature is addressed chronologically as from its beginning to present day. Therefore the question to ask should be is chronological method or history of literature the most appropriate method for achieving objectives of literature course?

### ***Chronological Method***

In all curriculums which have been prepared since 1924, literary education was performed as history of literature (Dursunoğlu, 2006; Işıksalan, 2011; Kantemir, 1976; Karakuş, 2005). Performance of literary education in the form of history of literature was criticized by many people at various times.

History of literature is defined as “a discipline that addresses literature as a form of art developing throughout historical events, within history, just as other governmental institutions do ”(Enginün, 1977:443) . History of literature is a branch of the science of literature, and in the case of history of literature, life of the man of letters, characteristics of his era and his circle are on the forefront whereas his work stays in the background. While literature course is taught by chronological method, the literary works are discussed by an author-centric approach.

Science of literature and literary education are different things. “Science of literature does not have the responsibility to teach, gives priority to scientific objectives and method becomes objective. On the other hand, literature teaching has more sense of teaching and stands closer to the role of intermediary” (Tepebaşılı, 2006:613). Günay (2006:11) stated that any knowledge about history of literature is important for those writing history of literature or making research about a work or author, however, it is not directly important for a student. Bilkan (2006:143) says “It is the job of literature historians to investigate who was born where, in which madrasa he studied and in which positions he was involved. This can also be given by encyclopedias or literary histories in the form textbooks” and draws attention to the importance of history of literature in literary education.

Ali Canib Yöntem, who prepared a textbook, reading book and anthology for high school students and worked during preparation of 1927 Turkish-literature curriculums, supported teaching history of literature in higher education, rather than high school education, just as Gustave Lanson. In his article called “Literary Education in High Schools” published in Günes magazine in 1927, he stated that even if it is possible, it is not appropriate to teach a systematic history of literature as from the very beginning in high schools because history of literature is of use in university, rather than high school.

In Varlık magazine, many articles have been published criticizing literary education, and curriculums. In his article about literature teaching published in Varlık magazine in 1953, Zihni Küçümen says “Why do we start from Orkhon Inscriptions? Let’s start with our most vibrant, lively, full-of-life literary texts fragrantly smelling of people. Let the teacher to be free and unbound. Let him/her to focus on contemporary writers, where necessary”(Demiral, 2006:301), while İhsan Akay asks in his article published in Varlık magazine in 1956 as “History of literature is a branch of knowledge that would help the understanding of literary texts. But in the case of us, it steps on texts and takes the lead. Why is that? (Demiral, 2006:301).

Behçet Necatigil also believed that literature teaching contained extreme levels of encyclopedic information and wanted that necessary freedom and authorization should be given to literature teacher for improvement of literature (Demiral, 2006:300).

In articles published in Varlık magazine from 1933 to 1960, it was stated that literature teaching should be planned again and teaching performed by chronological classification in high school turned young people against literature (Demiral, 2006:306).

Kavcar is one of those researchers, who had numerous articles on literary education and focused on this issue. Kavcar also criticizes performance of literary education in the form of history of literature and states that it should be performed in line with contemporary sense of education. “Rather than causing students memorize names, dates, movements, it should be essential to deliver positive information, many and nice texts, shake their inner world, make them acquire experiences and provide language and artistic taste” (Kavcar, 1993:31).

Çotuksöken stated that there is a need for a language and literature curriculum that is compatible with the conditions of Turkey and can respond to expectations of the society (1997), however, that literature textbooks should not be filled with boring information about history of literature, history of literature should be considered as a separate book and used as an ancillary book (2002).

According to Dilidüzgün (2001) “It is a bit thought-provoking that the only thing that comes to one’s mind in the case of literature teaching in Turkish education system is history of literature. Because science of literature does not only comprise history of literature.” According to him, history of literature is a required field for researchers but is one of the fields of science of literature such as literary criticism, literary theory, methods of science of literature and literature teaching.

Discussions about delivering literary education in the form of history of literature and to what extent of which era of literature should be included in high school period still continue in the 2000s.

In his article called “Discussions Arisen about Changing the Contents of Literature Courses”, Aydoğan (2002) refers to a discussion lasting for three months while refreshing at intervals in between about a news article published in *Hürriyet* newspaper on December 19th, 2001, entitled “Failatünfailün bitti(Failatün failün ended)”. Information such as removal of Divan literature from high school curriculum quoted by this news article about changes Ministry of Education plans to make cause discussions. Various writers, academics and journalists, including Doğan Hızlan, Murat Bardakçı, İskender Pala, Orhan Okay, Hıncal Uluç declared their opinions. During discussions, there was no one who declared any opinion that literatures of former eras, including divan literature, should be totally denied and should not be taught, and putting emphasis on literature of the Republican era was welcomed in general. Revelations on the fact that the courses will be taught by the method of from near to far, from easy to hard are mostly approved.

According to Cemiloğlu (2004:121-122), “Reading texts in textbooks which follow a current from Orkhon inscriptions to present day and are prepared with an understanding of history of literature make it difficult to teach them to students because they have a structure far -naturally to some extent- from today’s Turkish language of Turkey.” According to him, the language in historical texts causes them to be learned as an abstract information or perceived as a luxury particularly because they cannot be used in writing courses.

The file “Literature Education in High Schools” in September, 2005 issue of *Varlık* magazine was addressed with its different dimensions and criticized by many researchers, literature teachers, and university students. In that issue, it was stated that literature course did not make students gain aesthetic taste and reading habit, that literature education based on memorizing was wrong and literature course did not include adequate amount of material on contemporary Turkish literature and world literature.

In issue 196 of 2006, which was a special issue of *Milli Eğitim* journal, literary education was discussed in detail and delivery of literary education by history of literature or chronological method was criticized. Many researchers emphasized that literature course is taught in the form of history of literature, and that rote-based information, including biographies of poets and authors, names of their works, in which literary movements they were involved, when they lived and died, are taught in literature classes. Instead, it was expressed that basis of literary education is to make students face with literary texts, ensure that they enter into meaning world of texts and make them grasp aesthetic position of the texts (Çetişli, 2006; Coşkun, 2006; Günay, 2006; Taşdelen, 2006; Uçan, 2006).

Çelik-Özer (2010) stated that although content of Turkish literature course has an aim of focusing on the text, students encounter texts above their level in their textbooks because of the failure to move away from the understanding of literary history, and that they cannot come together with literary and educational texts produced in recent years before 12th grade.

İsmet and Uzun (2010) emphasized that in UK, literature teaching is planned to make students gain four basic skills while Turkish Literature curriculum intends students to gain knowledge and skills, however, the former occasionally heads off the latter and that the curriculum should be reviewed again.

According to Işıksalan (2011), one of the major problems in literary education is the failure to include adequate number of contemporary literary texts. Işıksalan stated that the curriculum is prepared with an

academic scope and depth, that students dislike literature course because they do not encounter any texts of their era and hence they do not feel any interest and sense of wonder in reading. Işıksalan (2011) also stated that the curriculum 2005 was not sufficient in achieving objectives.

As emphasized by the researchers above, it is not appropriate to perform literary education in high schools by history of literature or chronological method. Researchers agree on this issue. So, for the purposes specified above, by which method should the contents in literary education be prepared?

***What kind of contents should be prepared?***

“Contents are the act of organizing meaningful parts of life segments with an active effort, not bringing together cases and events in an encyclopedic way for them to be memorized” (Varış, 1978:154). “Information selected to achieve objectives should be organized according to certain criteria” (Doğanay and Sari, 2009:74). It is impossible to transfer the entire Turkish literature into a high school curriculum. Therefore, the contents and texts should be selected according to a certain method to achieve objectives. In the early years of the Republic, one of the most hotly debated topics was to what extent Folk literature, Divan literature, Contemporary literature and Western literature would be included in literary education. Among these, especially the place of Divan literature in literary education was disgreatly. While no one can ignore the role of Divan literature in history of literature, many stated that Divan literature is not suitable for high school students for a variety of reasons.

While names including Kazım Nami Duru, Nurullah Ataç, Cemal Sezgin advocated complete removal of Divan literature from literature curriculum in high schools because it completed its era, names such as H. Fahri Ozansoy advocated that a short history of Divan literature should be delivered at least in 10th-11th grades. In addition to this, names including Mahir Kocatürk, Sena Ongun stated that Folk literature, rather than Divan literature should be included in high school curriculum and Divan literature is among the areas of interest of experts at the universities (Demiral, 2006).

Something must be underlined about Turkish literature. Whether it is Divan literature or Folk literature, whether it is Turkish literature before Islam or Contemporary literature, they are part of a whole. A literary period is not superior to another literary period. Endurance is what is important in culture. In this respect, all of these periods comprise Turkish literature. Therefore, students should see the whole of Turkish literature in class and try to understand it.

Chronological order was followed in the curriculums prepared so far, including Turkish Literature curriculum, 2011. It was described in the previous section that chronological method is not very convenient for literary education. Then, according to which method the contents should be prepared? Bilkan (2006:151) underlined the need for creating “the contents of literature books without smothering them in theory and by taking care to make the addressee have pleasure from literary works in terms of language, thought and feeling”. Two different methods can be referred to while selecting the contents and texts:

***Literature Curriculum Prepared According to From Near to Far***

It was referred to by many researchers that from near to far or first contemporary then other literatures should be taught during literature classes. Here, weight or breadth is on contemporary literature (Belge, 2005; Canbaz, 2005; Çelik-Özer, 2010; Çotuksöken, 2002; Işıksalan, 2011; İpşiroğlu, 2005; Kavcar, 1993; Kudret, 1983; Tuncer, 2005).

“In developed countries, texts to which students do not have access, which do not tell about their environment and match with their world are not selected for language and literature classes. What should be done in our country is to briefly address examples of historical value of our language later, concentrate more on examples of contemporary language and literature so that students are attracted to the course and make them gain skills, rather than putting them off the course” (Kavcar, 1993:34).

If the idea is to make students gain language awareness and enjoy reading, reading task should be started with texts students can enjoy. First, a student should be given easy-to-understand texts which match the student's taste and interest. (Bilkan, 2006; Çelik-Özer, 2010; Kavcar, 1987, 1993).

During research studies performed with Turkish Language and Literature teachers, 70% of the teachers indicated that weight should be given to Republican era literature and distribution of texts should be made with an approach going from the present to past (İşıksalan, 2011; Kantemir, 1976; Oral ve Aşılıoğlu, 2000).

### ***Thematic Method***

Thematic method is based on the comparison between forms of processing of the same theme in different examples (Marshall 1994: 62-66). In thematic method, the subject as well as text type, movements or problems can be put in the centre.

Many researchers defend that the subjects in Turkish literature curriculum should be arranged in a thematic manner in which weight is given to example texts selected from contemporary writers (Çotuksöken, 2002; Gökalp-Aslan, 2000; İpşiroğlu, 2005). For example, they stated that an arrangement in which emphasis will be put on how different writers addressed concepts such as love, sadness, happiness, war, peace, democracy, mankind in different centuries should be made. (Oral and Aşılıoğlu, 2000; Poyrazoğlu, 1986).

Bilkan (2006:149) explained his views as "It would be a more appropriate attitude to choose and quote finest examples of odes or eulogies of our classical verse, rather than the whole text", while Cemiloğlu, (2003:97-98) stated "All poets of each century will no longer be taught in order and instead, a path based on types of verse will be followed or those with similar themes will be evaluated altogether, as in thematic approach".

In any curriculum whether prepared on the basis of from near to far or of thematic method, many researchers underlined the need for teaching selected works of world literature in addition to Turkish literature. It was deemed important for the student to embrace universal values as well as national values, compare texts from Turkish literature with texts from world literature in terms of increasing one's overall cultural knowledge (Çelik-Özer, 2010; Gökalp-Alpaslan, 2000; Güzel, 2006; Tuncer, 2005). Canbaz(2005:94) indicated the effect of literary education in terms of understanding other cultures and people by saying, "A literary education that includes out texts as well as products of world literature will be useful in terms of understanding how literature covers different topics, problems and sensitivities and expand students' point of view".

## **4. Conclusion**

Objectives of literature course were identified for the solution of first sub-question of the research. According to this, the five most important objectives of literary education are as follows: Ensure that the students gain aesthetic taste through literature courses; ensure that they gain love and habit of reading; ensure that they are faced with and introduced to literary works and hence enter the world of literature; ensure that they can express themselves verbally and in writing and acquire the ability to think, reason, criticize and interpret.

For the solution of the second sub-question of the study, chronological method was discussed. Researchers were united in the view that this method is not suitable for literary education in high schools. Accordingly, it has emerged that the chronological method is not suitable for literary education.

In third sub-question of the research, emphasis was placed on what is the best method for preparation of contents. According to this, it was established that from near to far and thematic methods are the best.

A literature curriculum which has been prepared according to the method of from near to far has many advantages. It is quite useful for the students to encounter contemporary works in which there is no difference in century, understanding, way of life in terms of language, style as well as world of imagination so that they perceive, understand, interpret the text and get aesthetic taste from it. A positive attitude towards literature may develop in students who have first encountered works of recent era and as a result, this may turn into the habit of reading. McKay (2000) also thinks that success in literary education depends on choosing texts that match a certain level. According to him, choosing texts that match the level of a target group in terms of linguistics and content is the most important factor in literary education.

A curriculum prepared according to the method of from near to far is also suitable in terms of teaching principles. Interest, sense of wonder, motivation, prior knowledge, developmental characteristics of the students are also taken into account in terms of teaching principles, including principle of orientation towards target audience, principle of providing motivation, timeliness principle, the principle of from known to unknown, the principle of from simple to complex.

A curriculum prepared according to from near to far is suitable in terms of text-centred and reader-centred approach. Because in these approaches, priority need to be given to texts a student can understand. Also, in a curriculum prepared according to from near to far, it will be easier for the students to comprehend texts written in previous centuries. As knowledge, vocabulary and reasoning ability of the students increase in parallel with their age, it will be easier for them to perceive, understand, interpret any works written in previous centuries.

In thematic method, presence of integrity within any texts gives the students an opportunity to compare the texts. It allows students to see any similarities and differences while comparing texts. In another aspect, addressing the subject, genre, or a problem in all their aspects, addressing the same subject with texts written by different people at different times ensure that the students realize the change in language as well as different approaches to the subject.

In the method of from near to far as well as thematic method, it was expressed that students should adopt national values as well as universal values and gain common heritage of humanity. Accordingly, it was emphasized that students should confront Turkish literature as well as selected examples of world literature. Accordingly, it emerged that Turkish Literature course should include world literature.

Based on these results, the following suggestions can be made:

1. According to Demirel (2003:126), "Content must be consistent with objectives and be meaningful for students." Therefore, the contents should be consistent with the objectives of Turkish literature course. In the study, it emerged that the primary goal of education is to ensure that students gain aesthetic taste and reading habit. Accordingly, the students should be faced with texts valuable in terms its content that will meet their interests, needs and expectations. Also, quality texts that are best examples of their type, era and theme should be selected.
2. At the end of the study, it emerged that chronological method or literary history method is not suitable for literary education in high schools. So, chronological method should be abandoned in literary education.
3. It ensued that either from near to far or thematic method is the best method of arranging the contents. According to this, the contents should be arranged by selecting one of these methods.

## References

- Aydemir, Y. (2006). Divan edebiyatı öğretiminde karşılaşılan sıkıntılar ve zihniyet problemi. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 134-141.
- Aydoğan, B. (2002). Edebiyat derslerinin içeriğinin değiştirilmesi konusunda çıkan tartışmalar. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 10 (10), 76-99.
- Belge, M. (2005). Edebiyat en az ezbere dayanacak şeylerden biri. Ezberle edebiyat olmaz. *Varlık*, 1176, 8-10.
- Bilkan, A. F. (2006). Liselere divan edebiyatı öğretimi. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 142-153.
- Buğra, T. (1979). *Düşman kazanma sanatı*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. (2006). Bilgi toplumu oluşturma bağlamında türk edebiyatı dersleri üzerine düşünceler. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 119-132.
- Canbaz, F. (2005). Edebiyat eğitiminin bazı sorunları üzerine notlar. *Hece Dergisi, Edebiyat Eğitimi ve Sorunları*, 9 (106), 91-97.
- Cemiloğlu, M. (2003). *Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimi* (1. Baskı). İstanbul: Alfa Yayınları.
- Cemiloğlu, M. (2004). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimine bütüncü yaklaşım. (Hazırlayan: Ahmet Günşen) *1.Kırşehir Kültür Araştırmaları Bilgi Şöleni (8-19 Ekim 2003)*, (s.117-125) Kırşehir: Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Coşkun, M. (2006). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimindeki sorunlara batı üniversiteleri temelinde çözüm önerileri. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 57-74.
- Croft, S. & Cross, H. (2003). *Literature, Criticism and Style*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Çelik-Özer, T. (2010). *Çağdaş bir dil ve edebiyat öğretimi program modeli önerisi*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- Çetin, İ. ve Uzun, Y. (2010). Türkiye’de ve İngiltere’de edebiyat öğretimi. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30 (2), 397-412.
- Çetişli, İ. (2006). Edebiyat eğitiminde edebî metnin yeri ve anlamı. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 75-84.
- Çetişli, İ. (2008). *Edebiyat sanatı ve bilimi* (1. Baskı). Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Çılgın, A. S. (2006). Nurullah Ataç’ın dil-edebiyat eğitimi ve öğretmenlik mesleğine eleştirel bakışı. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 191-206.
- Çotuksöken, Y. (2002). *Türkçe üzerine*. İstanbul: Papatya Yayınları.
- Çotuksöken, Y. (1997). Öğrenci ve genel okur düzeyinde katılımcı okuma yöntemi; bu yöntemin amaçları ve amaç davranışları. *Türkçe ve edebiyat öğretimi sempozyumu*. Eyüboğlu Eğitim Kurumları Yayınları, 120-126.
- Demir, C. C. (2010). *Türk edebiyatı ders kitaplarının programa uygunluğunun öğretmen görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi*. Balıkesir: Balıkesir Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Demiral, H. (2006). Türk dili ve edebiyatı eğitim programlarına yönelik varlık dergisinde çıkan yazılar. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 297-308.
- Demiral, H. (2011). *Orta öğretim türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretiminin uluslararası ölçütlere göre değerlendirilmesi (Eskişehir ili örneği)*. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.

- Demirel, Özcan (2003). *Kuramdan uygulamaya eğitimde program geliştirme* (5. Baskı). Ankara: Pegema Yayıncılık.
- Dilidüzgün, S. (2001). Türkiye’de edebiyat öğretimi ve edebiyat öğretiminde çağdaş yönelimler. *Çağdaş Türk Yazını*. İstanbul: Adam Yayıncılık, 244-261.
- Doğanay, A. ve Sarı, M. (2009). Öğretim Amaçlarının Belirlenmesi, İfade Edilmesi ve Uygun İçeriğin Seçimi. Editör: Ahmet Doğanay, *Öğretim İlke ve Yöntemleri* (4. Baskı), (s.37-80) Ankara: Pegema Yayınları
- Dursunoğlu, H. (2006). Cumhuriyetin ilânından günümüze türkçe ve edebiyat öğretiminin ortaöğretimdeki tarihî gelişimi. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 227-246.
- Enginün, İ. (1977). Edebiyat tarihi. *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi*, İstanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 2.
- Enginün, İ. (1988). Türk dili ve edebiyatı ders programlarının uygulanmasında görülen aksaklıklar. *Türk Dilinin Öğretimi Toplantısı 1-3 Ekim 1986*. (p.139-142). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Eyüp, B.; Uzuner-Yurt, S. ve Stebler, M. Z. (2012). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimine yönelik yapılan akademik çalışmalar üzerine bir inceleme. *Turkish Studies*, 7(1), 1119-1131.
- Fowler, M. E. (1965). *Language, composition, and literature*. United States of America: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Gökalp-Alpaslan, G.G. (2000). Derslikten günlük yaşama edebiyat eğitimi. *Türkbilig*, 1, 185-202.
- Günay, V. D. (2006). Liselerdeki yazın eğitimine yeni bir yaklaşım. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 8-17.
- Güzel, A. (2006). Edebiyat eğitiminde amaçlar ve bu amaçlara yönelik yöntem teknik ve örnek uygulamalar. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 85-106.
- Husbands, C. (2004). *Models of the curriculum. preparing to teach in secondary schools*. (Ed. Brooks, Valerie) New York: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Işıksalan, S. N. (2011). 2005 Türk edebiyatı dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi: Eskişehir örneği. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12 (1), 15-40.
- İnam, A. (2003). Edebiyatımı yitirmiş edebiyât: edebiyâtın edebi yatık mı. *Doğu Batı*, 22, 21-36.
- İpşiroğlu, Z. (2005). Amaç öğrencilerin edebiyat dünyasının içine girmelerini sağlamak. *Varlık*, 1176, 11-12.
- İspirli, S. A. ve Gülbahçe, A. (2009). Gençlerimiz ve divan edebiyatı öğretimi -Erzurum İli Örneği. *Turkish Studies*, 4 (2), 621-638.
- Kantemir, E. (1976). *Türkiye’de liselerde türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimi*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Kantemir, E. (1988). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimi. *Türk Dilinin Öğretimi Toplantısı 1-3 Ekim 1986*. (s.71-77). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Karakuş, İ. (2005). *Türkçe türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimi* (3. Baskı). Can Reklamevi.
- Kavcar, C. (1987). “Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretimi”, *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 20 (1), 261-273.
- Kavcar, C. (1993). Yeni Türk edebiyatı öğretimi, *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26 (1), 29-38.
- Kavcar, C. (1994). *Edebiyat ve eğitim*. (Genişletilmiş 2. Baskı), Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.

- Kerman, Z. (1988). Kültür, dil ve edebiyat. *Türk Dilinin Öğretimi Toplantısı 1-3 Ekim 1986*. (s.4-13). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Kılıç, S. (2005). Lise edebiyat eğitiminin sorunları. *Varlık*, 1176, 3-7.
- Korkmaz, Z. (Hazırlayan) (1992). Atatürk ve türk dili belgeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Kudret, C. (1983). *Benim oğlum binâ okur*. İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Kurudayıoğlu, M.; Şahin, Ç. ve Çelik, G. (2008). Türkiye’de uygulanan türk edebiyatı programı’ndaki ölçme ve değerlendirme boyutu uygulamasının değerlendirilmesi: bir durum çalışması. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9, (2), 91-101.
- Marshall, J. (1974). *Anadili öğretimi* (Çeviren: Cahit Külebi) 1. Baskı. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- McKay, S. L. (2000). *Literature in ESL classroom*. In Brumfit, C.J. and R. A. Carter (Eds). *Literature and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MEB (2011). *Türk edebiyatı dersi öğretim programı ve kılavuzu*. Ankara: MEB Basım Evi.
- Mert, N. (2005). Sistem, edebiyat, öğretim/eğitim. *Hece Dergisi, Edebiyat Eğitimi ve Sorunları*, 9 (106), 73-79.
- Oğuz, S. (2011). *10. sınıf Türk edebiyatı ders kitaplarındaki divan şiiri bölümünün öğretim programı açısından değerlendirilmesi*. İstanbul: Marmara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi.
- Oral, B. ve Aşlıoğlu, B. (2000). Lise türk dili ve edebiyatı dersi öğretmenlerinin türk dili ve edebiyatı programı hakkındaki görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 25 (116), 34-41.
- Özarslan, E. (2006). Edebiyat öğretimi üzerine tasvirî bir deneme. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 247-257.
- Özcan, M. (1997). Ali Canib’in edebiyat eğitim ve öğretimiyle ilgili görüşleri. *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4, 147-167.
- Polat, T. (2006). Okur odaklı bir yaklaşımla yazın eğitimi. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 18-24.
- Poyrazoğlu, O. N. (1986). Türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretiminde karşılaşılan başlıca sorunlar. *Türk Eğitim Derneği IV. Öğretim Toplantısı 10-11 Nisan 1986*, (p.79-140), Ankara: Türk Eğitim Derneği Yayınları.
- Saraç, C. (2006). Sözlü iletişim becerileri açısından Türk dili ve edebiyatı eğitimi. *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 106-118.
- Saraç, C. (2009). Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin türk dili ve edebiyatı öğretiminden beklentileri. *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11 (1), 189-199.
- Tarlan, A. N. (1981). *Edebiyat meseleleri*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Taşdelen, V. (2006). “Edebiyat eğitimi: Hermeneutik bir yaklaşım” *Millî Eğitim*, 169, 42-55.
- Tepebaşılı, F. (2006) “Edebiyat öğretiminde waldmann modeli”, *VI. Dil, Yazın, Değişibilim Sempozyumu*, 1-2 Haziran 2006. Isparta: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, 605-617.
- Tuncer, H. (2005). Saçlarını okşamak kitapların. *Hece Dergisi, Edebiyat Eğitimi ve Sorunları*, 9 (106), 80-83.
- Tural, S. (2003). *Zamanın elinden tutmak*. Ankara: Yeni Avrasya Yayınları.
- Uçan, H. (2005). “Edebiyat eğitimi, okuma/Anlamlandırma ve yazınsal kuramlar. *Hece Dergisi, Edebiyat Eğitimi ve Sorunları*, 9 (106), 54-64.

- Uçan, H. (2006). Edebiyat eğitimi, estetik bir hazzın edinimi, okumanın alışkanlığa dönüştürülmesi ve yazınsal kuramlar. *Milli Eğitim*, 169, 25-41.
- Uygur, N. (1969). *İnsan açısından edebiyat*, İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Uzun, Y. (2009). *Türkiye’de ve İngiltere’de edebiyat öğretimi*. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi.
- Varış, F. (1978). *Eğitimde program geliştirme* (3. Baskı). Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Wellek, R. ve Warren, A. (1983). *Edebiyat biliminin temelleri* (Çev.: Ahmet Edip Uysal). Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- Yalçın, A. (2002). *Türkçe öğretim yöntemleri yeni yaklaşımlar*. (2. Baskı), Ankara: Akçağ Yayınları.
- Yavuz, H. (2012). *Budalalığın keşfi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (8. Baskı), Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.